

sent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From The National Observer, Feb. 9, 1970]
MAGNETOHYDRODYNAMICS—CONCERN OVER POLLUTION LIFTS HOPE FOR NEW POWER GENERATING PLAN

EVERETT, MASS.—Billowing smoke from coal-fired generators enrages air-pollution fighters. Nuclear-powered plants discharging heat into water stir the opposition of ecologists. And even hydroelectric-power enthusiasts seem close to being outflanked by conservationists.

Perhaps there isn't any way to produce electricity so as not to make anybody mad. But to the gratification of certain researchers here, President Nixon last week proposed in his budget that the Federal Government renew efforts to perfect a promising method that theoretically would offend only the most ardent environmental purists.

The technique is called "magnetohydrodynamics," or MHD for short. And for more than a decade, Dr. Arthur R. Kantrowitz, director of Avco Corp's Everett Research Laboratory here, has been extolling its virtues.

How MHD works can best be described by comparing it with more conventional energy-generating units. The latter burn fuel and air to make steam that is expanded in a turbine to produce mechanical power. This power is transmitted through a shaft to turn an electric generator. The actual electric power is produced by the motion of a copper wire armature moving through a magnetic field. A nuclear plant operates in a similar fashion with the reactor replacing the furnace-boiler system.

MHD operation, not combustion products, fuel are seeded with potassium and become, in effect, the "armature." These hot gases move at high velocity through a magnetic field where electric power is generated directly. Thus, power is produced by a one-step process as opposed to the more conventional three-step method.

Then, the products of combustion, the sulfur dioxide and the oxides of nitrogen, are not transmitted into the atmosphere as many power plants do now. Instead, these pollutants are retained and processed for commercial use by a chemical process that is an inherent part of the MHD power system.

All of this remains theoretical, of course. The truth is, very high combustion temperatures of the MHD process actually produce more polluting oxides, not fewer, than more conventional generating methods. The hope is that the very abundance of these pollutants would make reclaiming chemicals from them profitable.

Sitting somewhat impatiently in his second-floor office in Avco's spanking new research-laboratory building, Dr. Kantrowitz points out mementos highlighting his work with MHD. One is a small, gray model of wood and wire, a souvenir of the first MHD unit at Avco more than a decade old.

Another is a photograph of a model of an MHD complex designed by Russia, where a 75-megawatt pilot plant is supposed to go into operation this year. "I estimate the cost of that is \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000," he says wistfully.

Japan, too, has started a national MHD project. West Germany also has a government-sponsored MHD project with funding being increased at the rate of 25 per cent a year.

For now at least, these foreign developments seem much larger than U.S. efforts so far. President Nixon proposed that in the fiscal year beginning July 1, MHD research contracts be negotiated for \$400,000 worth

of work. The contracts would be let by the Office of Coal Research (OCR), whose function is to find new ways to increase coal consumption. Large-scale MHD generators probably would use coal for fuel.

Earlier a Presidential panel of academic and industry specialists studied the current status of MHD development and recommended last summer that Mr. Nixon ask Congress to authorize spending of \$2,000,000 annually for more research about the technique. The panel's report said such research efforts by the power-generating industry had slackened in recent years perhaps because it was difficult to predict the benefits of large-scale MHD plants.

"Whatever the reasons," the report to the President said, "the panel does not expect MHD work to continue at an appreciable and useful level unless the Government provides the major support."

Actually about \$16,000,000 has been expended to date on MHD research in this country, about half of it coming from utilities led by the American Electric Power Co., Inc., of New York City and Avco and half from the Department of Defense for Air Force work. With these funds, a number of small MHD units were constructed, some in the Boston area and others at the Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tullahoma, Tenn.

—HARRIS SMITH.

[From the New Republic, Jan. 24, 1970]

HOW MUCH, HOW SOON FOR ANTI-POLLUTION?

Anti-pollution is the fashion. What we need to know is how much money the Administration (and the corporations) will invest in it. A little known—and little-funded—Interior Department agency, the Office of Coal Research (OCR), has in its files data on a half dozen or more techniques that promise to eliminate major environmental pollution. But OCR has never got more than \$12 million and until recently no one in Interior or the White House has been disposed to ask for more. OCR's technologies remain undeveloped.

Take magnetohydrodynamics. MHD is a way of converting coal and other fossil fuels to electricity almost directly, without intervening boilers, turbines or generators. It is about 50 percent more efficient than conventional coal-fired generating plants—which, in turn, are about 50 percent more efficient than nuclear plants. MHD would significantly reduce the "thermal pollution" created by most present power generation (with the exception of hydroelectric plants, which make up only a small percentage of the total and which sometimes create their own kind of environmental damage). Thermal pollution is the heating of water in streams, lakes or the ocean, often with severe detriment to the balance of life.

MHD also offers great promise for reducing air pollution. Because it is more efficient, it burns less fuel per kilowatt hour than other power-generating techniques; you get less pollution from producing the same amount of power. The fuel for MHD must be "seeded"; that is, an ionizable substance must be added to it to make hot gases electrically conductive. The seed must be removed from the leftover gases, a necessity which becomes a virtue because pollutants can be removed at the same time.

A major source of air pollution—second only to automobiles—is the fuel-burning industrial installations, primarily power plants. Almost without exception, they give off sulfur oxide, and a fine, abrasive ash. Although the sulfur oxides, or the particles alone may not be harmful to health (there's no conclusive evidence), in combination they are highly destructive to lung tissue, according to HEW's National Center for Air Pollution Control. Sulfur oxides, alone, are harmful to plant life. (The acid sulfur ox-

ides produce the foul taste in your mouth in highly air polluted areas.) HEW under the Air Pollution Control Act, has set "criteria" for the amounts of these two pollutants that can be emitted from industrial plants. But the criteria, applied by state and local governments, are flexible enough to "meet local needs." HEW's enforcement powers are minimal; the amount of money available here is in inverse proportion to the enormity of the problem.

But the criteria plus the techniques now in OCR's files could get the job done, if the technologies can be turned into commercial hardware. Then, instead of depending for clean air on corporate willingness to obey the law (and the willingness of state and local government to enforce it) the corporations might find it in their interest to adopt the new technologies voluntarily, because of their greater efficiencies.

MHD is not the only technique OCR has in mind. A process for dissolving raw coal in anthracene solvent, which would carry off all the potentially polluting materials, is another. The leftover would be almost pure carbon—in a form that could be extruded, ground, melted or handled in numerous other ways. Diesel-electric locomotives and perhaps diesel trucks could burn this clean substance. But once again, the potential would be greatest for power production, especially in congested urban areas such as New York City.

There are several ways, some pioneered by OCR and others by Interior's Bureau of Mines, to convert coal into producer or pipeline gas. If coal can be converted to pure methane—or pure hydrogen or pure carbon monoxide—leaving the pollutants behind in the coal residue, then the gas can be burned with little harm to the environment, in almost any kind of fuel-burning installation and with minimal conversion costs.

The Russians plan to have a part-MHD, part-conventional, plant in commercial operation in 1970; the Japanese are also advancing rapidly in this technology. The President's Office of Science and Technology last June recommended a full-scale MHD research program, as did the Interior Department's own Energy Policy Staff a year earlier. Support for MHD in the scientific community is almost unanimous. Yet, not a penny for MHD was left by the Budget Bureau in OCR's fiscal 1970 budget request. Efforts by Montana Senators Lee Metcalf and Mike Mansfield to get money for MHD into the 1970 Interior appropriations bill failed. The 1971 budget OCR submitted to Interior officials included a miserly \$400,000 for MHD, which was then entirely eliminated by a budget officer. The two Montana Senators asked that the money be reinstated. And last month, the Minerals, Materials and Fuels subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee, chaired by Senator Moss of Utah, held hearings on MHD, at which scientists gave the new technology strong endorsement. So now the Interior Budget, as it goes to the Budget Bureau, will contain "somewhat more than" the \$400,000 earlier asked, though less than the \$2-million suggested by OST.

Meanwhile, with electrical needs doubling every 10 years, the electric utility industry has indicated through the Edison Electric Institute that it will make some contribution to MHD, at least for research into "peaking" or emergency plants. HEW and the Atomic Energy Commission may also ante up some funds. Meyer Steinberg, a scientist with AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratory, has suggested that giant MHD plants burning coal be built at mine-mouth in thinly populated Western coal states (including Utah and Montana), the power produced to be transmitted to population centers via "superconductors" or other ultramodern "electrical superhighways." It is possible that AEC is motivated by its awareness that nuclear

plants are a serious contributor to environmental damage through thermal pollution and difficult-to-dispose-of radioactive wastes. Or the well-funded AEC (\$2 billion since World War II to develop nuclear power) may see MHD as a technique applicable to nuclear fuels. AEC's entry could make MHD go, if the President gets solidly behind environmental quality.

Of course, technology alone won't keep our environment clean. Scientists are coming to regard the formerly innocuous carbon dioxide as a pollutant, at least in urban "micro-environments." In these areas, higher levels of CO₂ will soon begin to cause rotting of the mortar in urban buildings. Burning fossil fuel always creates carbon dioxide, and the final solution to the CO₂ problem will have to be reduced burning of fuels. Moving industrial plants into thinly populated areas would help. But what would help more is fewer people and a lower per capita rate of consumption, including fewer automobiles or prohibitively high tolls for their admission into urban areas.

—RICHARD H. GILLULY.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE CARSWELL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the opposition to Judge Carswell has been very vocal—if misleading—in attempting to convince the Senate that the experts and the professors are on their side.

The truth is, the people on their side are largely those so-called experts and other who view the Constitution as a document to use to instigate social reform, not those who view it as the keystone of our Republic.

It may surprise many of Judge Carswell's opponents that the White House has received a number of letters and wires supporting the constitutional arguments in the President's letter to the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) regarding the appointment of Judge G. Harold Carswell to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

President Nixon contended that his constitutional duty could be frustrated if the Senate should withhold consent for other than strong or special reasons. The President said that such a case had not been made against Judge Carswell.

Messages of support for the President's position have come from James William Moore, Sterling professor of law, Yale University; Erwin A. Elias, professor of law, Texas Tech University; Michael J. Vaughn, assistant professor of law, Baylor University; Edward C. Banfield, professor of government, Harvard University; Howard Penniman, professor of government, Georgetown University; and James M. Brown and Edward A. Potts, professors of law, George Washington University.

