

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 3

FEBRUARY 9, 1970, TO FEBRUARY 19, 1970

(PAGES 2777 TO 4246)

ified in this regard on the basis of previous tests. We have not had the opportunity of seeing the results of those tests yet and therefore we have had no opportunity to decide whether to make a formal protest this time as we did before.

LINDA ROCKEY RECEIVES JOURNALISM AWARD

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, last April, the Chicago Sun-Times carried an excellent series of articles detailing the problem of hunger in Chicago. These articles were so revealing that they were compiled into a booklet for general distribution, "Hunger in Chicago," and subsequently utilized as source material for the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health.

The author of this series, Mrs. Linda Rockey, has recently been awarded the Jacob Scher Award for outstanding investigative reporting for her work. This award is sponsored by the Theta Sigma Phi professional journalism society for women.

I have read and studied "Hunger in Chicago." The description of the effect of hunger on schoolchildren and our elderly and of the bureaucratic obstacles involved in implementing food programs have contributed to my understanding of the problem of hunger. They have been valuable resources in my work on the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

I commend Mrs. Rockey for her fine reporting. She has made a great contribution to delineating the complexities of hunger and malnutrition in this Nation.

Through her efforts, an American public is better informed and public officials, including legislatures at the Federal, State and local level, must now be compelled to act.

A MUTUAL CEASE-FIRE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, so much has been said in this place about Vietnam that when something valuable is said, most of us are not listening. The ever vigilant Deseret News, however, in a thoughtful editorial, performed a "rescue operation" on a resolution by Senator MONDALE that most of us missed when it was first offered. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Deseret News, Saturday, Feb. 7, 1970]

FOR PEACE, HOW ABOUT A VIET CEASE-FIRE?

One test of a good idea is that it seems so simple and obvious it's surprising that something wasn't done about it long ago.

By that test, the resolution that Sen. Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the other day on bringing peace to Vietnam looks like an eminently fine idea.

But the best ideas don't necessarily command the most attention, and the Mondale resolution seems to be in need of a rescue operation if it is to win the support necessary for its success.

Briefly, the Mondale resolution goes like this:

"Whereas, the United States has not formally proposed for negotiation at the Paris Peace talks a mutual cease-fire as part of a comprehensive package to achieve a political and military settlement in Vietnam; and . . .

"Whereas, such a proposal could help break through the stalemate by offering a means of ending all the killing and moving the struggle for leadership from the military to the political level, thus enabling all the South Vietnamese people to choose freely and without interference their own future government; and

"Whereas, a cease-fire and political settlement is the best way to assure the earliest possible return of all U.S. forces, and release for constructive purposes the enormous resources now being expended on the war;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Senate urges the U.S. government to offer formally for negotiation at Paris a comprehensive proposal for an internationally supervised standstill cease-fire by all sides . . ."

Simple? Well, not entirely. Setting up the supervisory machinery seems bound to generate a lot of haggling, since whoever controls that machinery controls the future of Vietnam. Accepting the status quo would amount to North Vietnam's admitting defeat. Moreover, assuring self-determination is still no easy matter in a land that has known only martial law for years and autocracy before that.

But certainly the Mondale resolution seems more realistic than the remote hope that the war will just fade away without a negotiated settlement.

Certainly a cease-fire could bring all U.S. forces—not just combat troops—home much faster than "Vietnamization" of the conflict alone.

Indeed, Vietnamization alone may simply perpetuate the slaughter, with South Vietnamese deaths being substituted for American deaths.

Will North Vietnam accept a cease-fire? If not, surely the enemy's refusal can be used against him in the battle for free men's minds. But let's not take a rejection for granted. As Sen. Mondale observes:

"Only when we move our offers from the realm of publicity to the realm of true diplomacy can we say with any certainty what the other side's response will be."

Mr. MOSS. As the Deseret News observes, it is long past time to get the Paris peace talks moving.

The United States should make a genuine proposal for a mutual cease-fire. Such a proposal should contain detailed provisions for international peacekeeping machinery to oversee the cease-fire, the withdrawal of outside military forces, and prompt free elections.

Most Americans will be surprised to learn that the United States has never made such a commonsense proposal for a mutual cease-fire. The North Vietnamese may reject it, but at least we should make the sincere offer.

Surely a negotiated settlement is much preferable to the endless agony of Vietnamization. As the Deseret News says:

Vietnamization alone may simply perpetuate the slaughter with South Vietnamese deaths being substituted for American deaths.

Vietnamization is really no more than a military solution by proxy.

To encourage our Paris delegation to propose a mutual cease-fire, I am join-

ing Senator MONDALE in cosponsoring Senate Resolution 351.

THE DANGER OF ISOLATION

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, is there a danger that history might repeat itself and that this world might yet be plunged one day into another massive war—maybe even a conventional war which eschews the horrors of nuclear power but utilizes great land armies and navys? Could the new wave of isolationism so rampant in America today lead to a withdrawal of the United States from Europe and Asia, leaving those crucial continents naked to aggression, and with the balance of powers upset so that a potential aggressor might be tempted to march?

These questions, Mr. President, cannot, of course, be answered with any certainty. But they are questions posed honestly by some who are upset with the international picture in both Europe and Asia today. Yesterday, columnist David Lawrence explored these questions in a column entitled, "Isolationism May Be Danger Again," which appeared in the Evening Star of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

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

ISOLATIONISM MAY BE DANGER AGAIN

(By David Lawrence)

What should the policy of the United States be toward defending the peoples of Asia and Europe against aggression?

President Nixon would naturally not wish to discuss such delicate subjects in detail and deal in advance with the numerous contingencies that might arise. For U.S. policy will be made not by presidential speeches or by pronouncements by a committee of Congress. Everything will depend upon the nature of the emergency and the extent to which the defense of this country is actually involved.

Most people—even many in government here—don't like to look at the realistic picture in either Europe or Asia today. The truth is there now is no standing army which can match that of the Soviet Union. Reliance on the nuclear bomb has become a fact of international life.

For this reason the European countries have practically given up the idea of spending large sums for defense. They have been assuming that the United States would take care of the principal obligations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the future and that it would immediately come to the aid of the smaller countries of Asia.

The American people, on the other hand, as a result of their experience in Vietnam, are not enthusiastic about sending an army of 500,000 or more troops into a foreign land to defend a country which is the victim of aggression. Inevitably the question then is asked: "What about collective defense under the U.N. Charter?"

There is at present no sign that the European or Asian peoples are willing to get together themselves to set up defense forces that would lighten the load for the United States.

So utterances by U.S. officials indicating a lack of interest in further missions like the one in Vietnam are bound to have an impact on the world situation. European gov-