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TIME TO BE STALWART

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a well-thought-out column by William H. Stringer entitled "Time To Be Stalwart," carried in the Christian Science Monitor of February 7, 1968, be incorporated in the Record. I commend its reading to the Members of the Senate.

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

TIME TO BE STALWART

(By William H. Stringer)

It is time to think about upholding the hands of government. This is a moment for Americans to strive, not criticism nor dissent, but that violent, discouraged, and anarchic thinking which disrupts government and adds to Washington's already grievous burdens.

Add the North Vietnamese build-up around Khe Sanh to the Viet Cong's attack within South Vietnam's cities and you could have the war's most crucial engagement. The aim: to bring the United States and its Allies into peace talks in a starkly unfavorable position, so that the unavoidable result would be a coalition government essentially under Viet Cong control, and finally, an American pull-out.

Perhaps this is the feasible result. It would be a disguised defeat. Perhaps it would leave behind an eventual Vietnam that, Titolike, would someday repulse the advances of Peking. Each to his opinion.

The point is, neither the scars of war nor the peace proffers are reason for carrying placards denouncing, with obscenities, the President of the United States. Or encouraging widespread law violation, or the disruption of other people's rights to free speech. That is anarchy and nihilism. We are not that kind of people.

Our government represents our compact with society, whether it's headed by Johnson or Rockefeller or McCarthy or Eisenhower.
The mammoth power that is the United States is rooted in jocks and hollow shell bricsks, not in the constitutional order which gives thrust and purpose to our country. It is the general attitude of top Johnson administration officials and Secretaries McNamarra and Rusk on TV Sunday acknowledged at least this possibility. In the same time the aphy might have been inside North Korea’s 12-mile limit. The whole spy craze in books and movies and TV entertainment caused

There is the Development Assistance Committee, of Paris and it is composed of members from 15 nations and the European Community. It is the major international mechanism for providing economic assistance. There are the World Bank’s consortia for India and Pakistan, and other such consortia for other countries, composed of as many as 16 donor countries and institutions. There are consultative groups established by the World Bank and others for the purpose of coordination of assistance to particular countries, such as Nigeria, Colombia, Thailand, Peru, and Korea. There are other coordination arrangements, such as the Colombo plan for South and Southeast Asia and the Inter-American for the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

We have helped develop and have strongly stimulated such multilateralism, and some of our partners in these enterprises are devoting larger shares of their national product to aid foreign than we are.

Mr. Mansfield, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excellent editorial entitled "The Time Has Arrived", published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 7, 1968; and an equally excellent article entitled "Facing Reality," written by Alan L. Otten, and published in the Wall Street Journal of February 8, 1968.

There is much food for thought in the editorial and the article. I urge Senators to give them their consideration.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The MULTILATERAL TREND

Mr. McCoy, Mr. President, I have read with interest the President’s foreign aid message to Congress today. As we all know, there is now a desirable trend toward multilateralism in foreign aid. The plan to make 90 percent of our loans on a multilateral basis or another is wise and proper, and the President’s statement of the need of the Inter-

national Development Association—the World Bank’s “soft loan window”—is commendable to our serious consideration. Those who bemoan such foreign aid giveaway” and who carp at our assistance to less-developed nations should instruct themselves on how many multilateral in-

stitutions and arrangements these are.

Europe, where the present governments of France, West Germany, and Italy are popularly elected or popularly chosen, is not safe from this alienation between those on top and those below. Although the situation is more desperate in Vietnam than anywhere else, there are forces in other parts of the world that would tend to produce other Vietnams. There is a deep-seated pessimism; the people have come to feel profoundly that their government is against them, rather than for them. There are peasants toiling for others at a few pence a day, wherever there is cruel and glaring shortage of food and poor, wherever elections bring no real change in the situation. Strong constructive action is urgently needed to prevent the development of other Vietnams.

For instance, the World Bank’s work in World War II the United States has generally been content to prod gently in the hope of improving conditions. By 1968, and with the lesson of South Vietnam before us, has not the time come for America to push, and push hard, rather than merely prod?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 8, 1968]

FACING REALITY

(Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON—The most interesting thing thus far about the popular American reaction to the Pueblo affair is the lack of it. Officials and editorial writers have been comparatively calm and restrained in their response, which suggests that perhaps the United States, after 217 days, has lost its adolescent confidence in its infinite ability to shape and reshape conditions at home and abroad to suit its notions of what defines power. This long-delayed maturing results, at least in part, from the nation’s involvement; it may be that we’re becoming a little more realistic about what is producible.