I ask unanimous consent that the messages be printed in the RECORD.

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

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was pleased with your statement to Senator Saxbe that your choice of Judge Carswell should not be frustrated because of philosophical or ideological differences concerning your nominee, especially where his confirmation would aid in restoring a balance to the Supreme Court; which I believe the electorate approved. This

position still leaves the Senate with large and proper powers to reject a nominee for lack of integrity and for other reasons stated by Hamilton in the Federalist, such as favoritism in the President, personal attachment and the like. None of these reasons stated by Hamilton is applicable to Judge Carswell. I am pleased that you continue in your steadfast support of Judge Carswell and I trust that your sound constitutional position will in the end be vindicated by the good sense and conscience of the Senate. I have the honor to remain your obedient supporter.

JAMES WILLIAM MOORE,

Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,

April 3, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

Your letter of Presidential-senatorial roles and appointments is correct. Washington Post misuses Federalist 76 by ignoring paragraph preceding the one quoted. Senate not intended to substitute its choice for those of President as seems to be goal of opponents of Carswell confirmation.

HOWARD PENNIMAN,

Professor of Government, Georgetown University.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington D.C.:

We the undersigned respectfully take this means to indicate our support for the nomination of Judge Carswell and our concurrence with the deep concern expressed by you in your letter of March 31, 1970 to Senator Saxbe.

ERWIN A. ELIAS,

Professor of Law, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Tex.

MICHAEL J. VAUGHN,

Assistant Professor of Law, Baylor University, Waco, Tex.

President NIXON,
The White House,
Washington D.C.:

Every Senate has endeavored to weaken the powers of the Presidency and every President to preserve and strengthen them. Your present struggle is in this great tradition and those who want strong effective national government must pray for your success.

EDWARD C. BANFIELD,

Professor of Government, Harvard University.

APRIL 3, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In our judgment your letter to Senator Saxbe accurately reflects the intent of the Constitution with respect to the Presidential power of appointment to the Supreme Court with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Washington Post editorial of April 2, 1970, quoting the Federalist Paper No. 76 neglected to cite the sentence immediately preceding the one quoted, which in part reads "...it is not likely that their sanction (the Senate) would often be refused, where there were not special and strong reasons for the refusal." (Emphasis added.) This is precisely what we read your letter to say.

In the Federalist No. 76 Hamilton discusses three possible methods for appointment of ambassadors, public ministers and judges of the Supreme Court. He describes the rationale by which the compromise process was reached establishing the method prescribed by the Constitution under which the President nominates, and, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints. In discussing the selection by the President, Hamilton says, "Premising this, I proceed to lay

it down as a rule, that one man of discernment is better fitted to analyze and estimate the peculiar qualities adapted to particular offices, than a body of men of equal or perhaps even of superior discernment."

He further states, "He will have FEWER personal attachments to gratify, than a body of men who may each be supposed to have an equal number; and will be so much the less liable to be misled by the sentiments of friendship and of affection. A single well-directed an, by a single understanding, cannot be distracted and warped by that diversity of views, feelings, and interests, which frequently distract and warp the resolutions of a collective body." Having argued the superior wisdom of one man making the appointment, Hamilton goes on to justify the compromise by which the nomination must be approved by the Senate and states, "In the act of nomination, his judgment alone would be exercised; and as it would be his sole duty to point out the man who, with the approbation of the Senate, should fill an office, his responsibility would be as complete as if he were to make the final appointment. There can, in this view, be no difference between nominating and appointing." Hamilton further observed that, "It is also not very probable that his nomination would often be overruled." This expectation has been borne out by the fact that the Senate has withheld its consent, to nominees to the Supreme Court, in only three instances in this century.

The Senate has the positive duty to determine whether the nominee's character befits the office. The Senate should, of course, make this judgment with respect to Judge Carswell. We believe, however, that you have correctly stated the traditional constitutional relationships of the President and the Congress, and that the consent of the Senate should be refused only when, in the words of Hamilton, there are "special and strong reasons for the refusal." The Senate should not attempt to substitute its subjective judgment as to this or any other nomination.

Very respectfully yours,

JAMES M. BROWN,

Professor of Law,

EDWARD A. POTTS,

Professor of Law and Associate Dean,
the National Law Center, the George Washington University.

MORRIS ABRAHAM WARNS OF DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF U.S. INACTION IN HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, three crucial human rights treaties now lie before the Senate of the United States—the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the Convention on Forced Labor, and the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

These treaties reaffirm the principles on which this country was founded and which are guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Their ratification is essential if this country is to actively participate in developing an international law of human rights.

It is important at this time that we ask ourselves how the U.S. failure to ratify these treaties has affected this vital effort. The answer is crystal clear: The inactivity of the United States in this area has been a severe handicap to progress in securing international protection of human rights.

Mr. Morris B. Abram, a distinguished New York lawyer and former president

ica as by these two distinguished colleagues it would present little problem. But to most Americans, to the man on the street, the man in uniform, and the man who has been in uniform, it will be interpreted almost universally as an attack, first, on the President's credibility and as an effort to hamstring the Commander in Chief in his efforts to protect American forces after June 30, 1970, in Cambodia.

Mr. President, this is the issue that concerns many of us. I recognize some are opposed to any resolution. But it appears even at this point that there still may be an opportunity for compromise, that there is still opportunity for accommodation. We can recognize the rights, powers, duties, and obligations of Members of this body and also recognize the rights, powers, duties, and responsibilities of the President of the United States if we truly make the effort.

I would hope in the days ahead, after adoption of the perfecting amendment, there still may be some accommodation and some recognition of the fact the President had a right to make a tactical move into Cambodia, and that the move was made to protect American troops and to keep the Vietnamization program on schedule. I trust we can resolve the remaining issues in the Church-Cooper amendment in a very short time.

The issue is important enough, as it was in 1951—during the so-called great debate which lasted from January to April over the President's right and power in connection with the Korean conflict. The issue is serious enough and grave enough that, if necessary, we should spend days, and perhaps weeks, debating the rights, powers, and responsibilities of Congress vis-a-vis the rights, powers, and responsibilities of the President.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think that the current Senate debate on the Church-Cooper amendment is one of the most vital matters we have had before us this Congress.

It is a crucial step in the reassertion of our Constitutional responsibility over the waging of war and peace.

It is a vital measure in the current effort to bring the tragic Indochina war to a close and to substitute a firm policy of political settlement and American disengagement for the current policy of military victory and perpetual warfare.

Most of all, this amendment is a means by which we can respond to the despair of a nation—a nation which needs to know that there is a Congress both willing and able to reflect their will that the war be ended.

Never in my 6 years in the U.S. Senate have I seen such an outpouring of bewilderment, frustration, fear, and disappointment from my constituents as over the recent decision to carry the Vietnam war into Cambodia.

I must admit that I share and deeply sympathize with these same reactions. I very much want to support the President in his professed goal of withdrawing American troops from Southeast Asia and bringing an end to the longest war in our Nation's history—a war in which, in a decade, has claimed nearly 50,000

American lives, another quarter of a million wounded, untold millions of Vietnamese deaths, and over \$100 billion worth of American resources.

But I am absolutely convinced that we cannot end a war by escalating it; that we cannot further negotiations by increasing the tempo of warfare; that we cannot achieve a just political settlement by pursuing a quick military victory in a land where that goal has eluded us for 10 tragic years.

The Church-Cooper amendment now before us, and the Hatfield-McGovern amendment which will follow when the military authorization is considered, are vital and responsible pieces of legislation, designed only to further the objectives of peace which all profess to hold.

They will not tie the hand of the President in his constitutional obligation as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. As Commander in Chief, he must direct the military effort, protect our troops, and further the objectives which lie behind our massive involvement in Indochina.

But Congress has the authority and the obligation to direct the nature of these objectives and to set limits upon military activities which run counter to them.

The recent invasion of Cambodia was in clear contradiction to the objectives of peace, disengagement, and a political solution which the President has told us we are pursuing.

I firmly believe, as I have stated, that Congress must set limits which will strengthen our pursuit of these objectives.

The Church-Cooper amendment does just that. It simply reinforces what the President has already insisted to be our inviolable timetable for the withdrawal of troops from Cambodia. But it will make clear that such an adventure does not, in fact, correspond to the objectives of our Indochinese involvement, and that it must not be attempted a second time.

Our troops will be protected. The President's Cambodian mission will be completed according to his own timetable and will be successful by whatever criterion the administration and the Pentagon are now setting for the evaluation of that mission.

All the Church-Cooper amendment will do, then, is make it clear that whatever we call our objective—"withdrawal," "Vietnamization," "peace," "peace with honor," or "political solution"—will not be served by another massive invasion of Cambodia.

Similar reasoning, I think, applies to our involvement in all of Vietnam. In effect, Cambodia is only a peripheral issue—symbolic of the confusion over the goals we seek in Indochina. The real tragedy of Cambodia was and is not the fact that our troops are there, and not even the likelihood of a wider and prolonged war throughout Indochina—although these are profoundly disturbing issues. The real tragedy of Cambodia is that it was an utter violation of the objective of a negotiated, political settlement of the Vietnamese war.

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot profess to a political solution while seeking the military victory which has

eluded us for 10 years and already cost us 50,000 American lives.

I was hopeful that the "Vietnamization" program was a means of seeking the political solution. I hoped that it would bring an end to the hostilities and encourage the Saigon government and the South Vietnamese Army to put their house in order and see if they can secure the stability and allegiance of the people of South Vietnam.

But recent events have suggested that there must be congressional limits in order to pursue and secure such a policy. Again, I have no desire to thwart the responsibility of the President as Commander in Chief. But I do feel that the Congress has the responsibility and the constitutional obligation to determine why we are in this part of the world, to support the President in his decisions and activities which further these objectives, and to prohibit activities which run counter to peace, disengagement, and political settlement.

I firmly believe that the Hatfield-McGovern amendment to the military authorization bill will serve these ends. It will give ample time for the President and our military and political delegation in Saigon to accomplish the total Vietnamization of this war. It will surely encourage the South Vietnamese to further this goal. And it will hold us to a disengagement from a war in which we have now won all we can ever win.

