

U. S. Congress  
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 23

SEPTEMBER 1, 1970, TO SEPTEMBER 15, 1970

(PAGES 30549 TO 31966)

nam or elsewhere in Southeast Asia. The frustration of our Government is matched, and surely exceeded, by the sorrow, the uncertainty, the cold fear felt by the relatives and loved ones of members of our Armed Forces who are missing from the ranks of their comrades in Vietnam, but whose fate cannot be definitely determined due to the stubborn intransigence of those against whom we are fighting in Southeast Asia.

Despite the best efforts of our Government, of some foreign governments, of international organizations, of certain U.S. citizens and officials acting in unofficial capacities, Hanoi refuses to abide by the rules of civilized nations governing the treatment of prisoners of war. This is despicable.

The most expeditious way to bring about the identification and release of our men held captive in Southeast Asia is to negotiate a general settlement of the war. This is the surest way, perhaps the only way, to bring about their early release.

As I have pointed out, ever since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, it has been customary to release all prisoners upon the negotiation of a general settlement following an armed conflict. Partial exchanges, releases, and paroles have sometimes occurred, but these have been rare. There have been limited releases of badly crippled and diseased prisoners in wars as recent as World War II, but this is a definite exception to the general rule. During the American Civil War, there were exchanges, particularly of officers, and in December 1864, prisoners of war officers were paroled by both sides to arrange for food and supplies to be sent to prisoners still held. Generally, these limited releases have been based on bartering between the opposing sides.

It has been proposed by some that we try to barter for our men held by the North Vietnamese. We do this sort of thing in connection with hijackings and exchanges of high-level spies. Perhaps it would work with prisoners of war, or so it is thought by some. In my opinion, although I would be willing to have our Government try this, it would be fruitless. I base this on the lack of interest displayed by the North Vietnamese in getting their own people released from South Vietnamese prisons and stockades.

Furthermore, both North Vietnam and the Vietcong have stated that release of prisoners and information about them must be a part of a general settlement of the war.

I have joined with other Senators in sponsoring various resolutions deploring the conditions under which our men are held by enemy groups in Southeast Asia. I have urged, through various channels, that an accounting be made by North Vietnam, through the International Red Cross or otherwise, of all Americans held by them or their associates and underlings. Thus far I have seen few tangible results. Some names have been released. Some films have been shown. These teasers only tantalize sorrowing and uncertain relatives and friends.

And we, of course, do not entirely trust the accuracy of what the other side out there has to say. Based on the brain-

washing and brutalization practiced in Korea, we can be on guard against the same kind of thing in Vietnam. Of course, this kind of treatment and possibly enforced defection must be placed in the "nothing-new-under-the-sun" category. During our own Civil War, the Yankees captured some 476,149 prisoners and "allowed" 5,452 of these captives to join the Union Army. Senators from the North may point out in rebuttal that 3,170 Yankees captured by Confederate forces—out of a total of 188,145—joined the Confederate Army.

Without a negotiated settlement of some sort, our prisoner-of-war problem is discouraging.

For about 6 years, I have publicly urged, as I had privately urged for many years prior to that time, that the President of the United States, beginning with Mr. Eisenhower, negotiate a settlement of the political problems in Southeast Asia. Now that President Nixon has "ruled out" winning the war militarily, I see no reasonable alternative to a compromise. Such a settlement should and must include an early release of all prisoners of war.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the turbulence on our Nation's campuses is one of the most disturbing and perplexing developments we face.

We are in very real danger of losing that essential bond between the university and society at large. And with it, we stand to lose much of the potential for our future as a free and progressive nation.

We begin to repair that bond with a new understanding—a new understanding by students of the society in which they live, as well as a better understanding of students by their elders.

The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has made a major contribution to this mutual understanding in an address delivered last night at Boston University. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY's wise reflections be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

I am honored to be with you this evening and to have the privilege of inaugurating this year's lecture series at Boston University.

We all know that every campus in every city, town and village across the country is apprehensive as the new academic year begins.

The events of last May, at home and abroad, are behind us, but not forgotten. The war continues.

The intensity of the public debate has lulled after the strenuous summer lobbying and the optimistic vote on the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. Many persons feel that we may be passing through the eye of the hurricane, with yet another round of unrest and disturbances to besiege us on the road ahead. The embattled university in Wisconsin has felt the murderous, senseless shock of a bomb heard round the country.

Public tolerance has been severely strained, and public indignation is clearly being played by some political figures.

Everyone awaits the recommendations of the President's Commission on Campus Un-

rest. Everyone hopes that we are pulling back from the brink on which we have stood.

