

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 4

FEBRUARY 28, 1966, TO MARCH 9, 1966

(PAGES 4181 TO 5494)

imagination to the potentials of technology. We cannot afford to "underimagine" the future.

These future developments are extremely promising, and they can have a worldwide impact that will be truly revolutionary. However, in order for them to be realized peaceably and with full respect to human freedom and dignity, we must use technology for one task of highest priority. That task is to help preserve the independence of peoples who are threatened by aggression. As long as aggressors employ force or threaten to employ it, we must build and maintain realistic means of meeting that threat.

Thus the advancement of military technology becomes a cornerstone of our Nation's continuing policies of deterrence and of controlled response to aggression. But technology cannot be divided into neat little compartments which can be labeled either "peaceful," or "nonpeaceful." In actual practice, we find that a tremendous amount of military research and development makes direct or indirect contributions to the civilian economy.

The many contributions of military aviation to the airlines industry and the substantial support given by the ballistic-missile effort to the national space program are fairly obvious examples. Less obvious, perhaps, but equally real, are such developments as higher reliability, new management techniques, new materials, improved manufacturing methods, better instrumentation, and the expansion of technical fields such as cryogenics and microelectronics. All of these have been greatly stimulated by military necessity. The vast store of technical knowledge that has been generated in this way is a new national resource which has yet to be exploited fully.

And there is much progress ahead. About 2 years ago the Air Force completed a long-range planning study called Project Forecast. Its purpose was to look at the national security requirements of the Nation extending into the 1970's and to predict how science and technology could meet those requirements. Although many of the forecast recommendations obviously are classified, one unclassified example will show some of the things we found.

The example I have chosen is long-range air transportation, which clearly has both military and commercial value. It has long been known that in order to make the kind of advances that were needed in this area, we needed substantial progress in such key technical areas as materials, propulsion, and flight dynamics. Project Forecast indicated that such progress could be made.

In materials, for instance, it was found that metals could be strengthened by oxide dispersion to allow an increase of several hundred degrees in operating temperatures. This increase would make it feasible to build more efficient aircraft engines. At the same time, the development of new composite materials made of metallic and metalloid fibers in a plastic binder—using roughly the same principle as reinforced concrete—was shown to promise weight savings of between 35 and 50 percent in airframe structures, with no decrease in strength or stiffness. The fibers under consideration include boron, carbon, silicon carbide, and boron carbide.

In the propulsion area, it was found that the use of these new materials, together with advanced design concepts, would allow us to build greatly improved engines with increased thrust-to-weight ratios and reduced specific fuel consumption.

Likewise, advances in flight dynamics, such as laminar flow control and variable geometry wings, together with the use of new materials and propulsion systems, can lead to new transport aircraft with ranges several hundred percent greater than those

of today's aircraft. It is possible to develop new generations of aircraft which can be designed for near global range or for vastly improved payloads, for vertical takeoff and landing, for economic operation over quite a wide range of speeds, or for a combination of these capabilities.

When these predictions were made 2 years ago some people thought that they were overly optimistic. But, in actual fact, many of the Forecast findings have turned out to be just the opposite—they have been quite conservative. In some areas we have already achieved experimental results in the laboratory which reach or surpass the goals predicted for 1970.

For example, current experiments with oxide-dispersed metals for strength at high temperatures show a 40-percent improvement over the findings of 2 years ago. Boron fibers for composite materials have already been produced with a 20-percent greater average strength than they were predicted to attain by 1970. Their monthly production is more than 20 times the total supply that existed 3 years ago. Production costs have already been reduced from \$6,000 a pound to \$650 a pound, and there are immediate prospects for a further reduction to \$250 a pound. We feel that eventually the cost of boron fibers can be brought down to less than \$25 a pound.

At the same time a new plastic binder has been produced in the laboratory which offers an increased temperature resistance of 100° centigrade over polymerized benzine (PBI), which was the best plastic binder known 2 years ago. And promising new concepts for composite materials of metalloid fibers in a metal matrix are being explored.

When we turn to the propulsion area, we find that a new aircraft engine is presently under test, which surpasses the gains predicted for 1970 in bypass ratio, high temperature capability, and reduced specific fuel consumption. The supersonic combustion ramjet, or SCRAMJET, is showing great promise for airbreathing vehicles at speeds of mach 6 or greater. Supersonic combustion has already been repeatedly demonstrated at simulated speeds of mach 6 in test facilities.

Now I do not want to leave the false impression that these technical advances are going to be incorporated into new products next week. Many of them are still in the laboratory stage, and there are problems of cost, design, and fabrication which remain to be solved. But there is every indication, from our past experience, that they will be solved. In fact, as I have indicated, we are steadily making progress toward their solution.

I think that perhaps the real barrier to progress is simply negative thinking. There are always people who would rather give you a thousand good reasons why something cannot be done than encourage you to go ahead and try. This seems to be a fundamental tendency in human nature. I feel sure that the man who invented the wheel back in the dawn of history must have run into the same kind of thinking from some of his neighbors. And every inventor since has been surrounded by skeptics. The ones who enabled civilization to advance were those who dared to go ahead anyway. I think that our biggest need in the can-do age is for can-do people.

Now I have been talking about the future, but that is not the only place where challenges exist. We have pressing problems which confront us right now in southeast Asia. You, in Hawaii, are probably even more aware of these than other Americans may be, because geographically you are much closer to it than the rest of the country.

But the challenge in southeast Asia is not a regional problem. It is a global problem, and it clearly poses the basic question:

"Must free peoples anywhere allow themselves to be victimized by force and terror and brutality?" Our Nation's answer is that we have both the right and the duty to help the people of South Vietnam resist aggression and build a free and independent society.

You will recall the words of President Kennedy's inaugural, when he said: "We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty." He did not add, "We will pull out when the going gets tough." Let us make no mistake about it: the going is tough, and it may get tougher. Anyone who thinks that there are any easy answers in Vietnam is only deluding himself.

There are some who think we should not turn back aggression in Vietnam, and there are some who think we cannot turn back aggression there. Fortunately, most Americans appear to disagree with this negative thinking. They know that we must turn back Communist aggression in Vietnam. As Winston Churchill pointed out after the concessions at Munich in 1938: "The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion." Those who would deny the truth of this observation are either blind to history's lessons or deluded by wishful thinking.