Mr. President, I commend the authors of these amendments, and I very much hope that they will receive the overwhelming endorsement of the Senate which they deserve.

We can, at this time, take no more important steps for the causes of peace, honor, unity, and national pride.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, one of the tragic consequences of the agonizing war in Vietnam has been the tremendous toll paid by the Vietnamese people. This aspect of the war is often overlooked in this country. But the fact remains that over the last 5 years the conflict has destroyed the countryside, generated millions of refugees, and inflicted at least a million civilian war casualties, including some 300,000 deaths.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on refugees I have long been concerned over this human cost of the war, and we have tried to make the case—over and over again—that the problem of refugees and civilian casualties must be a matter of vital concern to the United States.

It is with considerable interest, therefore, to note what has apparently become a primary justification by the administration for bogging down the withdrawal of American troops. Repeatedly, officials in the administration—including the President—have suggested that the mere withdrawal of these troops—at any point, it seems—would result in a "bloodbath" for millions of South Vietnamese citizens.

Frankly, Mr. President, I am skeptical of these speculations—these fears. As they are phrased by the administration, I find they are also misleading. And I strongly feel the polemical repetition of the "bloodbath" argument has become an irresponsible evasion of the real is-

sues involved in reaching a political settlement—A negotiated settlement—in South Vietnam, and finally bringing peace to that battered land.

First of all, the "bloodbath" argument is, at best, based upon dubious historical evidence. Several recent articles which I shall introduce into the RECORD at the close of my remarks, point this out rather convincingly.

It is misleading, for example, to compare the situation in South Vietnam today with that of North Vietnam in the 1950's when an alleged "bloodbath" occurred. The two situations are simply not analogous, especially because the non-Communist groups in South Vietnam today—including the Thieu government—are well organized and strong, and, I should emphasize, well armed.

Within the context of the Vietnamization program, this should suggest to the administration that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, even if they were intent upon a "bloodbath," will have to seek political accommodation—not political annihilation. In this connection, one of the analysts most widely quoted by those who actively fear a "bloodbath"—Douglas Pike—admits in his recent study on Vietcong terror, that only a decisive Communist victory would carry the threat of reprisals involving mass slaughter. No one seriously argues that such a "decisive victory" is about to occur.

In the case of political accommodation, the negotiated settlement should obviously include provisions to protect and provide sanctuaries for those who fear for their lives. But the mere fear of a "bloodbath" must not become a slogan to evade those negotiations. The safety and right of asylum for South Vietnamese citizens opposed to the political solution achieved in their country can only be provided by the negotiations.

And there is ample precedent for such provisions—within the historical context of Indochina and elsewhere. We all know, for example, that the right of refuge and population regroupment was agreed to in the Geneva accords of 1954, which ended the first Indochina war. And in similar wars, no less bloody and impassioned than Vietnam—such as Algeria, or even Nigeria—the issue of protecting former opposition groups and the civilian population was guaranteed in the arrangements which followed the war, and, in the main, were satisfactorily carried out.

Finally, Mr. President, we must not allow the specter of a highly dubious "bloodbath" of the future to blind us from the "bloodbath" that is going on today, every day, in South Vietnam and all of Indochina. This "bloodbath" started long ago—and we are part of it—and it will continue daily so long as the war continues, so long as negotiations to end that war are avoided and delayed.

Already a million soldiers and civilians have been killed in Vietnam, and, by very conservative official estimates, approximately 4,000 Vietnamese civilians are wounded each month. This "bloodbath"—which is here and now—must be stopped. Concern for the future safety and rights of the people of South Vietnam is proper and right. But it must

not be used to derail us from the hard task of negotiating a settlement that will end the military "bloodbath" that is going on today.

In all candor, I must concur with the view that administration spokesmen seem to be rather cynically using the "bloodbath" argument to win support for short-range policies of military success. But, it seems to me, that if we are to avoid the long-term "bloodbath" of continued war, we must expose the administration's argument for what it is: Cynical political rhetoric designed to disguise the hard choices we face in negotiating a peace that will end the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of relevant articles on the "bloodbath" issue be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1970]

EXCERPT FROM "ONLY A TIMETABLE CAN EXTRICATE NIXON"

(By Lee Gelb and Morton H. Halperin)

... Another argument frequently used by the Nixon administration against a fixed withdrawal schedule is that a blood bath would ensue in South Vietnam. This is a serious matter to take into account. The administration, however, is using it as a scare tactic. Speculations—and they can be only speculations—about a blood bath have to be weighed against the certainty that South Vietnamese are now being killed by the thousands and will continue to be killed by the thousands each year that the war goes on.

The North Vietnamese record of dealing with their enemies after the 1954 Geneva Conference is certainly no worse than the record of our South Vietnamese allies. The performance of both on the matter of human life over the last six years has been equally appalling. For the South Vietnamese who would not wish to take their chances with a "peace," we should, of course, stand ready to provide sanctuary and assistance.

But the interesting thing about the blood bath argument is that it must hide either the belief that the South Vietnamese army is hopeless or the conviction that U.S. forces can never be fully withdrawn—or both. The Nixon administration keeps insisting that our South Vietnamese allies have made great progress in the military field, and even the heretofore knowledgeable pessimists agree. The South Vietnamese armed forces number one million, and if police and civil defense forces are counted, this adds another quarter million. They have the most modern U.S. equipment, and after an American withdrawal would continue to receive U.S. military assistance.

The 1½ million-man force would be left to contend with a combined North Vietnamese and Vietcong force of about 220,000 backed up by a North Vietnamese army of approximately 400,000. If these numerical odds are not considered significant by the President, is he really concerned about something else? Does it have something to do with the quality of the South Vietnamese forces? Will they ever be able to hold their own against North Vietnam?

All these questions come down to the overwhelming question: Does the President really intend to get out of Vietnam fully or will his policy inevitably lead to a leveling off of U.S. forces at 100,000 or even 250,000 men? If the latter is his policy, the President really has no objection to the fixed timetable alternative. His objection rather would seem to be to the very principle of full withdrawal in the absence of a negotiated settlement. . . .

[From Life Magazine, May 22, 1970]

EXCERPTS FROM CLARK CLIFFORD'S, "SET DATE IN VIETNAM, STICK TO IT, GET OUT."

On a number of occasions, President Nixon, in arguing that it would be improper for us to leave Vietnam now, has used the so-called "bloodbath" arguments. He has suggested that the massacre of many South Vietnamese, including a million and a half Catholics who fled from the North, would occur when our forces withdrew.

I find this position difficult to understand. In the first place, the figure of one million and a half Catholics who fled to the South, referred to by President Nixon in his speech of Nov. 3, 1969, is incorrect. A study of this subject, published in 1966, by the South Vietnam Department of Education and the National Commission for UNESCO, discloses that the number is not 1.5 million but 754,710. This is significant because the President overlooked the fact that there are still living in North Vietnam today approximately 800,000 Catholics. There are also Catholics among the leadership of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam.

The President basis his claim of "bloodbath" on his charge that when the Communists took over North Vietnam in 1954, they slaughtered thousands upon thousands of North Vietnamese. In fact, the records of the International Commission disclose that, in the two years following the armistice of 1954, only 19 complaints were filed covering political reprisals in all of North Vietnam. Later, in 1955 and 1956, a peasant revolt was harshly repressed, and the best estimate are that 10,000 to 15,000 may have died.

It is my firm belief that, when it becomes apparent that the Americans are in fact leaving, all parties seeking power in South Vietnam will have a strong incentive negotiate a compromise settlement. All will recognize that compromise is their one assurance of a share in political power. The contending factions must now be aware that, in the absence of compromise, they can look forward only to continued conflict and disruption. The need for peace must now be apparent to all but the very few whose power and profit depend on war.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 3, 1969]
SPECIALISTS DOUBT U.S. PULLOUT WOULD LEAD TO A SLAUGHTER

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG.—In contrast to the apocalyptic view of the future currently being voiced in some quarters in the United States, specialists in this part of the world strongly doubt that an American withdrawal will give the Communists an automatic victory in South Vietnam.

Even if the Communists do acquire a share of power in Saigon, these specialists submit, it is equally doubtful that they could or would slaughter everyone who resists their authority.

This is not to depict the Communists as Boy Scouts dedicated to good deeds. Nor does it mean that their ultimate goal is anything less than the complete control of Vietnam.

Yet they, like their opponents, cannot realistically ignore the fact that Vietnam is a highly fragmented, pluralistic society that can only be governed by balancing rather than crushing its vast and often baffling assortment of factions.

These factions include religious sects like the Cao Dai, the Hoa Hao and various Catholic and Buddhist persuasions, as well as crazy quilt of splintered political parties, clan associations, ethnic movements, secret societies and other groups.

Moreover, many of these factions have deep roots in different areas of the country, where they have survived and even flourished by

S. RES. 415

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the introduction of Russian pilots and the manning of missile sites by Russian technicians in the United Arab Republic is contributing to the increasing tension in the Middle East, and the President is strongly urged to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all Russian personnel as a major step toward the encouragement of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am proud to join the distinguished minority leader (Mr. SCOTT) in submitting this resolution, urging the President to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its pilots and technicians from the United Arab Republic.

It would be a tragic mistake if the current Senate debate over our involvement in Indochina were interpreted by any other nation as an indication of a growing isolationism or as a weakening of American determination to stand firm wherever our real interests and real commitments are at stake.

It is no secret that I strongly doubt whether either national interests or, by this stage, real commitments are at stake in Vietnam or Indochina. Upon this matter there is honest debate in the Senate, and that is a most healthy and encouraging development.

But there is no debate of which I am aware over our firm commitment to the balance of power in the Middle East or to the need to stand by the beleaguered nation of Israel. Here, at the crossroads of three continents, in the face of an aggressive Soviet move for Middle Eastern hegemony—and in defense of one of the most democratic, progressive, enlightened, and courageous nations in the world—there should be no doubt of our national interest or our moral commitment.

I applaud the administration for its steadfast attempts to avoid a Middle Eastern arms race and to reach an accord with all nations in that part of the world. If there has perhaps been any excess of objectivity and neutrality, it has undoubtedly been with the very finest motives.