In the midst of this strife and of our deep concern over the future of our Nation, it is important to pause and note that in recent times, we have seen the system respond.

Changes, both great and small, can be directly attributed to the involvement of young people. They began in the McCarthy and Robert Kennedy campaigns of 1968. There the movement against the war was crystallized into hard political activity. Whether or not we are pleased with the rate of American withdrawal from Southeast Asia, it cannot be denied that American policy is now different.

Men and women have been elected to public office in the past two years, or will be this November, who would not have had a chance a few years ago. And men have been deprived of office by the strength of the new political vitality of the young and the concerned.

Surely, the rejection of Judge Haynesworth and Judge Carswell cannot be overlooked in measuring the responsiveness of our system.

I well recall the influx of thousands of young Americans into Washington following the invasion of Cambodia and the tragedies at Kent and Jackson.

I met with many of you in this audience on the steps of the Capitol, and together we discussed the war and the other great issues of our day. The progress we sought last spring can be measured in results this summer.

In areas like the debate on the Church-Cooper amendment and the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, the Senate clearly began to respond to the voice of the people. A President who resists a timetable to end the war was forced to set a timetable for withdrawal from Cambodia. Congressional investigators and a presidential commission have visited Kent and Jackson, and grand juries are still meeting.

So there is responsiveness to constructive pressure.

And, in another extremely important area, the American political system itself has reached out to embrace the young.

Last June, culminating more than a quarter century of debate in the Halls of Congress and throughout the Nation, Congress passed a historic statute lowering the voting age to 18 in all elections, Federal, State and local—thereby bringing your generation of Americans into the mainstream of the political process of the United States.

By lowering the voting age to 18, the Nation has passed another important milestone in our long march toward extending the franchise to all our people.

Not for fifty years—not since 1920, when the Constitution was amended to give the right to vote to women—have we taken a comparable step to broaden the base of our democracy and increase the responsiveness of our Government.

Last Thursday, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, I had the opportunity to participate in the oral argument of the first judicial case testing the constitutionality of this statute.

Although there were some legal arguments raised against the bill in the course of the congressional debate, I believed then, and I continue to believe, that Congress had ample constitutional authority to lower the voting age by statute.

As a result, when the statute first goes into effect, millions of young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21 will be eligible to go to the polls for the first time, and thereby begin a lifetime of participation in the political process of America.

On January 1, the Supreme Court willing, they will have that right.

Whether they use it, and how they use it, is up to them. The answer will be part of the promise of this decade.

Yet, even beyond the potential of the

youth franchise, the opening year of the 70's has brought America's student population to another important fork in the road.

As we saw last May, and as we will see this fall, there are two clear choices for every student, every organization, and every campus.

They can choose destructive violence and physical coercion, rioting, burning, occupying, bombing, and trashing, at their schools and in the community.

Or they can choose concerted and constructive political action to restructure university governance, to change laws and policies at every level of government, to elect progressive officials in city halls and State houses, in Congress and in the White House.

In the past few years, and especially since May, some students have pursued each of these paths.

But so we are still at the fork in the road, because so many students have yet to choose their course.

And for most of those who have started on the road of violence, it is still not too late to reassess, restart, and turn the other way.

Let me state forcefully, briefly, and simply where I stand, for the hour is much too late for hedging, and the stakes much too high for equivocation.

There is no room, no role, no reason for violence at America's colleges and universities. Those who seek change by the threat or use of force must be identified and isolated, and subjected to the sanctions of the criminal law.

They are hijackers of the university, holding hostage its peace and tranquility, its students and faculty, its research and scholarship, to be ransomed for their particular demands.

And like hijackers, they must be deterred and repudiated, even—or especially—by those who may share their goals. Any person who lends them aid and comfort, any person who grants them sympathy and support, must share the burden of guilt.

For, like the Arab Commandos, the campus commandos can only operate if the environment allows them to.

I fully recognize that the apostles of force and destruction on campus are very few in number, and that the vast majority of students and faculty totally reject violence as a conscious tool of progress.

Yet there is a collective responsibility. It is partly real—to the extent that the few are followed, encouraged, and tolerated by their peers and teachers—and it is partly imagined by those in the public who lump all students together.

Surely the time has come to face these facts, and to face the other realities which student activism in all its forms has visited upon us all.

By their methods, their appearance, and their rhetoric, students have managed to obscure their noble goals in the public's consciousness, and to replace them with the issue of student unrest itself. Instead of being the medium for vital messages about society's ills, for ending war, racism, poverty and repression, the students on the campus are seen in the public eye as one of the principal ills in today's society.