Some ask whether we have the resources to honor our commitments in Vietnam. But the real point at issue is not our firepower; it is our willpower. Your distinguished Senator, Mr. INOUYE, made this point very clearly in the U.S. Senate last fall when he said: "Vietnam is not a war over land or strategic position. It is a war of will, a test of the character of the American Nation. * * * If we do not fight this war, there will be another, and if we do not fight that one, there will come a time when there is no choice; and the price will be increased accordingly."

If a job has to be done, then people will find a way to do it, no matter how difficult it is or how long it takes. In some ways Vietnam represents a challenge unlike any our Nation has faced before, but this certainly does not mean that we must abandon the effort. The whole history of our country and in fact of civilization itself is the story of response to new challenges—and that story did not come to an end in 1966.

Technology can do much to help us deal with the problems of jungle warfare, and we are actively at work to develop new weapons and new techniques. But the crucial issue is still one of our determination as a people and our willingness to find fresh ways of waging counterinsurgency warfare. This is a challenge that must be met, and with enough can-do people, I am fully confident that we can meet it successfully.

Thank you.

A WAR ON HUMAN HUNGER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson has proposed that the United States lead the world in a war on human hunger. The Senate Agriculture Committee is now conducting hearings on his proposal to establish a new food-for-freedom program, as well as the bills introduced by Senator McGovern and myself.

During the committee hearings, and the growing national debate on this issue, several questions have come to the forefront. One is the need for other advanced countries—especially those which excel in agricultural production—to play a larger role in the war on hunger. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that

a recent editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Internationalizing Food Aid" be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, another point which has received increasing attention is the importance of accelerated food assistance programs in providing an expanded market for the products of American industry and agriculture. America's trade today is primarily with industrialized countries, because their people have sufficient incomes to purchase American products. But in the less developed nations, it is the lag in agriculture, more than anything else, which prevents them from achieving rapid economic growth, which would provide increased markets for our products.

Finally, there is the recognition that, in an expanded war on hunger, U.S. private enterprise must play a far greater role than ever before—in setting up fertilizer plants, fortification of foods, and processing of farm products.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD three articles from the March issue of *Forbes*, entitled "World Hunger: Enemy of U.S. Prosperity," "U.S. Business Against Malthus," and "Twice as Many Sukarnos?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

INTERNATIONALIZING FOOD AID

"We cannot meet this problem alone," the President told Congress in his food aid message. "Hunger is a world problem. We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture."

The administration is thinking of a food aid consortium to deal with the famine threat in India as a first step toward an internationalized approach to the world agricultural problem. Canada, for example, has a wheat carryover this year of 14 million tons; even allowing for the customary retention of a 10-million-ton reserve, Ottawa still has a 4-million-ton margin. Yet Canadian involvement in food aid to India has been limited in the current crisis to unilateral donations totaling 165,000 tons.

Similarly, Australia, which has available out of its carryover at least 500,000 tons, notwithstanding a poor crop year, has contributed 150,000 tons. This is in contrast to new U.S. commitments to ship 4.5 million tons by May.

In a consortium, countries with cash to spare would sit across from less affluent countries with food to spare; and the result, hopefully, would be collaborative arrangements resulting in increased exports to the food deficit nations. Thus, West German or French capital might be applied to Australian or Canadian wheat purchases or at the very least to shipping costs. One of the most interesting dimensions of the consortium idea is a plan to include aid programs for fertilizer manufacturing ventures. Whether much actual help can be realistically expected in the near future is doubtful. But it could put the whole program on a sounder footing in the long run. The greatest advantage of an internationalized approach is its tendency to reduce the politi-

cal friction inevitably arising in relations between a single patron and a client country.

EXHIBIT 2

[From *Forbes* magazine]

WORLD HUNGER: ENEMY OF U.S. PROSPERITY

One billion people, a third of the world's population, drag themselves through the day weak from hunger, an easy target for disease and frequently for death from starvation. Another billion are badly malnourished, almost on the borderline of starvation. What we call progress, civilization, prosperity, is meaningless to two-thirds of the human race. These people are only half alive. They are half dead from hunger.

The average American consumes 3,100 calories a day in food rich with proteins, vitamins, and minerals. In the underdeveloped nations, the average person must drag his body along on a mere 2,030 calories a day, and his food usually is deficient in those nutrients. While the United States, Western Europe, Japan, and a few other nations get richer, the hungry get hungrier, because, in the underdeveloped part of the world, human fecundity is outstripping agricultural fecundity. In Asia and Latin America in the past 5 years the population has risen by 12 and 17 percent, respectively. In contrast, production of food has risen by only 10 percent. The result is that per capita food production has fallen by 3 percent in Asia, by 7 percent in Latin America.

The deadly effects of the population explosion aren't for tomorrow. They are here and now. Today.

As Chairman Robert S. Stevenson, of Allis-Chalmers puts it: "The United States, Canada, and Australia are going to have to feed the world, or we're going to have to help the world feed itself." Nobody realizes this more keenly than President Lyndon B. Johnson and his top aids. The more newsworthy problems of Vietnam and inflation have not, even for a day, crowded it out of their deliberations.

Humanitarian motives aside, the President and his aids know full well that the U.S. economy cannot continue to grow without an expanding world market. Moreover, as the President has noted, quoting Seneca, "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice, nor is bent by any prayers."

The malnourished masses love their children as intensely as well-fed Americans love theirs. They are not about to starve peacefully and quietly, in patience, resignation, and fatalism, as their ancestors might have done. They know there is a world without hunger somewhere outside their dusty villages. They have transistor radios, and they have bumped in rickety buses into market towns. They have taken seriously the politicians' promises of a better life. They will riot and kill to achieve it. They are doing so right now.

ESCALATION

Almost in desperation, the United States plans to escalate its efforts to deal with the world hunger problem. In so doing it will create tremendous opportunities for businesses that have the know-how, the foresight, and the capital to help end hunger.