But it has been increasingly clear that our efforts to restrain the conflict have not been met with any corresponding restraint on the part of the Soviet Union. The Soviets, in fact, have met every conciliatory move on our part with actions which have only escalated the hostility and intransigence of the Arabs.

The introduction of Russian pilots flying air defense and Russian technicians manning the missile sites has severely destabilized what was only a precarious balance, at best. There is little doubt that the Arabs have no intention of negotiating with the Israelis, in spite of the continuing willingness of Israel to discuss any and all matters directly with the Arab States. There is little doubt that only Israel air superiority has prevented the Arab nations from launching a new Middle Eastern war. And there is no doubt that with such heavy Soviet assistance, both materials and men, the Arabs are only counting the days until they can once again try for the total elimination of Israel.

The introduction of Soviet pilots and

technicians has not only affected the balance of power. It has seriously and dangerously changed the very nature of the conflict.

We know, from the very bitterest experience, how "a few technicians and defensive military advisers" can escalate into an enormous commitment which grows far out of any planned proportion. Have the Soviets thought about what they will do if the Arabs should launch a strike tomorrow across the canal? Can the Soviets keep their pilots and technicians in a purely defensive capacity if hostilities should break out? What will happen when the first Soviet pilot strays over the canal and is brought down by an Israel flyer? What have the Soviets done by their actions to the Arab's willingness to reach a reasonable accord on the basic issues that still divide the Middle East? Can the Soviets truly control the Arab nationalists? Or, will they wind up being slowly and tragically drawn into a great and prolonged conflict much as we were drawn into the Indochinese war?

These are reasons why the President must take all possible steps to get the Soviet Union to abandon this reckless course. No escalation of the arms race in the Middle East can bring peace any closer. But we will soon have—we may now have—no other choice but to respond by providing Israel with jets and other implements of war with which to protect herself.

Unless the Russians can be persuaded of our resolve to stand by Israel and of the futility and danger of their recent actions in Egypt, I see a new and more dangerous level in the Middle East confrontation.

So I repeat my plea to our President which is contained in the resolution introduced by the distinguished minority leader and myself: Bring all the power and prestige of your Office and your past record of statesmanship in the Middle East to bear upon the Soviet Union to reverse their dangerous policies. Know that we in the Senate stand behind you in that effort, prepared to uphold American interests in the Middle East and our moral commitments to the people of Israel.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT—THE CHURCH-COOPER AMENDMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in newspaper advertisements and on the floor, I have been struck, during this past 2 weeks, by one interesting line of argument being raised by opponents of the Church-Cooper amendment. In these advertisements and statements by Senators on the floor a great deal is being made of the fact that several years ago the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, made a number of statements in support of Presidential power as against congressional restriction, and supported the effort in Vietnam in 1964 at the time of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Mr. President, as everyone in this body knows, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has in the course of

the years changed his position on both of these points based on the performance of the President and the course of the war. He has readily confessed he was mistaken in both matters.

Those who seek to use his words today seek to imply that once a position is taken on matters affecting defense and foreign policy there should be no change.

I find this position ironic, particularly in the face of the sharp change that apparently has taken place both in the White House and here in the Senate with regard to the administration's attitude toward so-called limiting amendments.

On December 15, 1969, the Senate approved overwhelmingly an amendment which reads as follows:

In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to finance the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand.

I listened to the debate of that amendment and at no time was mention made of any inhibition of the President's constitutional powers or his right as Commander in Chief to protect American troops in South Vietnam or anywhere else.

On the day following that vote, when faced with newspaper articles which referred to the Laos-Thailand amendment as a curbing of Presidential power, both the White House and the President's supporters here in the Senate were quick to argue that the Senate action in no way inhibited the President and, in fact, was endorsed fully by the White House.

At this point I would like to read a statement made on the Senate floor by the distinguished minority whip (Mr. GRIFFIN) on the day after the passage of the Laos-Thailand amendment:

The Senate did not take any action to "curb" an Asian role. The intent and the plain meaning of the amendment ultimately adopted by the Senate yesterday was to reaffirm the existing role and existing policies of the United States with respect to Thailand and Laos.

Indeed, the amendment was drafted—and I think most of the people on the Senate floor and those who were watching from the gallery were aware of the fact that it was drafted right here in the Republic cloakroom. In fact, the principal Senators involved in its drafting, along with the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church) were the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Allott) and the Senator from New York (Mr. Javits); . . .

Following a meeting with the President and others at the White House this morning, I can report to my fellow Senators that the President is pleased with the amendment, and he recognizes that it is in accordance with his announced policies.

White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler and the Senate minority leader, Senator SCOTT, were no less forceful in pressing the idea that the Laos-Thailand amendment was approved by the White House, in fact there is an indication that they sought to take partial credit for the effort:

This wording, it was disclosed today, was approved by the White House in advance of adoption.*

*"President Backs Senators on Laos," by John W. Finney, *New York Times*, December 17, 1969, p. 12, column 4.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1970

No. 89

Senate

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the source of our being, and the guide of our pilgrim days, we hush our busy thoughts that we may learn in silence what we cannot know by speaking. Put out all lesser lights that we may have Thy light upon our pathway. Subdue our pride, our passion, our sin, and all finite frailties and set our spirits free, in tune with the infinite, at home with the eternal. Give us faith to see behind the tangle of human affairs and beneath the collision of world forces, some mighty purpose working toward Thy coming kingdom, in the fulfillment of which we have a part.

O God, our life, our hope, our strength, make us sure of Thee. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1970.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 1, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

VACATING OF ORDER FOR SENATOR HRUSKA TO SPEAK THIS MORNING

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order, under which the able Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) would be recognized for a period of 1 hour, be vacated.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time prior to recognizing the able Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) at 12 o'clock be utilized for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein being limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 415—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE GROWING THREAT POSED BY SOVIET PILOTS AND TECHNICIANS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) is in the Chamber. I submit for appropriate reference a resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE).

It has been virtually axiomatic that the Middle East is the No. 1 trouble spot in a troubled world, and I submit that the presence of Soviet personnel in the cockpits of United Arab Republic aircraft and in the surface-to-air missile sites on the ground has turned a dangerous situation into a critical one.

The Russians already have done too much, and this resolution urges the President to call upon the Soviet Union—in the interest of peace and as a means of encouraging peace in the Middle East and in the world—to withdraw its personnel from the United Arab Republic.

Passage of this resolution, Mr. President, will enable the President to make such representations to the Soviet Union, and should the Russians comply, such action would aid immeasurably the cause of peace which we all seek.

Mr. President, I submit that this resolution—in which Senator MONDALE and I ask all our colleagues to join—could go a long way toward cooling down the hot spot of the Middle East and could lead to a deescalation of war activity. Indeed such action by the Soviet Union could avoid the confrontation which conceivably could lead to all-out war.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. President, that the balance of power in the Middle East is crucial to the security of the United States. The Soviets now have warships in the warm waters of the Mediterranean in numbers which should alarm all of us.

And their entry into the missile picture is another example of the type of escalation we all decry.

Similarly, the presence of Soviet pilots in United Arab Republic aircraft is a situation which should not only be discouraged, but one which should be acted upon by the United States. It is the President who can best handle such a situation, and this resolution will express to President Nixon the sense of the Senate in this respect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 415) expressing the sense of the Senate on the growing threat posed by Soviet pilots and technicians in the Middle East, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to point out that no limiting language was offered to that amendment, and in January of this year that same language was included in this administration's requested appropriations language.

That brings us down to the Church-Cooper amendment which, as any reasonable person must agree, is drafted in the same context as last year's Laos-Thailand amendment. Though it has more sections than the initial effort by the Senate last fall to set outer limits in line with Presidential policy, the thrust of this Cambodia amendment clearly follows the precedent of Laos-Thailand.

It is, therefore, strange to see statements such as the one made on the Senate floor on May 14 by the minority whip, which reads as follows:

Even if we were to draft an amendment which was precisely tailored to the exact and actual intentions of the President, it seems to me that it would be a mistake to adopt such an amendment. We would be tying our own hands needlessly in a way that would serve the enemy, and would make it more difficult to negotiate with the enemy. I am sure the enemy would be delighted if we were to announce that we are going to tie our own hands in this way.

I would be interested in knowing what has occurred between the enthusiasm of last December and the frostiness of the spring. Does the Senator from Michigan believe that we tied our own hands needlessly last December?

Was the enemy delighted with the Laos-Thailand amendment? May I remind the Senate that as with Laos-Thailand—which was framed to conform with the President's own statements—Church-Cooper also puts into Senate language the President's own statements. As has been noted on this floor before, does the enemy only become joyful when the Senate acts in line with the President's statements of limits, or does that joy begin when the President himself announces the limits under which he will act as Commander in Chief?

When did the great constitutional crisis develop that apparently was unseen last December, but appears to be overwhelmingly with us today?

Mr. President, I must suggest that this change of position of the White House and of the White House supporters here in the Senate on this amendment represents apparently arose from necessity to develop a rationale of what was close to an unconstitutional if clearly an unauthorized act by the President of the United States in sending troops over the border into Cambodia. The President himself recognized the situation when he sought to regain congressional support by arbitrarily setting a limit of 21.7 miles beyond which he would not go without congressional authority.

Is this some new refinement that the Constitution becomes applicable 21.7 miles over the border of South Vietnam or any country?

The President, I am afraid, does both himself and his office disservice by seeking to use the constitutional argument to protect himself from his own responsibilities to protect himself, not just from the public at large but from the

public's representatives. And I think his supporters who refuse to look back at what they did in December are showing the same shortsightedness today that the administration itself showed in undertaking the Cambodian adventure in the first place.

I opened this statement by referring to Senator FULBRIGHT's change in mind on two key matters of Presidential and congressional responsibility. I would note that his changes were accompanied by continuous study and analysis which often has been shared with us on the floor and with the public at large. The fact that the President and his supporters wish to forget their support of Laos-Thailand at the same time they stress their opposition to Church-Cooper shows that they are suffering not from new understanding but from the practical necessity of making the best arguments that they can in what is otherwise an untenable position.