Particularly notable is the spirit of tolerance which seems to have developed among the people. It is a spirit of realism born of the experience of the last half-century in which we have been led to expect the unexpected, and the unexpected is happening again. It is not even surprising; it is to be expected. And what is happening is what we have learned to expect, a little more of the same. It is not the trend but the rate of change that is the new fact.

It is the decision of the Supreme Court, in its裁ruling on the Pueblo affair, to give the case a relative hearing. It has not decided against the government, nor has it decided for the government. It has merely said that perhaps the government is doing something wrong, but that thev (those who use terms like "foreign subversion") are people, too, and they have a chance to be heard. It has held the government to the same standard as its critics.

The mammoth power that is the United States is rooted in jocks and hollow shell bricks, not in the constitutional order which gives thrust and purpose to our country. It is the general attitude of top Johnson administration officials and Secretaries McNamarra and Rusk on TV Sunday acknowledged at least this possibility. In the same time the aphy might have been inside North Korea’s 12-mile limit. The whole spy craze in books and movies and TV entertainment caused
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Heads nod wisely at the Pueblo news: This is a dirty business, those who work at it are unlikely to get caught and get hurt, and it's all in the game. To many Americans it seems more sensible to take the losses quietly than to risk more ships on a poor hand.

But certainly there is an additional factor working in the Pueblo affair that was not present in earlier incidents: A reluctant recognition that the U.S. does not have limitless military or financial resources, and thus should not expose itself to another long, messy war for anything less than a very clear threat to its self-interest.

The U.S. response to the Arab-Israeli war last spring was remarkably similar. Even the shrillest Vietnam hawks cautioned against rushing into another major battle-ground, and the nation squirmed uneasily as its conscience urged it to help Israel and its common sense warned it to stay the hell out. A nationwide sigh of relief went up when the Israeli army and air force ended the war before the U.S. had to decide between the promptings of conscience and the counsel of good sense.

It seems highly likely, too, that similar restraint will be the response to future foreign flare-ups. For the Vietnam war has driven home-rubbed the national nose in, if you will—the lesson of the limitations of American power. The nation is coming to realize, as decades earlier Britain and France had to realize, that massive military might, technological superiority and even good intentions aren't always enough to shape events. Particularly the U.S. is learning that there are many situations where nuclear power is too awful to contemplate and conventional power inadequate, and that in such situations discretion is definitely the preferred course.

It is a difficult lesson for a people inherently optimistic and self-confident. Americans have long believed there was almost nothing they couldn't do once they set their minds to it—and, somehow, things got worked out that way until recently. Didn't the U.S. win World War I and World War II, rebuild Western Europe, halt the Communists in Korea? Now, with realistic resigna­tion, the Republic is adjusting to the fact that events don't always march to the American tune.

It still comes as a considerable shock to a nation used to flexing its financial muscle to be told that gold supplies are dwindling dangerously, that the dollar is in trouble, that its citizens may have to accept strict limits on where they can invest and—for the first time—stiff taxes when they travel abroad. Perhaps the Administration's proposals are examples of overkill, and will ultimately be trimmed down or even in part rejected. But whatever curbs finally emerge, and even the debate about them, will force Americans to face reality.

In the domestic field the awakening is proving equally rude. Even those Americans who have had doubts about the nation's power to remake the world have always happily assumed they could pretty well do as they wanted to remake their own country. Good will, hard work and money could overcome the race problem, save the cities, give jobs to practically everyone and so forth. Indeed the President quite properly and accurately recites strings of statistics of advances in employment, housing, education, health. Yet the problems seem to have grown even faster; the list of unmet needs stretches ever longer and race relations grow more bitter.

Perhaps the awakening was bound to come sooner or later, as it came to the British and French and other once high-riding empires. Certainly, though, Vietnam has been a catalyst to speed the American awakening, dramatically underlining the difficulties of winning wars in faraway lands, the limits of financial resources, the problems of mobilis-