President Johnson fired an opening gun in the stepped-up war against hunger when he sent a message to Congress last month, asking for a new food program to replace the present food-for-peace program, Public Law 480, which expires this year. The President did not spell out all the details of his food-for-freedom program, but, even so, agricultural experts agree that it eventually will have an enormous impact on the entire U.S. economy. For one thing, it will change the whole direction of the foreign aid program. Until now, foreign aid has gone primarily toward industrial development; hereafter, it

will be directed more toward agricultural development. The food-for-freedom program will have an even greater impact on U.S. agriculture. Since the first Agricultural Administration Act, the U.S. Government has attempted to keep food production down. Now, the administration plans to offer inducements to farmers to raise production of certain foodstuffs. Under the food-for-peace program, the United States sent abroad primarily those agricultural products it had in surplus in Government warehouses. Now, it will gear its production more directly to the needs of the hungry, using incentives to increase production of certain foodstuffs when necessary.

Out of this inevitably will come several other developments: Little by little, land which has been retired from production under the present farm program will be brought back into cultivation. The exodus of marginal farmers into the cities will be speeded up, since they will not have the capital to expand production as the Government requires. The big farmers will get bigger. Even if world prices of agricultural products don't rise, the big farmers will become so efficient and have such an enormous market they will be able to prosper with lower subsidies—or even without them.

One expert, Don Lerch, a Washington management consultant who specializes in agriculture, believes that by 1976 there will be only 500,000 farmers in the United States (as compared with 3.2 million today). But, he quickly adds, they will all be immensely prosperous.

The farmers of Canada and Australia also will benefit. Both countries, as a result, are likely to keep booming.

The United States plans to fight the war against hunger on two fronts. The first will be a crash program to supply the underdeveloped countries with food. The United States has been giving away \$1.5 billion worth of food abroad every year under Public Law 480. If Congress approves the President's new program—as seems all but certain—food shipments could rise to \$3.3 billion by 1967-68. This move is designed to cope with such emergencies as the recent drought in India, which already has led to Communist-organized riots in the State of Kerala.

In the long run, the second front will be the decisive one. This is the self-help part. Every nation receiving U.S. aid will have to promise to build up its own agriculture as swiftly as possible. Not only promise, but show results. The reason for this is simple. "We don't have enough capacity to feed all these people," says Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. "Unless they learn to feed themselves, there will be world famine. The estimated increased needs between now and 1980 are in the neighborhood of 300 million tons. The potential reserve productive capacity of this country is 50 to 55 million tons more. There is a 250-million-ton gap here that only the underdeveloped nations themselves can fill."

Along with the food, therefore, the United States will send the underdeveloped nations fertilizer and farm equipment. It will also encourage U.S. companies to build fertilizer plants and farm equipment factories abroad. It will teach farmers in Asia and Africa and Latin America how to make the most of the land they have. It will urge—and even arm-twist—governments to reorganize policies in the field of price incentives, farm credit, and land reform. This will all be done under the Agency for International Development (AID).

Increasing food shipments abroad will mean increasing production at home, for, according to Freeman, the reserves in Government storage don't come anywhere near the world's requirements. "Our reserves are now in the land rather than in the storage bin,"

he says. Grain in storage has been dropping steadily since 1961—wheat, from 1.4 billion bushels to 800 million; feed grains, from 77 million metric tons to 50 million.

This means that millions of acres of land that have been retired under the present farm program eventually will be brought back into production as needed. It will be done gradually, Freeman says, first to prevent chaos in the marketplace, and second because there isn't enough shipping to handle all the food the U.S. farmer could produce if the wraps on him were taken off all at once.

All told, there are now nearly 57 million acres of U.S. farmland "in reserve." Freeman won't reveal just how many he intends to put back into production, but some Government officials believe it will be somewhere between 5 and 7 million acres. He already has taken a small step in that direction. "Just last month," he points out, "I discontinued the alternative of voluntary acreage reduction whereby a spring wheat producer could take 10 percent out of production and get paid for doing it. The producer no longer has that option. He has to plant his full allotment."

MORE TO COME

The acreage allotment for rice will be increased this year by 10 percent. Many experts believe it will eventually be necessary to increase the allotment for winter wheat. Says Claude W. Gifford, senior economist of Farm Journal: "A shortage in wheat is only a few years away."

Freeman's guideline will be the President's promise to Congress to "bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus." In short, to change the very nature of U.S. agricultural policy but without causing chaos on the farm and in the marketplace.

In his message, Johnson called for increased production of soybeans. The Secretary of Agriculture believes this can be achieved by the judicious use of incentives—more acreage with guaranteed prices. "In corn," he says, "we have too much. We still have a surplus. We'll do something which will make it possible for those farmers to plant soybeans on those acres and come out just as good. We need the soybeans. We don't need corn." Soybeans produce a high-protein, low-cost diet meal for animals. They also are one of the richest sources of protein in food mixes for humans.

Robert W. Engle, manager of marketing of Allis-Chalmers' farm equipment division, believes that increased production will have to come from improved farm equipment and improved farm techniques, as well as from greater acreage. "One area where output per man hour has been neglected is farm materials handling," he says. "There are going to be some giant strides made in coordinating a farmer's growing system with a push-button, automated method of handling and storing his crop."

"Another way of increasing farm production is * * * by growing two stalks of corn where only one grew before. Instead of growing corn in the standard 38- or 40-inch rows, we've tried it in 30 or 20. Yield often increases 10 or 15 percent."

CHANGE IN POLICY

Under Public Law 480, the United States has either been giving the food away or else selling it for local currency. In simple fact, selling it for local currency almost invariably has meant giving it away, because so little of the currency can be used. According to Sam I. Nakagama, a senior economist of the First National City Bank of New York, the United States now holds an amount equivalent to two-thirds of the currency of India as a result of selling the Indians food. Most of this money obviously can't be used; spending it would create horrendous inflation. Un-

der a tacit agreement with the Indian Government, therefore, the United States simply hoards it. The United States now holds \$2.8 billion in counterpart funds.