Therefore, I would hope that the Senate's position could be seen in the same light it was last December and that the Senate could follow the precedent so clearly set with Laos-Thailand and overwhelmingly approve the Church-Cooper amendment without additional language. That language was unnecessary 6 months ago and is only necessary today to justify the President's Cambodian adventure and perhaps some other in the future.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) to attend the Washington Diplomatic Conference on the Patent Treaty being held from May 25 to June 19, 1970.

SOVIET INVOLVEMENT AND THE DELICATE BALANCE OF POWER IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed a letter to Secretary of State William Rogers. I quote the following extracts from that letter:

The recent escalation of Soviet involvement in the Middle East has seriously endangered the delicate balance of power in that part of the world, and has become a source of great concern to all Americans.

In light of this military buildup, and in light of the continuing hostilities between Israel and the Arab states, I urge that Israel's request be granted to purchase 125 jet combat aircraft from the United States.

In March, it was decided to postpone any action on the Israeli request, and, given the situation that prevailed at that time, the decision was understandable. However, in the past three months, the number of Soviet technicians in Egypt alone has grown from 3,000 to about 10,000; and reports indicate that an estimated 200 Soviet pilots are flying training missions in the area of the Nile River.

This increased military activity appears to be the Soviet Union's response to the decision to hold in abeyance the sale of jets to Israel.

I believe the best guarantee against a major eruption of hostilities—that could

result in a confrontation between the super powers—is for the United States to do everything it can to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East; and, in view of the Soviet military buildup there, I feel that a balance of power can best be assured by selling the jets to Israel.

I also urge the renewal of your efforts to bring about direct peace talks between the Israelis and the Arabs, and that every channel be explored to bring the parties to the conference table where direct negotiations could, hopefully, lead to a stable peace in the Middle East.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LETTERS FROM MICHIGAN SOLDIER SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S DECISION

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on Sunday I was in Marquette and the editorial page of the Marquette, Mich., Mining Journal of Saturday, May 23, 1970, contained a letter from the parents of a young man assigned to combat duty in South Vietnam.

In it, Mr. and Mrs. Don D. Becker of Marquette, quote from portions of letters they have received from their son, David, relating to President Nixon's decision to clean out enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia.

I ask unanimous consent that the Beckers' letter to the editor of the newspaper be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FROM LIEUTENANT IN VIETNAM

DEAR SIR: With the recent campus uprisings and the discontent shown by those who are safe here at home, I would like to quote you some words written by our son, Lt. David M. Becker, now serving in Vietnam.

May 5: "I suppose you're wondering about Cambodia—I suppose it's the 'big' thing back there. I do believe the President has made the right decision—as long as we go in and then get out. That's where all the North Vietnamese army is coming from—through Cambodia."

May 10: "I wish all those so-called 'educated' demonstrators who create violence could be packed abroad a plane and flown over here and find out what it's like to be awakened in the middle of the night and be told you'd better get down to the hospital because one of your men has been shot while on patrol—or listen to the rockets hitting your base camp at night—or see some hootches blown up by sappers with American bodies lying around. Maybe then they'd realize why we here are anxious to return to the 'world' where freedom and democracy reign. No one here looks forward to a 'violent' life back there like it's happening. For those who disagree with the President's policy, let them disagree, but peacefully, and in an educated manner, like a

free society as ours permits, whether it be by letters, books, magazine articles or politics—because they elected our politicians. A divided country is what the Communist world wants—because that's the only way they will ever reign over a free and democratic society as ours."

David is a four-year ROTC man, a graduate of St. Norbert's College. He recently received a citation which reads in part: "The Bronze Star Medal is presented to Lt. David M. Becker, who distinguished himself by outstandingly meritorious service in connection with military operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam."

We, his parents, want to see the end of this war as do all right-thinking Americans. But we also feel that it is our place as Americans to stand by our President in these very difficult times.

Mr. and Mrs. DON D. BECKER.

MARQUETTE.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Mr. BELLMON obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BELLMON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oklahoma be recognized for not to exceed 25 minutes.

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

THE DEVELOPING CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, as debate on the Cambodian involvement has developed in the Senate, I have been impressed by what appears to be a widely held feeling among Members that our actions in Southeast Asia were begun and have continued without sufficient debate and full understanding of the ultimate results of our step-by-step involvement. I believe it is fair to assume that the present mood of the Senate is such that if we could turn back the pages of time to 1964, or 1960, or even 1954, we would have chosen a vastly different course of action in Southeast Asia.

In light of this feeling, Mr. President, I feel it is timely to call attention to certain aspects of the developing crisis in the Middle East, hoping that by doing so a more balanced debate on the situation there will result which could prevent the tardy second thoughts many now entertain about Southeast Asia.

My remarks this morning are precipitated by news reports that more than a majority of the Members of the Senate have joined together in signing a letter to the President urging immediate sale of additional planes to Israel.

Mr. President, as a marine combat veteran of World War II, I have deep admiration for fighting men who demonstrate

skill and valor on the field of battle as the Israelis did in the 6-day war of June 1967. My personal admiration and the admiration of this Nation went out to the Israelis as a result of their defense of their country on this occasion. This feeling still persists.

However, I rise to question the feeling that seeking a military answer in the Arab-Israel conflict is in the long-range interest of any of the countries concerned.

The dispute between the Arab nations and the State of Israel over Palestine has embroiled that area of the world in military turmoil for over 20 years, resulting in great loss of life and property, causing economic stagnation because of the heavy expenditures for defense, postponing the economic and social development vital to the region's peoples, adding to world tension and creating in its course what may become insurmountable animosities. There is also the impending danger that the Arab-Israel dispute will draw the great powers into a confrontation, perhaps even a nuclear war that could destroy human life on this planet.

Even though the United States has directed its efforts toward finding a peaceful settlement of this vexing and complex problem and has engaged in a series of discussions with the major powers and with the parties to the conflict, I feel that we have not exerted all of the means at our disposal in bringing this dispute to a just settlement. For this reason I rise to call attention to certain aspects of the Arab-Israel dispute which I feel deserve consideration.

It is necessary that the United States keep open all lines of communication with all of the interested and involved nations. No cause is served by reducing contacts or by turning a deaf ear to the entreaties and legitimate complaints of the Arabs or the Israelis and no peace will be found among nations whose leaders have closed minds.

It is essential to continue this search for peace, within the framework for a settlement as outlined in the United Nations Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, along with every available avenue in the United Nations, through neutral mediation in consultation at every level, with every nation, until a reasonable and workable solution to the Arab-Israel problem is found.

The hour is late. Each day brings reports of clashes, of new battles, of more death, more injuries, more destruction, of innocent people sent fleeing from their homes, of an ever-increasing arms spiral that appears to have no upward limits of more hatred, more blood, more war.

A solution can be found, and that solution should include the following provisions:

As the first and foremost step, all troops and military equipment should be withdrawn to the armistice lines that existed prior to the war of June 5, 1967. This point is mentioned in the U.N. Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, and it is clear that no peace can come as long as territory is being occupied as a result of conquest by armed forces. Both President Johnson and President Nixon have recognized that

boundaries should not reflect the fruits of conquest.

Second, recognition of the State of Israel by the Arab nations and recognition of Israel's free right to transit the international waters of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aqaba. The State of Israel exists and it must continue to exist. It is not enough to recognize the reality of Israel, as some Arab leaders have said, but all the Arab nations must recognize the State of Israel as a sovereign and free member of the family of nations. As a sovereign nation, Israel must have the right, as is guaranteed to every other nation, to use the waterways of the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Strait of Tiran.

Third, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights should be neutralized and the city of Jerusalem should be internationalized. The Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights have long served as launching points from which attacks against Israel have originated. By neutralizing these crucial areas, the threat of Israel will be minimized.

The city of Jerusalem is sacred to the three great monotheistic religions of man and should be completely free of factional control. Only by internationalizing this great city and its venerated shrines can all people be assured that the city will remain an international center, open to all without discrimination and without fear of recrimination.

Fourth, the Arab refugees should be given the choice of returning to their former homes or receiving compensation for their losses. For over 20 years, the Palestinian Arab refugees have been confined to tents in squalid camps, waiting for justice, and it is in keeping with the United Nations resolutions on the matter that the refugees be offered the choice of repatriation or compensation. Since it is Israel that has realized the greatest advantage from the dispersal of the refugees, it is incumbent on Israel and in fact it is their duty to offer this choice of compensation or repatriation.

Most certainly, these ideas are not new. Many reasonable people, people in position of stature and power have said these same words more eloquently and in greater detail. Unfortunately, their efforts have fallen on deaf ears or have gone unheeded because each of the parties to the conflict continue to harbor certain illusions.

First is the illusion held by Israel that superior military power will overwhelm the Arab nations. Experience should show that this policy will not succeed. This was evidenced by the November 1956 Israeli war. Nothing was settled by that war. The Government of Israel felt that because of the interference of the United States and the Soviet Union, Israel was denied the fruits of victory. More important, Israel seemed to think that its military superiority has not been clearly demonstrated, since the Arabs seemed convinced that the Arab defeat was caused by the intervention of British and French forces.

Again, in June of 1967, war was believed to have settled the issue once and for all. In the aftermath of the Israeli's 6-day victory there was euphoria generated by the belief that the Arabs had

receive refuge and medical treatment. Some base areas contain sizeable ordnance depots, weapons and ammunition factories, petroleum storage facilities, truck parks, and POW camps. Clearly, the base areas provide the foundation upon which rest Communist expectations of maintaining an effective military-political apparatus in southern South Vietnam while the U.S. withdrawal proceeds.

The more northerly base areas, opposite II Corps and northern III Corps, serve as safe havens for Communist troops operating into these areas, and also facilitate the southward movement of North Vietnamese troops and supplies toward COSVN and eastward into the highlands of South Vietnam. They constitute, in effect, an extension of the Laos corridor—but a sector in which the NVA has enjoyed virtual immunity from Allied attack. To the extent that the Communists were denied free use of these areas, their forces in the highlands of South Vietnam could suffer a loss in combat effectiveness and increased casualties.

The southerly base areas, opposite the Delta and the Saigon region, have grown rapidly in size and importance since August 1969 as Hanoi has sought to limit exposure of its main force units and reduce casualties while attempting to halt the erosion of its political-military base in the populous and decisive theater. The bases are situated in well populated areas, many in villages and plantations inhabited by ethnic Vietnamese and controlled by Communists since the days of the Viet Minh.

The Cambodian sanctuaries play a key role in Hanoi's response to the Vietnamization and pacification programs. Because of their existence, especially the sanctuaries in southern Cambodia along the III and IV Corps frontiers, Hanoi can always mass large hostile forces in close proximity to major South Vietnamese population concentrations. This ability enables Hanoi to pose a continuing threat to South Vietnam's internal security that progress in pacification or Vietnamization cannot eradicate.

Infiltration

The Cambodian base structure, as noted above, supports infiltration of NVA personnel into South Vietnam, and the shift of units from one portion of South Vietnam to another, as in the case of the movement of NVA regiments into the Delta last year. The infiltration system through Cambodia handled nearly 55,000-70,000 NVA personnel in 1969, an estimated 60 percent of total NVA infiltration into South Vietnam that year. About 45,000-55,000 of these enemy troops moved as far as the southerly base areas subordinate to COSVN. The foot trails used lie very close to the border and occasionally cross into South Vietnamese territory; they are, for the most part, heavily canopied and secure from aerial observation. The trip from the Laos border to the "Parrot's Beak" opposite Saigon takes 45 to 60 days.

The Communists' north-south logistic route through Cambodia has few motorable segments and is mainly a network of trails and waterways. Occasionally, it utilizes the same trails as the personnel infiltration system. It has never been possible to quantify the north-south movement of supplies to VC-NVA forces in South Vietnam via Cambodia, but there is evidence that the trails are being constantly improved and that supplies are being moved.

Large quantities of heavy weapons and bulk supplies have moved until recently through the port of Sihanoukville and along West-East routes to III and IV Corps in South Vietnam.

Over the past year the demands of the new NVA force in the Delta would have greatly increased Communist supply requirements there. These increased supply requirements probably account in part for the actions of the Communist forces in attacking Cambodian police and military posts in provinces

adjacent to the Delta region of South Vietnam. Food needs had evidently been met in part earlier by clandestine shipments of rice to the NVA/VC forces through Cambodia, but the recent decision of the Cambodian Government to halt such shipments has evidently induced the Communists to drive the Cambodian authorities entirely out of large sections of the country so that the Communists can then draw directly on the civilian population for their food supplies. Other purposes which the Communists undoubtedly have in mind in attacking the Cambodian forces are to strengthen and deepen the area from which they can threaten the allied forces in South Vietnam, as well as to threaten the overthrow of the neutral Government of Cambodia.

U.S. POSITIONS ON CAMBODIA

On April 16, 1969 the Australian Ambassador in Phnom Penh, representing United States interests in Cambodia, delivered to the Cambodian Government the following U.S. declaration:

"In conformity with the United Nations Charter, the United States of America respects the sovereignty, independence, neutrality, and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Cambodia within its present frontiers."

July 2, 1969—U.S. resumes diplomatic relations with Cambodia and appointment of Chargé announced.

In a March 21, 1970 Press Conference, President Nixon stated that the U.S. would deal with the Government selected by the Cambodian Parliament and that:

"We respect Cambodia's neutrality. We would hope that North Vietnam would take that same position in respecting its neutrality."

In his April 20, 1970 speech, President Nixon warned Hanoi about the risks of North Vietnamese escalation in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia as follows:

"But I again remind the leaders of North Vietnam that while we are taking these risks for peace, they will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Vietnam, in Cambodia or in Laos."

"I repeat what I said November 3 and December 15: if I conclude that increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation."

"My responsibility as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces is for the safety of our men, and I shall meet that responsibility."

CHARLES BAILEY'S STORY ON THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO INVADE CAMBODIA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the great tragedies of the Cambodian adventure is how it has undermined the credibility of the current administration and the faith of so many people in the manner of Presidential decisionmaking.

Given the administration's adherence to a military victory and its total commitment to propping up the Thieu-Ky government, the escalation of the war into Cambodia may well turn out to be tactically advantageous. The real question, of course, has never been in the tactic of Cambodia as much as the Indo-Chinese strategy which this adventure revealed.

But whatever comes of Cambodia, America stands to lose if the credibility of the President is lost along the way.

It has been recently revealed that the story we were told on April 30 of the

decision to invade Cambodia was far, far from the complete story. In fact, the decision to invade Cambodia had been in progress for more than a month—far in advance of the April 20 speech, for example, when the President told the American people how well Vietnamization was proceeding.

Charles Bailey, Washington bureau chief for the Minneapolis Tribune, has done a remarkable job in piecing together this story. He describes in detail the elaborate background of the Cambodian invasion and how long this decision was in the making. He points out—vividly but objectively—the inconsistencies which have emanated from the White House since the Cambodian plan began.

Mr. Bailey has done a great service by this reporting. I commend his article to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, May 17, 1970]

UNITED STATES ENDS ONE OPERATION IN CAMBODIA, WITHDRAWS—WHEN DID NIXON DECIDE?

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Despite President Nixon's claim that a sudden increase in North Vietnamese military activity was the reason he ordered U.S. troops into Cambodia, plans for that attack were under top-level study for more than a month before it began.

This fact, now stated flatly by top officials, runs counter to Mr. Nixon's public assertion that he ordered the attack because of a step-up in enemy action between April 20 and April 30, when the operation was launched.

The contrast between public explanation and private action also provides new support for the growing belief here that the President and his military advisers viewed the Cambodian situation more as an opportunity than as a threat—as a chance for military gain rather than a danger which had to be checked.

This picture of the behind-the-scenes action in the Cambodian drama emerged Saturday on the basis of comments by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, who revealed additional details of the planning that preceded Mr. Nixon's April 30 order to strike into Cambodia.

On that night, the President told a nationwide television audience that he had warned the enemy 10 days earlier not to take advantage of U.S. troop withdrawals to increase its own military activity.

Mr. Nixon asserted in the April 30 speech that "North Vietnam has increased its military aggression . . . particularly in Cambodia" and that "the actions of the enemy in the last 10 days clearly endanger the lives of Americans who are in Vietnam now."

The President also said that "in the past two weeks" the enemy had stepped up guerrilla actions and was "concentrating its forces in these sanctuaries . . . where they are building up to launch massive attacks on our forces."

Finally, Mr. Nixon pinpointed "the last two weeks" as the period when the Communists had "stripped away all pretenses of respecting the sovereignty or the neutrality of Cambodia."

Nothing in Mr. Nixon's April 30 speech suggested that he had been considering an attack into Cambodia prior to April 20, when he issued his "warning." In fact, he went out of his way to say that "even after the Vietnamese Communists began to expand these sanctuaries four weeks ago, we counseled

patience to our South Vietnamese allies and imposed restraints on our own commanders."

Actually, according to Laird, U.S. military commanders were put to work in late March planning possible actions in Cambodia.

"When the change in government came about in Cambodia, I requested planning to be done at that time on various courses of action that could be taken by our government," Laird said.

"Planning was started in the latter part of March. Various proposals were presented to me. I approved certain actions, and made certain other recommendations to the National Security Council and the President

"The plan that is currently going forward is a plan submitted to me by the NSC, and supported by me."

The NSC (National Security Council) met at the White House on March 24 and again the next day, March 25. The next NSC session was on April 8.

Laird's comments make clear that Mr. Nixon began to study the plan for the Cambodian attack early in April.

The defense secretary said he had given the plan to the President probably more than a week before Mr. Nixon's trip to Hawaii on April 18.

While in Honolulu, where he flew to greet the returning Apollo 13 astronauts, Mr. Nixon received a briefing on the invasion plan from Adm. John McCain, U.S. commander in chief in the Pacific.

Laird said that McCain's briefing "did give the (Cambodian) plan as presented by Gen. Abrams, modified by discussions we had had here."

But, he added, Mr. Nixon had seen the plan before:

"I had given him the plan. The plan had been transmitted to him."

When a reporter asked if that had occurred "the previous week," Laird replied:

"Well, before that, I think. But it had not been approved."

Mr. Nixon returned from Hawaii to his California home on April 19 and the next day announced to the nation that another 150,000 U.S. troops would be withdrawn from Vietnam in the coming year.

In that announcement, he noted a recent step-up in Communist attacks in Vietnam but added that, "despite this new enemy activity, there has been an overall decline in enemy force levels in South Vietnam since December."

Mr. Nixon referred specifically to Cambodia at one point, charging that "almost 40,000 communist troops are now conducting overt aggression there."

And he said that the leaders of North Vietnam "will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion (of more U.S. withdrawals) to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Vietnam, in Cambodia or in Laos. . . . If I conclude that increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining forces, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation."

Except for these two passages, Mr. Nixon did not refer to Cambodia in his April 20 speech. At no point in that talk did he discuss the border sanctuaries which only 10 days later became the target of U.S. attack.

Indeed, the tone of April 20 was upbeat—and obviously purposely so. Mr. Nixon said, "We shall not be defeated in Vietnam," that "we finally have in sight the just peace we are seeking" and that "we can say with confidence that all American combat forces will be withdrawn."

At that moment, however, Mr. Nixon's military planners were in the midst of a decision-making process that would send U.S. combat forces to new territory.

Laird said last week he had initially opposed the use of American troops to attack the Cambodian sanctuary areas—because of

his concern that strong enemy resistance could lead to heavy fighting and high U.S. casualties.

But in mid-April, he said, the situation changed. North Vietnamese troops began moving westward out of the sanctuaries and further into Cambodia—thus reducing the force in the base area so that "the risk involved militarily" in the proposed attack "became much less."

At that point, Laird said, he changed his mind and supported the use of U.S. troops in the Cambodian attacks. "This was the time to hit them," he said.

Laird told reporters last week that about one-third of the estimated 40,000 Communist troops in Cambodia had moved out of the sanctuaries and were "facing the other direction" when the U.S. attack began.

Laird's statement that the North Vietnamese had moved something like 13,000 men out of the sanctuaries and away from South Vietnam contrasts with Mr. Nixon's claim in the April 30 speech that "the enemy . . . is concentrating his main forces in these sanctuaries where they are building up to launch massive attacks on our forces in South Vietnam."