Under the food-for-freedom program, food will no longer be sold for local currency and only a maximum \$800 million worth will be given away. Only those nations which clearly can't subsist except on charity will receive free food. The United States will grant the others—nations like Taiwan, Spain, Greece, and the United Arab Republic—long-term credits at low interest, perhaps 2 percent, to buy the remaining \$2.5 billion worth. They will have to pay the world market price. They will be required to repay the money in dollars.

Prices also should be bolstered by the fact that, at times, the United States will have to get the food on the open market.

There are those who fear that, by helping other nations increase their food production, the United States will destroy its own commercial food-export market, which now amounts to about \$4.5 billion a year. According to Freeman, these fears are groundless. Experience proves, he says, that, as a country raises its production of food, what it does is switch to importing other U.S. agricultural products like animal feeds. The result is a net gain for the U.S. farmer. Freeman cites the case of Japan. That country used to get massive agricultural aid from the United States. It soon may be buying \$1 billion worth of U.S. farm products annually on a straight cash basis. Western Europe, which also used to receive agricultural aid, is now this Nation's biggest customer of feed grains and poultry. In 1964, U.S. food exports to Western Europe totaled \$2.3 billion.

As Freeman sees it, prosperity abroad, therefore, will mean prosperity at home. "Every 10-percent increase in per capita income (abroad) results in a 16-percent increase in the commercial imports of our products," he says.

In the fight to increase production of food-stuffs abroad, the United States will count particularly on the manufacturers of fertilizer. Says David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development: "Fertilizer will be our biggest need." Dr. Lester R. Brown, staff economist of the Department of Agriculture, adds: "Ironically, the less-developed regions of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which contain two-thirds of the world's people and where the food needs are greatest, use only 5 million tons of the 35-million-ton annual world total. In other words, only one-seventh of the world fertilizer supply is used in the regions containing two-thirds of the population. As the supply of new land that can be brought under cultivation diminishes, fertilizer becomes the principal substitute for land in the food production process."

FERTILIZER BOOM AHEAD

The United States is now shipping about \$325 million worth of fertilizers abroad every year through foreign aid and commercial channels. By 1970, it will be shipping about \$1 billion abroad each year. In addition, the United States will spend about \$250 million to help build fertilizer plants in partnership with natives in the underdeveloped countries such as Gulf Oil's project in Korea.

Says an AID chemical engineer: "One million dollars worth of food aid will feed 70,000 people for a year, but the same \$1 million put into fertilizer would help feed 200,000 people for a year."

AID's Bell is also counting on farm-equipment manufacturers and food processors to help beef up the agriculture of the underdeveloped countries. The farm-machinery makers will have to develop equipment especially designed for their needs, he says, pointing out that in India, for example, "the land-holdings are very small. Farming takes on

the characteristics of gardening. You need small power units, hand equipment almost."

A great deal rides on the success of this new program—which partly explains why support for it seems to cut across party lines. President Johnson's proposals have the support of many Republicans, who in the past were leery about foreign aid. Much of the Republican leadership in Congress comes from farm States, where food-aid programs naturally have strong support. Moreover, as Senator MILTON R. YOUNG of North Dakota, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Committee, points out, "Republicans originated the whole food-for-peace program back in the Eisenhower administration." He adds: "I think the President will get substantially what he wants. Giving people food and helping them produce more food is the best kind of foreign-aid program."

Is the food-for-freedom program alone big enough to deal with the problem? No. The sad fact is that, no matter how generous it is, it can only supplement the efforts of the underdeveloped countries themselves.

Some pessimists think that the problem is hopeless; that the population explosion is now out of hand. But some very hardheaded experts think otherwise. To quote Bryson M. Filbert, vice president and director of Esso Chemical Co., a big factor in the world fertilizer business, "It is possible to double or even triple agricultural production in all of Asia, Africa, and Latin America through the use of more fertilizers, more irrigation, better seed varieties, more pesticides, and other improved farm practices. I have been told by experts that four times the present world population could be supported by widespread use of improved farming methods."

But the key word is "could." To turn "could" into "will" is going to take some very drastic, very fast changes in the underdeveloped countries themselves. Almost without exception they misread the economic history of the prosperous nations. They only noticed that these countries built industries and turned farmers into workers. What they failed to note was that in most cases such countries did so only after developing a prosperous agriculture first. In part this misreading of history was due to an obsession with the "Soviet experiment."

RUSSIA'S BAD EXAMPLE

The Soviets reversed the normal process of economic development. By starving agriculture of capital and by keeping food prices artificially low, they made the farmers bear the cost of building hydroelectric dams and plants and steel mills. The Soviet Union became a great industrial power, and this bedazzled the underdeveloped nations. What they failed to realize was a fact that has since become obvious to everyone: The Soviet Union produces more steel than it needs, but it can't feed its steelworkers without importing food.

India is the classic case of a country that was misled by the "Soviet experiment." India concentrated all its capital and most of its foreign aid into building up industry. It used the free food it received from the United States to keep food prices low for industrial workers. The program has proved self-defeating. Low food prices have kept the Indian farmer too poor to provide a market for the goods the industrial workers are producing. At the same time, the low prices have discouraged the farmer from attempting to increase production.

[From Forbes magazine, Mar. 1, 1966]

U.S. BUSINESS VERSUS MALTHUS: IT WILL TAKE ALL THE NATION'S ECONOMIC RESOURCES TO DEFEAT THE ARITHMETIC OF STARVATION

Obviously, the U.S. farmer will be the first to feel the impact of the food-for-free-

dom program. In a recent talk with mid-western grain dealers, Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, predicted that food exports under the program and through regular commercial sales would increase by 50 percent "within the next few years." They now amount to \$6 billion a year. A 50 percent increase would bring them close to \$9 billion. Land values are going to rise. Smart farmers with capital will become rich.

Major segments of U.S. industry are going to benefit, too. The menace of starvation will mean steadily mounting sales for the producers of fertilizers, farm machinery, seed and feed. According to Liebenow, in order to increase exports by 50 percent, the farmer will have to spend \$3 billion a year more for those products than the \$13 billion he spends now. Little wonder that farm machinery companies are expanding as fast as they can, that almost every major oil company is striving to build a major stake in fertilizer.