This was not the only contradiction between official accounts.

On the same night that Mr. Nixon spoke publicly of the enemy "concentrating" in the sanctuaries, a high White House official, who briefed reporters, said Communist forces had moved out of the sanctuary.

There have also been signs that the administration rationale for the attacks has shifted. Originally—as in the President's speech—the strikes were depicted as basically defensive, as a response to a new and growing threat caused by Communist moves to connect the sanctuaries and thus form a 600-mile-long base for attacks on South Vietnam.

More recently, however, there has been a new tone to the explanations.

Laird put it bluntly to a congressional committee last week:

The President, he said, saw the operation as "an opportunity."

The military has seen it that way all along, and weeks ago authoritative military figures were arguing— anonymously—that the overthrow of the neutralist Sihanouk government provided a good excuse for letting them do what had been forbidden previously for diplomatic reasons.

The "opportunity" argument is being advanced more openly now that the operation against the sanctuaries seems to be going smoothly with low casualties and a high box score of captured enemy materiel.

This may prove to be a politically advantageous line. But the disclosure that the attacks had been in preparation long before the time cited by Mr. Nixon in his April 30 speech could create problems for an administration seeking to preserve its credibility with a troubled and divided public.

LUBBOCK AVALANCHE-JOURNAL EDITORIAL ON SBA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial published in the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal of May 14 which describes the quick and effective response of the Small Business Administration and its Administrator, Hilary Sandoval, to the recent tornado disaster which occurred in the Lubbock, Tex., area.

Mr. Sandoval was on the scene shortly after the tornado hit and quickly brought the resources of the SBA to bear on the reconstruction of the shattered businesses and homes of the area. This is the type of flexible and responsive Government action to a natural disaster which

the people of this country deserve, wherever they may live. I commend the service performed by the Administrator in this situation and in other disaster situations in Texas and around the country. I also want to express my confidence that this same public service ethic will continue to make the SBA an outstanding model of a truly effective and functional Government agency.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICIALS SPEEDING FINANCIAL AID—LIKE HILARY SANDOVAL

Whatever the final figure may show, it is safe to say that the tornado damage to construction in Lubbock—homes and business buildings—will be tremendous.

Whether the overall figure of losses will run \$100 million, \$150 million, or what, a great deal of money has gone down the drain and rebuilding and repairs will demand terrific expenditures.

Therefore, it is important to note that money in massive quantity will be quickly available. Whether it will be enough, or come cheaply enough, cannot be said at the moment. But a lot of it will be available through both private and public sources.

Sen. John Tower, Rep. George Mahon and Gen. George Lincoln, who heads the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness, all said during a flying visit here Tuesday that money would be made quickly available from Washington. Sen. Ralph Yarborough wired the same statement. But more important, Hilary Sandoval, the perceptive and indefatigable young head of the Small Business Administration, echoed those words. In final analysis, it will be Mr. Sandoval and organization who'll tote the wood and water and who will get the money where it needs to go and soonest.

Mr. Sandoval flew here with the others to view the situation both on the ground and, by helicopter over the city. He told *The Avalanche-Journal*: "There will be no delays. I've told Fred Neumann, our divisional supervisor stationed in Lubbock, that he can have all the loan officers here he needs. He can have 100 of them tomorrow if that's necessary."

Sad as the situation is in many homes and business concerns, there will be financial help and much of it. That is the best kind of news as the rubble is being cleared away.

Mr. Sandoval's personal visit to view the tornado's damage here is the second of its kind he has made to West Texas in recent weeks. He was Johnny-on-the-spot then in Plainview, Clarendon and other points hit by a savage storm, taking a personal hand in solving the problem, not leaving it to a subordinate. As was said on this page then, we say again: El Paso's Hilary Sandoval is a take-charge guy of the type the Government needs more of. A native West Texan and former Texas Tech student, he gives his whole home area a sense of pride in the way he works, really works, at his job.

AUTO SAFETY—AN INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Secretary of Transportation, Hon. John A. Volpe, is a man whose public pronouncements are almost always worthy of note. He has spoken with vision about future developments in field of transportation, from low-emission engines to adoption of intermodal transportation systems. Even though the

The bill S. 1946 would go a long way toward restoring the rights of employees to insist that their unions be responsive to their needs, and it would insure that they be allowed to exercise the rights already written into the labor statutes.

I urge the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to take this bill up and report it favorably in order to give the entire Senate an opportunity to vote for individual freedom.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I want to join those who have spoken out in praise of President Nixon's nationwide talk today on the economy.

I found it a realistic speech that faces up to the problems of that economy and offers concrete proposals for meeting those problems.

I was gratified to note that the speech was not political in nature or in tone, but instead recognized that these problems affect all of us and all of us here in the Congress have a duty to help solve them.

I can assure the President he has my support in combating both inflation and the threat of unemployment. And I am confident that with his leadership and his recognition of what must be done, we can keep our economy strong, we can end the inflation without a drastic recession or depression, we can renew our productivity and we can build a healthy and prosperous peacetime economy.

MINNESOTANS OPPOSE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the tragic escalation of the war in Southeast Asia has been shown by strong disapproval by my constituents. I am interested to see that the White House continues to issue vague statements about public support for this dangerous escapade. There is no doubt about the views of Minnesotans. My mail has been very heavy on the Cambodian invasion and has been running 10 or 12 to one against the President's action.

An excellent letter from a thoughtful Minnesotan was recently printed in the Minnesota Tribune. Mr. Russell points out so well:

We have serious problems at home that demand our full attention and . . . the time to get out of Vietnam is now—in 1970.

I understand that readers of the Tribune who contacted Mr. Russell were unanimous in their support of his position.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this perceptive letter to the editor be printed in the RECORD.

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

EX-NAVY MAN IS FED UP

To the Editor: As a short-haired, middle-aged conservative, ex-Navy, establishment-type Republican, I am getting increasingly fed up with all the generals, politicians and press, radio and TV characters who keep talking about "the enemy" in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia or Thailand.

Whose "enemy"? Certainly not mine. No war has been declared, I don't hate anybody, anywhere in Southeast Asia, and I don't know a single Minnesotan who does. I couldn't care less what kind of government they have, if any.

If a bunch of Asians came over here and tried to tell us how our part of the world should be run, I'd be happy to help throw them back across the Pacific, and I just can't conceive of any self-respecting, patriotic Vietnamese not feeling the same way about half a million Americans trying to play God 10,000 miles from home.

Like us, the Vietnamese, North and South, are perfectly capable of lousing up their own affairs with no "help" from outsiders. After all, they've been successfully fighting off the Chinese for centuries, they finally got rid of both the Japanese and French, and then we crazy Americans had to come over and drop more bombs on their little country than were used by both sides in Europe in all of World War II. With "friends" like that, who needs enemies?

You don't need to visit Expo '70 to figure out that the Japanese, who have led the world in shipbuilding for the last 14 years and know the Chinese can't walk on the water, are again the dominant power in the Western Pacific. Also, you don't need to wear long hair and a beard or be under 30 to realize that we have serious problems at home that demand our full attention and that the time to get out of Vietnam is now—in 1970. As the world's most powerful nation, the initiative is completely ours, nobody can stop us, and no "negotiations" are necessary for desirable, least of all with a fourth-rate power in Paris.

TERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, Life magazine for June 12, 1970, contains an article and an interview by Oriana Fallaci with Dr. George Habash, the head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. This group is responsible for many acts of terror which have shocked the world, and the nation of Israel in particular. It is a rare opportunity to look behind such violent and seemingly irrational acts to the individual committing them, and this interview is one of those occasions. I commend the article to Senators so that we may better understand the tragedy of the Middle East and, it is hoped, change the tendency toward escalating conflict and polarization in that troubled land.

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

A LEADER OF THE FEDAYEEN: "WE WANT A WAR LIKE THE VIETNAM WAR"

(By Oriana Fallaci)

The man I was facing was responsible for most of the acts of terror the Arabs have committed in Europe. The head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine: Dr. George Habash, a Christian doctor who until a few years ago was a Schweitzerlike figure running a private clinic with a group of nuns in Amman. This hospital was filled mostly with children and poor old people. Dr. Habash never insisted on being paid and he bought the drugs for his patients out of his own pocket, then slipped them a roll of notes when they were ready to leave. Born rather rich, he used up much of his wealth in this way. He spent nothing on himself: a sterilized white coat over old clothes was all he ever wore, and he slept under a crucifix on a cot in his hospital.

One day the clinic was closed and Dr. Habash disappeared. He had gone with the

fedayeen to follow the only calling in which he now believed—the pitiless fight for vengeance. It was 1967 and since that day he has given up everything, including his two children and his beautiful young wife whom he had married five years before. He now lives in the *fedayeen* bases that he leaves only at night escorted by a bodyguard.

In any sense, it's a tough life. The *fedayeen* who belong to the Front have no regular salary like those who belong to Al Fatah; at most they got a subsidy of \$5 a month and transport every 30 days to visit their families. Their few military bases are ill-equipped and insufficiently supplied; the daily fare is boiled beans, meat once a week if all is well. Any free time left over from military training is filled with study of Marxist and Leninist classics. There is no question that the Palestinian resistance is a socialistic movement aided by China and the U.S.S.R. But the Front is so poor that it doesn't even have a headquarters or a telephone, so a *fedayeen* who joins the Front does not do it for material gains. That would explain why there are only 1,600 or so members.

Yet those 1,600, for ill or for good, are attracting the world's attention with acts of terrorism. "Why?" is what I went to ask Dr. Habash. We met at night in the suburbs of Amman, in a building attached to a refugee camp. The room contained one desk and a few chairs; outside the closed doors, armed *fedayeen* stood guard. Inside there were only four of us: Habash, myself, a photographer and the man who had driven us there. I was sitting behind the desk and Habash sat on a chair in front of me, with his hands resting on his baggy knees, his tired, unshaven face slightly lifted in expectation of my questions. Solidly built, with shoulders like a wrestler, he kept watching me through steady and pained eyes, making it hard for me to attack him. I ask his age, and he said 44. Then he rumbled his gray hair with his fingers, as if to apologize for looking so old, and smiled humbly. But when I asked "Why?" the smile disappeared.