James Devlin, director of domestic agricultural sales of American Metal Climax, which makes fertilizer, goes further. Increased food exports, he says, will "affect the whole gross national product." The railroads will prosper, he points out, because the food must be shipped from farm to seaport by rail. The steel industry will profit because farm machinery is made of steel. Even the paper industry will profit, he says, noting: "We put our fertilizer in paper bags."

SHIPS AND SHIPPERS

"It will mean a lot more business for us," says Alvin Shapiro, executive vice president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, which represents the nation's shipowners, who will have to carry the foodstuffs and fertilizer and farm machinery abroad. He doubts, however, that it will have an immediate effect on the nation's shipbuilders because "there is still tremendous unused capacity around. The big tankers are excellent for shipping grain and are not being fully utilized." Increased exports also will mean a lot more business for such commercial grain shippers as Cargill and Continental Grain.

Claude W. Gifford, senior economist, of Farm Journal, believes that, aside from the farmer, the makers of fertilizer will profit most from the food-for-freedom program. "You can get fertilizer on the land quickly," he says, "and it's easy to teach peasants how to use it even if they can't read. It's harder to teach the operation of machinery, and there's the problem of repairs."

This does not mean that manufacturers of farm machinery won't benefit, too, Gifford is quick to add, naming specifically Massey-Ferguson, Deere, and International Harvester. Others who will benefit are seed companies like DeKalb, Northrup King, and Pioneer, he says.

DEMAND FOR ROADS

Norman R. Urquhart, assistant vice president in charge of commodities of the economics department of the First National City Bank of New York, foresees a growing demand abroad for American earth-moving machinery. "When I was a boy growing up on an Illinois farm, one of the farmers' great cries was for good farm-to-market roads. We have them now, but the rest of the world needs them." This should help Caterpillar Tractor, he says. He also sees great opportunities for companies that build chemical plants, like Fluor, Foster Wheeler and Pullman's M. W. Kellogg division, "if they can get the contracts against foreign competition."

Some experts fear that increased production of foodstuffs in the United States and abroad actually may create a world shortage of fertilizers. Urquhart and one of First

National's senior economists, Sam I. Nakagama, insist there is a world fertilizer cartel outside the United States. Asked why U.S. companies don't attempt to break it, Nakagama says: "Perhaps they don't find it advantageous to do so."

Whatever the facts about this may be, according to Devlin of American Metal Climax, the world potash industry is geared to expand only at the rate of 6 to 7 percent a year. If demand rose to a 10-percent increase a year, Devlin admits, the industry wouldn't have the facilities to keep up with it for more than a few years. "We couldn't, in that time, bring out new mines," he says. Devlin doesn't believe that such a rise in demand is likely, but this view is far from unanimous.

One company that is all but certain to benefit is International Harvester. Says Hugh A. Davies, general manager of Harvester's overseas division: "We do research all over the world, in places ranging from Argentina, which is a net exporter of foodstuffs, to Africa, where the people eat bananas. We have facilities in 20 nations outside the United States. We're in roadbuilding, trucks, and farm equipment. Only where farming is done by hand and horse do we not supply the tools.

"We can fill any demands that come. We just hope that demand is created. Roadbuilding might be a big thing. You have to have a way to get the food to market. The hinterland of Brazil is an example. You need better roads, schools, dams, and irrigation channels."

Deere & Co., already the biggest farm machinery manufacturer in the United States, is spending heavily to expand abroad. These investments have yet to pay off, but Chairman William A. Hewitt is sure they will. Meanwhile, he believes, the new farm policy will mean a big sales increase for his company in the United States. White Motor, which got into farm machinery through a series of mergers, now gets 30 percent of its \$638 million in sales from that business and is out for more. So are Allis-Chalmers and the revitalized J. I. Case (Forbes, Feb. 15, p. 62).

Since the war against hunger can succeed only if the underdeveloped nations learn to produce more food, the U.S. Government is particularly anxious for U.S. manufacturers and food processors to expand abroad. Says AID Administrator David E. Bell: "There are lots of American companies beginning to invest abroad in fertilizer plants and there will be more in years to come. International Minerals & Chemical is putting up a big plant in India. We've recently made two loans for fertilizer plants in Korea; there the principal American investors are Gulf Oil and Swift. Now we are working with Standard of Indiana, Armour and others on fertilizer projects."

Bryson M. Filbert, vice president of Esso Chemical Co., says: "We have already invested about \$90 million in facilities to produce ammonia, nitric acid and various other fertilizers and fertilizer compounds in Colombia, Aruba, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Spain. In addition, we are building or planning plants in the Philippines, Greece, Jamaica, Malaysia, Lebanon and Pakistan, as well as one in a very economically advanced nation, the Netherlands. In all, these plants will have more than 1 million tons of ammonia capacity and more than 1.8 million tons of fertilizer capacity. * * * Their capital cost will exceed \$200 million."

The company also is working on new techniques which, it hopes, will make the sand dunes of Tunisia and Libya bloom. These involve using oil to stabilize them.

The U.S. Government is putting a great deal of pressure on the underdeveloped nations to make it attractive for U.S. companies to build fertilizer plants abroad. For a

long time, India insisted that it handle all the distribution of fertilizers produced in that country by U.S. companies and that it also set the price. Standard of Indiana understandably refused to accept these conditions. AID put food shipments to India on a month-to-month basis until the Indian Government let Standard of India market the fertilizer itself at its own price.

OPPORTUNITY—AND PROBLEMS

Bell believes "there is a real opportunity in food processing." However, the food processors themselves think it may be a long time before they make any great progress in the underdeveloped countries. Harry Meisel, technical coordinator for Corn Products International, points out his company has sold a product derived from corn called "Maizena" which has been known for 100 years in Latin America. Recently, it brought out a new product in Brazil, "Enriched Maizena." This is "Maizena" with proteins, vitamins, and minerals added. "It solves the problem of getting nutrition into the diet in an innocuous way," says Meisel.

But Corn Products is losing money on "Enriched Maizena" because the protein element, which is made of milk and soybeans, costs too much. One reason is that it's been difficult to shift Brazilian farmers to soybean production. U.S. farmers will shift from one crop to another at the drop of a dollar, but in Brazil caution and suspicion prevail. It takes 15 years to get a Brazilian farmer to shift crops, Meisel says. Introducing a new product in underdeveloped countries, he concludes, "is a baptism of blood."

Quaker Oats has been having a similar experience with "Incaparina." This is a powdered cereal mix that contains cottonseed and soy flour. Quaker Oats is promoting the cereal with an advertising campaign. Particularly effective have been movies which show babies before and after drinking the cereal.

"But," admits Michael Hore, general manager of Latin American and Pacific operations for Quaker, "we have a long way to go. It's a matter of education, and the money for that has to come from us."

Dr. Harold L. Wilcke, director of research for Ralston Purina, suspects there may be greater opportunities in the underdeveloped countries in processing food for animals than in food for humans. "In many areas," he says, "animals cannot economically compete in food value with direct consumption of grain. But in some areas the land can grow food fit only for animals. These are areas similar to our Rocky Mountains, where grass is the only crop, and they exist in India, Mexico, and Venezuela. In addition, animals can compete when they scavenge or when they eat spoiled grains."

This could mean business for Ralston Purina's supplementary feeds, which help the animals grow faster and bigger, Dr. Wilcke says.

Clearly, the outlook is this: In the United States, the economic impact of the food-for-freedom program will be swift. In the underdeveloped countries, however, the problems are as great as the need. For many of the companies that go overseas, these problems will make it difficult to show a profit for a long time. But for many the opportunity is simply too great to miss, whatever the risks.

The great 19th century clergyman-economist Thomas Malthus believed that population growth inevitably would outstrip food supply; only massive starvation and misery could right the balance, he said. It didn't happen that way in the countries of the West and in Japan, but it seems to be coming to that for the world as a whole. In the struggle to prove Malthus wrong, the know-how and enterprise of U.S. businessmen are going to prove mighty weapons.

Companies that will help feed the world

Company	Operating data			Stock data				
	Assets (millions)	1965 revenues (millions)	1965 net income (millions)	Latest 12 months earnings per share	Recent price	5-year price range	1966 indicated dividend	Yield (percent)
FERTILIZER PRODUCERS								
American Cyanamid	\$786	\$863	\$93.1	\$4.21	92 $\frac{1}{2}$	96 - 35 $\frac{1}{2}$	\$2.50	2.7
Armour	631	2,062	22.4	2.38	46 $\frac{3}{8}$	53 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 29	1.60	3.4
Borden Co.	677	1,353	49.1	1.94	40 $\frac{1}{2}$	47 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 20 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.20	3.0
Cities Service	1,586	1,185	104.1	3.86	47 $\frac{1}{4}$	50 - 22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.50	3.2
Continental Oil	1,554	1,552	96.2	4.25	66 $\frac{3}{4}$	81 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 43 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.40	3.6
Grace, W. R.	906	902	40.5	2.61	57 $\frac{1}{2}$	62 $\frac{3}{4}$ - 16 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.20	2.1
Gulf Oil	4,667	13,879	427.0	4.12	53 $\frac{1}{4}$	60 - 30 $\frac{3}{4}$	2.00	3.8
International Minerals & Chemical	324	279	21.7	3.40	84 $\frac{1}{2}$	84 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 17	1.20	1.4
Kerr-McGee	324	314	23.8	3.64	77 $\frac{3}{8}$	77 $\frac{3}{8}$ - 24	1.30	1.7
Lone Star Gas	421	183	17.8	1.22	24 $\frac{3}{8}$	28 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 18 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.12	4.5
Potash Co. of America	55	28	4.6	3.67	74 $\frac{1}{4}$	76 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 18	2.00	2.7
Socony Mobil	4,879	12,755	330.0	6.30	89 $\frac{3}{8}$	88 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 38 $\frac{3}{4}$	3.20	3.6
Standard Oil of California	3,796	2,930	391.0	6.15	79	88 - 40 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.50	3.2
Standard Oil of Indiana	3,306	3,063	219.3	3.10	44 $\frac{1}{2}$	50 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 20	1.20	3.8
Standard Oil of New Jersey	12,490	12,725	1,035.0	4.80	78 $\frac{1}{4}$	92 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 40 $\frac{3}{4}$	3.30	4.2
U.S. Borax & Chemical	135	98	9.4	2.21	36 $\frac{3}{4}$	47 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 19 $\frac{1}{8}$	1.10	3.0
AGRICULTURAL EQUIPMENT								
Allis-Chalmers	552	714	22.1	2.33	35 $\frac{1}{4}$	36 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 12 $\frac{1}{2}$	0.75	2.1
Case, J. I.	218	289	13.5	2.93	30	38 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 4 $\frac{1}{2}$	(³)	-----
Caterpillar Tractor	1,007	1,405	158.5	2.80	46 $\frac{1}{2}$	53 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 14 $\frac{1}{4}$	1.20	2.6
Deere & Co.	981	922	56.5	4.07	62 $\frac{1}{4}$	63 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 20 $\frac{3}{4}$	1.70	2.7
International Harvester	1,814	2,359	103.2	3.56	50 $\frac{3}{4}$	50 $\frac{3}{4}$ - 21 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.725	3.4
Massey-Ferguson	742	808	40.1	2.66	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 8 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.00	3.0
White Motor	286	635	22.0	3.80	43 $\frac{3}{8}$	44 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 16 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.40	3.2
FOOD PROCESSORS								
Archer-Daniels-Midland	183	339	3.7	2.32	41 $\frac{1}{2}$	44 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 30	1.60	3.9
Central Soya	126	469	10.5	3.44	60 $\frac{3}{8}$	60 $\frac{3}{8}$ - 23 $\frac{3}{4}$	1.40	2.3
Corn Products	584	979	54.7	2.45	50 $\frac{1}{2}$	67 $\frac{3}{8}$ - 37	1.60	3.2
National Dairy Products	825	2,017	69.9	4.83	84 $\frac{3}{8}$	98 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 40 $\frac{1}{4}$	2.80	3.3
Pfizer, Chas.	465	543	53.4	2.70	71 $\frac{3}{8}$	76 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 30 $\frac{3}{8}$	1.45	2.0
Pillsbury Co.	237	450	10.4	2.35	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	49	1.00	2.5
Quaker Oats	228	480	16.3	3.89	74	98 - 55	2.20	3.0
Ralston Purina	395	988	32.4	2.16	49 $\frac{1}{2}$	50 - 22	1.00	2.0
Swift	634	2,751	16.4	2.70	57 $\frac{1}{4}$	65 - 31	2.00	3.5
Unilever N.V. ⁴	2,932	\$5,050	\$188.0	\$2.83	31	43 $\frac{3}{8}$ - 23	1.438	4.6
CONSTRUCTION								
Foster Wheeler	96	1,228	1.9	2.65	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	51 $\frac{1}{4}$ - 22 $\frac{1}{4}$	\$1.40	2.9
Kaiser Industries	441	1,452	\$15.1	\$7.73	13 $\frac{3}{8}$	15 - 5 $\frac{1}{2}$	(³)	-----
Morrison-Knudsen	135	314	5.3	2.57	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	35 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 26 $\frac{1}{8}$	1.60	5.4
Pullman	390	661	20.6	4.51	66 $\frac{1}{4}$	73 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 20 $\frac{1}{4}$	2.40	3.6
GRAIN-CARRYING RAILROADS								
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	1,857	677	91.0	3.45	41 $\frac{1}{4}$	42 - 20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.60	3.9
Chicago, Milwaukee	682	241	7.3	2.16	61 $\frac{1}{2}$	64 - 7	1.00	1.6
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	497	211	\$1.5	\$8.50	42 $\frac{3}{4}$	47 - 14 $\frac{3}{8}$	(³)	-----
Illinois Central Industries	743	283	9.8	6.60	78 $\frac{1}{4}$	81 - 31 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.40	3.1
Missouri Pacific	1,196	417	26.3	14.26	94 $\frac{1}{2}$	96 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 36 $\frac{1}{4}$	5.00	5.3
Union Pacific	1,765	549	93.8	4.03	47 $\frac{1}{2}$	49 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 27 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.80	3.8