Dr. Habash, the Front specializes in acts of terrorism, many of them carried out in Europe. What right do you have to impose this war on Europeans?

I will explain. Let us start with a premise: in a war one has to establish scientifically who one's enemies are. In this war Israel is not our only enemy. Our enemy is Israel, plus the Zionist movement that controls many of the countries which support Israel, plus imperialism. I mean specifically British imperialism from 1918, and American imperialism from 1948 on. If we had to face Israel alone, the problem would have been almost a simple one: but we have to stand against whoever supports Israel economically, militarily, politically, ideologically. This means the capitalist countries that have conceived Israel and are now using it as a bulwark to protect their interests in Arabia. They include the U.S., and almost every country in Europe.

Let us for a moment leave out Europe, and concentrate on Israel. From an economical and political point of view Israel is an island isolated from its friends and surrounded by enemy lands: Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Egypt. Its communications with friendly nations can take place only through the air and the sea; therefore it becomes imperative for us to block those avenues. In the future we will take care of maritime communications, aboard ships at the docks or at sea. We have been taking care for some time now of the air routes by striking at the planes of El Al, the Israeli airline. El Al planes are a perfectly legitimate military target; they belong to the enemy, they connect the island of Israel with other shores, and they transport troops and ammunition. They are flown by reserve officers of the Israeli Air Force. In a war it is fair to strike the enemy wherever he happens to be, and this rule

leads us also to the European airfields where El Al planes land or take off.

Dr. Habash, you are forgetting that those planes also carry citizens of neutral countries, and that the airfields belong to neutral countries, not Israel. To respect neutral countries is another rule of war.

Aside from the fact that these airfields are always located in pro-Zionist countries, I repeat that we have the right to fight our enemy wherever he might be. And as for the non-Israeli passengers, they are on their way to Israel. Since we have no control over the land that was stolen from us and called Israel, it is right that whoever goes to Israel should ask for our permission. Countries like Germany, Italy, France, and Switzerland, with many Jews among their population, allow their territory to be used as a base for the Jews to fight the Arabs. If Italy, for instance, is a base against the Arabs, the Arabs have a right to use Italy as a base against the Jews.

No, Dr. Habash, Italy is not used as a Jewish base, nor is Germany, France or Switzerland. And you don't stop with El Al's planes. How far are you planning to go? Do you want to make war on three-fourths of the planet?

No, we don't want to do that. But we have to look at this scientifically and recognize that our revolution is a phase of the worldwide revolution. We ought to be honest and admit that what we want is a war like the war in Vietnam. We want a Vietnam war not just in Palestine, but throughout the Arab world. Palestinians are part of the Arab nation, and what we need is for the whole Arab nation to enter the war; which will occur anyway, within three or four years. By then, if not before, the revolutionary forces in Jordan, Syria and Lebanon will rise to our side in a total war. Our struggle has barely begun, the worst is yet to come. And it is right for Europe and America to be warned now that there will be no peace for them until there is justice for Palestine. There are uncomfortable days ahead for you all, and they will not be too steep a price to pay for the help you extend to Israel. Now that this is clear, let us return to the subject of planes not belonging to El Al. I assume that you refer to the TWA flight we rerouted to Damascus. Well, the United States are a harbor of our enemies, and so they are our enemy too. The plane was hijacked in protest against the American sale of Phantom jets to Israel.

America sells Phantoms to Israel, and Russia sells Migs to Egypt. Don't you think it all even, out in the end? If the Israelis were to hijack planes every time Russian gives weapons to Egypt, we would all be traveling on bicycles. Don't the prospect of triggering a third World War bother you?

To be frank, it doesn't. The world has been using us and has forgotten us. It is time they realized we exist, it is time they stopped exploiting us. Whatever the price, we'll continue our struggle to return home.

The opinion of the world does not concern you?

Obviously we are concerned with world opinion. When it is on your side it means you are in the right, when it's against you it means there is something wrong in what you are doing. But the problem has to be stated differently, because we are interested in public opinion more on the plane of knowledge than on that of emotion. Let me explain: the attacks of the Popular Front are based on quality, not quantity. We believe that to kill a Jew far from the battleground has more of an effect than killing 100 of them in battle; it attracts more attention. And when we set fire to a store in London, those few flames are worth the burning down of two kibbutzim. Because we force people to ask what is going on, and so they get to know our tragic situation. You have to be constantly reminded of our existence. After all, world opinion has

never been either with us or against us; it has just kept on ignoring us. Since 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was signed, you have ceased to know about us. It is only now beginning to dawn on people that we were chased from our land like rabid dogs. Well, through sabotage we want to remind the world that a catastrophe has taken place here, and that justice must be done. Believe you me, after what has happened to us we have the right to do anything, including what you call acts of terrorism. Where was world opinion in 1917 when the British decided to give a land that was 90% populated by Palestinians as a gift to the Jews?

It was busy, Dr. Habash, with a trifle known as World War I. I assume from your answer that you don't mind making casualties among Europeans. Does it follow that you intend to go on burning our stores, shooting up our air terminals, placing bombs in our mail, and harassing us with terrorism?

When the Jews were doing this sort of thing in Palestine you didn't call it acts of terrorism, but a war of liberation. Of course we will continue to work according to our strategy; in fact we will escalate it. However, we will do our best not to harm Europeans; I swear it upon the head of my children that we are devoting a lot of attention to this problem. Orders to our commandos always emphasize that neutrals should be spared. During the whole of 1969 this order has always been followed, and never has a European lost his life as a result of our operations. Let's take the burning of the London store. It would have been very easy for our fedayeen to just throw a couple of bombs and kill a lot of people. He waited till night instead, to avoid causing casualties. It's true that a child was killed in Athens, but the Front had nothing to do with that operation. We are not the only ones to resort to what you call terrorism; you should remember that there are several Palestinian organizations.

Let's change the subject, Dr. Habash, to the countries that are your friends.

Our position is the same as that of the Vietnamese: we are friends with those who are our friends. The goal of our struggle is not only that of restoring the nationhood of Palestine, but to transform it into a socialist state as well. We are nationalist and socialist in equal measure: the Popular Front is a movement that proceeds within the framework of socialist ideology. By 1967 we had understood the undeniable truth, that to liberate Palestine we have to follow the Chinese and Vietnamese examples. There is no escape from this logic, although we have spent a long time thinking about it. Israel is a product of colonialism, colonialism is a product of imperialism, and imperialism is a product of capitalism. Therefore, the only nations we consider to be friendly, the only ones whose planes we spare, are the socialist countries. Our best friend, in fact, is China. China wants Israel erased from the map because as long as Israel exists there will remain an aggressive imperialistic outpost on Arab soil.

How about the Soviet Union?

Obviously the Soviet Union is also a friend, although to a lesser degree. They provide weapons to the Arab nations, or, should we say, to the governments that presently rule the Arab nations. Perhaps it isn't even right to say "to a lesser degree," because we are also very close to the Soviet Union. We don't see the Russians the way the Chinese would like us to see them, and vice versa. Of course we don't appreciate it when the U.S.S.R., in the Security Council of the U.N., presents peace resolutions that are nothing but disguised traps. We don't want peace, we will never agree to any peaceful compromise. And China sees eye to eye with us on this issue.

Do you send your army instructors to be trained in China?

We don't. The Front trains its soldiers by

itself, in our camps we teach more than shooting; our recruits, among other things, have to learn Hebrew. Our training is not the same as Al Fatah's.

In fact you don't get along too well with Al Fatah.

We fight on the same side of the barricades. At the same time, our position is very different from Al Fatah's on a variety of issues. To give you an example, we would never accept the money they are getting from reactionary sources; we would never touch money that stinks of American oil. Before, when I listed our enemies to you, I forgot to mention the Arab national states. That was an omission, because if I were to tell you the history of the last 52 years of Palestine, I could show you that the worst obstacles have always been those placed in our path by Arab reactionaries. Like Saudi Arabia, where the majority of oil wells are in American hands. Or Lebanon, with its rotten government. Then there is Jordan, whose king is ready to recognize Israel. And the list could be extended. These are all countries with whom Al Fatah collaborates; but for us to accept money from them would mean to trample on our moral beliefs, to lose our honor. We have been collecting money among ourselves, and if the financial problem becomes crucial we will take money away from those who have it. We will take it, not ask for it. Those who join the Popular Front know that we aren't joking. After all, it is us who give the revolutionary momentum to Palestine, not Al Fatah. The real people, the proletarian masses, follow our lead.

How do you explain the fact, then, that the immense majority of the common people are for Al Fatah, and that you seem to attract mostly intellectuals and bourgeois?

It is true that we aren't numerically strong; at least not yet. But this doesn't give an inferiority complex, because it is not enough to have many proletarians in a party to be a proletarian party. What counts is a proletarian ideology, proletarian program. It doesn't mean anything to have a lot of fedayeen, perhaps recruited with money as an incentive: 100 men with clear revolutionary ideas fight better than 1,000 mercenaries. We wouldn't accept many people even if we had the money Al Fatah has; we would continue to hold that the strength of the fedayeen is not in their numbers but in their quality. Especially when one is forced to rely on terrorism, as you call it, to wage one's war.

But what is so heroic about setting fire to an old people's home, destroying the oxygen supply of a hospital, blowing up an airplane or a supermarket?

It's guerrilla warfare, a special kind of guerrilla warfare. The main point is to select targets where success is 100% assured. To harass, to upset, to work on the nerves through unexpected small damages. Brute force is out; this is a thinking man's game. Especially when one is as poor as the Popular Front is. It would be silly for us to even think of waging a regular war; imperialism is too powerful and Israel is too strong. The only way to destroy them is to give a little blow here, a little blow there; to advance step by step, inch by inch, for years, for decades, with determination, doggedness, patience. And we will continue our present strategy. It's a smart one, you see; would you really want to fly El Al? I wouldn't. What's the matter, you seem upset.

I am upset.

You are perfectly entitled to dislike what I say, but I can't afford to take your opinions and emotions into account: it would be like trying to do surgery without spilling blood. I am not interested in what you think, even though you might be right, in a way. I am interested only in what my people think. And you should see how my people react to a successful operation! Spirit shoots sky-high. The more you are upset, the more they are encouraged.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org