¹ 12 months ended Sept. 30.

² Excludes excise taxes.

³ None.

⁴ Stock data for Unilever N.V. shares.

⁵ Estimates.

⁶ Plus stock.

⁷ 12 months ended June 30.

⁸ Deficit.

TWICE AS MANY SUKARNOS?

Each generation faces its own crisis. In the thirties and forties it was the rise of fascism. In the fifties and sixties it has been communism. In the seventies and eighties it's likely to be an even more virulent threat: Hunger. Americans probably won't go hungry, but most of the rest of the world will, and we won't be able to escape the consequences.

On pages 19 through 26 of this issue, the editors of Forbes examine the economic implications of population growth pressing against an inflexible food supply. The work of a six-man Forbes team, the report takes a generally optimistic view about what U.S. business can do about the situation—and how it can benefit from it.

But not everybody is optimistic, and we think it only fair to expose our readers to the views of an extremely well-informed businessman who thinks the prospects for feeding the world over the next few decades are dim.

He's Thomas M. Ware, 47-year-old chairman of International Minerals & Chemical. Under Tom Ware's brilliant direction IMC has been extremely aggressive in expanding in the fertilizer field. But that isn't Tom Ware's only credential. He is chairman of the Freedom From Hunger Foundation, a nonprofit organization that promotes support among businessmen for the food programs of the United Nations. Most im-

portant of all, Tom Ware is an engaged and aroused citizen.

"Hope always springs eternal," he told Forbes late last month. "But I don't see how on earth it's possible for the world to feed itself in the years ahead."

UNDERUSED TOOLS

It isn't a shortage of fertilizer, he emphasizes, of implements, of seeds, or even of land. The trouble is even more basic: It lies in the human mind. "Intelligence," he says, "is capital. We've spent billions on education in this country to get the amount of intelligence we have today. The underdeveloped countries haven't, and they aren't going to be able to catch up overnight."

"We've got the tools," he goes on. "TV is a great tool for mass education. Computers and jet planes give seven-league boots to brilliant men. Satellite communications can spread ideas instantaneously."

"But, because of a lack of education, of intelligence, many of our tools are not being used properly. Atomic power cannot be used for digging irrigation projects because of politics. Population control cannot always be used effectively because of religious ethic. And remember that the sword we give someone to cut food can also be used to slay somebody else."

Ware believes that hunger itself breeds ignorance. "If half the people in the world are starving," he says, "then half the world's

minds are permanently maimed. They just don't have the voltage between the ears to get any work done. How can a mental dwarf who has no energy grow more food?"

TO THE SKY?

In his own field of fertilizer, Ware says, proper use takes intelligence and education. "Every soil is different, and needs different treatment," he says. "An American farmer knows just what he needs, and has the capital to pay for it. But a man who can't read might put fertilizer on a plant a foot thick and expect it to grow to the sky. Instead the plant would grow at all."

Ware is concerned too that Americans aren't sufficiently aroused and may wait too long to take really effective action. He points out that it took 15 years to open up his company's big new potash mine in Saskatchewan. "For the first 5 years, we had to sit and assay the market. The next 5 were taken up with design and planning. The third 5 were spent actually digging the hole. In addition to all that time, there was the \$60 million we spent. That experience has made me very respectful of the meaning of a doubled population in just 35 years."

SCORCHED EARTH

Finally, he speaks about the scarcity of arable soil in the world, and of the fact that world hunger will create turmoil that destroys soil. "The soil was destroyed by war in the Nile Valley and the Mediterranean

Basin, and now it's being scorched in Vietnam," he says. "When you double the population, you're going to double the number of Sukarnos, Cubas, Vietnams, library burnings, and the like. More accurately, you're probably going to get eight times as much trouble."

We hope Tom Ware is wrong in his pessimistic view. In fact, he hopes so, too. But unless the American people and American business make a mighty effort, and soon * * * well, Ware knows what he is talking about, if any man does.

CAREFUL ASSESSMENT OF DOMESTIC PROGRAM EXPENDITURES URGED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for some time I have been convinced that we must assess very carefully and wisely the expenditures for our domestic programs in light of the needs to win the war in Vietnam.

If we are to have a "win" policy in Vietnam, we must look at the domestic programs to determine where cuts should be made. These cuts rightly should be channeled into our military effort so that we may be able to win the war at the earliest opportunity.

I believe the editor of the Farm Journal in the March 1966 issue made a very valid point when he asked:

Isn't it about time we all got into this war, all made some sacrifice? Should we just leave all the sacrificing to 200,000 or more American boys in Vietnam?

The editor is convinced that we cannot continue full speed ahead on both the domestic and Vietnam areas without a necessary trimming back on the domestic front.

This editorial should be required reading for those who believe we can do both.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "It's Our War," be placed in the RECORD.

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

It's OUR WAR

Isn't it about time we all got into this war, all made some sacrifice? Should we just leave all the sacrificing to 200,000 or more Americans boys in Vietnam?

We may as well admit it: For the most of us except those boys and their families back home, life has been going on pretty cozily. We've followed the news of the war, but then have gone on about our affairs undisturbed. Most Americans have been doing pretty well financially. They've enjoyed all the usual pleasures and some extra ones, kept comfortable and snug.

Partly this was because we hoped that this war which we drifted into would soon end, and that the Vietnam nightmare would somehow go away. But we see now that likely we are in for a long and dirty fight and that the cost in men and money will probably go up, not down.

What can we noncombatants do?

Well, for one thing, we can realize we are in a war and act like it. We can ask our Government to do the same.

In his annual budget message the President called on us to "support the struggle in Vietnam" but then added that "the struggle for a Great Society must go unabated." Unabated, with a war going on? We doubt that he really meant it, for already some spending programs have been cut back. But they need to be trimmed a lot more and the effort turned to the military struggle

and the prevention of more inflation. Those are the two big jobs on our hands now. That's plenty; other things can surely wait.

We can make the draft more fair. It can never be fully fair, but so far it has been falling too heavily on the boys not shielded by the sanctuary of college.

If we need more taxes to curtail Government deficits let's have them, unpleasant though taxes are. But not unless or until we've cut out spending for things we can forgo or at least postpone. Let's try that first.

In today's world we need allies. World opinion is a powerful force. But how many American boys should we sacrifice for fear of offending "allies" who are sending food and materiel to a shooting enemy?

It seemed to us that the bombing lull, the dispatch of our emissaries to all parts of the world, the appeal to the United Nations, futile as that organization is, were all worth trying. We favor making every other possible attempt at peace. The President has tried hard.

What we are asking now is that he first consult fully with Congress, which he hasn't done, then have the courage to tell us what is necessary and when. In brief, let's all of us begin to share this war, so far as possible, with the boys doing the fighting. It will be mighty uneven sharing at best, but at least we can start acting like this is our war, not just theirs.

OUR NATION'S CAPITAL COLORING BOOK

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in dignified impressive ceremonies at Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22, 1966, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society was presented with its second Freedoms Foundation award. Honored with a 1964 citation for We, the People, the society was recognized again for its 1965 publication, Our Nation's Capital Coloring Book.

The principal Americana Award was presented to the U.S. Capitol Historical Society of Washington, D.C.

Honoring Our Nation's Capital Coloring Book, using the historic and scenic monuments of the Capital City, re-created our heritage in story and picture and included a recommended reading list, a full color page of State flags, a tour map of the city and note pages.

Representing the society at Valley Forge was the driving force founder, and first president of the society, Fred Schwengel of Davenport, former Congressman from the First District of Iowa.

In presenting the George Washington Honor Medal, Dr. Kenneth D. Wells, president of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, made the following remarks:

This next award goes to show what can be done with an idea in this great free society of ours. The staff of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, ever mindful of the importance of history to the impressionable young, decided that in order to meet the minds of our youth it must bend to the child's own media. The result was a combination history-coloring book that is now being used in classrooms all over America. It is one thing to produce a coloring book, but another to rank among the top echelon of Freedoms Foundation awards. Our jury felt that this was a great thing being done for millions of young Americans and we are proud to present this medal to the society. Our most sincere congratulations.

Mr. President, I am sure this is an honor with which all Members of Congress and millions of other people are in full agreement. All of us know of the outstanding job that the United States Capitol Historical Society has been doing to make our people more acquainted with the facts and traditions of the U.S. Capitol.

I believe that the untiring work of Mr. Schwengel should share in this recognition because I know how long and how hard he has labored so that the United States Capitol Historical Society will fulfill the dreams of its founders.

VIETNAM: CONTAINMENT OR ACCOMMODATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star, in its lengthy and well-put lead editorial yesterday, examined the crux of the current debate over America's Vietnam policy, cut through the entangling maze of questions and answers and reached a conclusion. That conclusion was that, "Given the importance that Vietnam has assumed as a test case for Mao's doctrines of revolutionary conquest, there is, at present no realistic alternative to military containment" of Red China.

The Star's editorial commands attention, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 6, 1966]

CRUCIAL ISSUE: CONTAINMENT OR ACCOMMODATION

The continuing debate on Vietnam has not produced a solution to our problem in that part of the world. But it has succeeded to an encouraging degree in getting the problem down to its essentials.

More and more, in recent days, the debate has begun to transcend the ambiguities of Vietnam itself and center on the problem of the containment of Communist China. More and more, both those who defend our policies in Vietnam and those who criticize them have cast their arguments in terms of a confrontation between American power and that of the vast nation which has taken over as the primary global antagonist of the United States.

Most serious critics of the administration now admit that the containment of China, in southeast Asia and elsewhere, is a vital interest of the United States. The question is simply whether or not the war in Vietnam serves this purpose. Are we containing or provoking China in Vietnam? Are we decreasing or increasing the risk of all-out conflict? Have we the means of attaining our objectives? Is there, in fact, a practical alternative to the military containment of Chinese expansionism in Vietnam and elsewhere?

The answers to all of these questions depend finally on an assessment of the capacities and ambitions of the regime in Peiping. If, as the critics fear, the capacities of Red China are virtually unlimited, military containment is indeed a dubious proposition. And if, as they hope, its ambitions are modest, an alternative might be found.

The alternative suggested, most explicitly by Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is what he calls an "accommodation" with China on a large scale. Peiping, he believes, can be induced