Instead of producing leadership for new solutions to the Nation's problems, campus activists are producing fear and outrage and reaction.

They are pushing the public in the opposite political, philosophical, and social direction. For every American who blamed the National Guard for the killings at Kent State, there were two who thought the students were at fault. There are probably another two for whom the tragedy at Madison was the last straw.

Perhaps the force of public opinion is not, and should not be, enough alone to affect the young. But force of public opinion cannot be

ignored, for its results are real and important. Because public opinion is focused on this new and complex problem of "campus unrest", students are convenient and welcome scapegoats.

Turmoil on the campus lends itself to the wildest and basest forms of political rhetoric. The kind of demagoguery we hear from our Vice President and others provides a thick smokescreen behind which some elements in our society can hide what they themselves are really doing to this Nation.

For those who pander to public emotion and perplexity at events on campus are also those who allow the war to continue, and who disorder our national priorities so that we invest in S.S.T.'s and A.B.M.'s instead of teachers for our children and health care for our sick.

And so, in large part because mainstream America is preoccupied with concern about the campus, we all suffer.

While the politicians of panic get their way, leaders with conscience and foresight find the institutions of power—and the public—less receptive and responsive to their programs, priorities, and values, perhaps partly because these are also shared by student America. Thus the deep problems of society go unsolved and short-sighted policies endure.

Moreover, as those who look backward are emboldened by the polarization between the community and the campus, and as those who look forward are resisted, the ones who really suffer most are the ones most in need; the working people who need more and better health care and public education; the unemployed who need training and jobs; the growing families who need housing; the elderly for whom inflation is a constant pick-pocket; the union men and women whose sons are dying in Vietnam in larger numbers than any other group in society; and the poor—white, black, and Indian—who need help to lift themselves from deprivation and discrimination. They are the ones who are the real losers when "town" takes on "gown" on a national scale.

For students themselves, there are also some distressing signs of change. Two years ago you could go anywhere to canvass for candidates at election time. Now some candidates feel that student canvassers may be a liability, and the scope of their activities is being curtailed.

Students have become suspect. America is beginning to fear and blame them as a group, without making distinctions between those who seek violent change and those who seek peaceful change.

In many minds, a student is a radical, a radical is a revolutionary, and a revolutionary is a bomb thrower.

Students of all stripes thus suffer the pains of prejudice.

Their lives on campus have been changed. There is an aura of tension and control, instead of calm and freedom.

They have lost some of their natural allies in the university. Many professors feel that student activists are diluting the tradition of academic freedom and interrupting the scholarly and educational functions of the university, causing damage from within that rivals the potential damage from without.

Some students have also alienated most of those who could, and should, be the beneficiaries of their reform efforts—the salaried and hourly employees, the blue collar workers, the hard hats, the commission salesmen, the policemen and all the other middle Americans whose taxes are unbearably high, whose children go to overcrowded and underfunded public schools, whose sons went to war because they could not get deferments, who cannot afford B.U.'s \$1700 tuition—let alone next year's \$2,000—who can be wiped out by the costs of a major illness, whose automobile insurance and automobile repair costs are getting out of reach, who rely for

their leisure on inadequate public park and recreation systems, who inhabit cities where pollution, traffic, utility service, and crime are daily challenges.

These are people who have very real and very immediate complaints about the system and its institutions, as you do, and if you succeed in making the system more responsive, it will respond to their needs as well as yours.

They are also the ones whom you must persuade if new national values and priorities and ideals are to be adopted. But the gap between them and the student is too wide now for these processes to go on.

The worker who could not go to college thinks students should be grateful that they can. He cannot understand why the privilege of college is being abused, why the opportunity is not being fully pursued, why the educational process, which can be the key to success, is being interfered with, and thus he has little respect for anything the activist student might have to say on any subject.

He is not prepared to accept the life-style of the students he sees on the streets of Beacon Hill, Back Bay, or Cambridge.

There is no basis for him to understand or empathize with the needs and drives which bring some young Americans to beards and long hair, beads and pot, and fringed vests and free love.

And so he turns off when the student speaks.

And the student not only loses a vital audience, and potential ally, but also gains an antagonist.

I need not remind you, as well, of the constant backlash from state and national legislators seeking to tie strings to funds and to legislate their own version of discipline on the campus. Or the backlash from alumni and boards of trustees, whose pressures all too often encourage the forces of repression.

That is a dismal picture, and I regret I have to paint it. But you are the ones who can brighten it.

If violence and interference with the rights of others are to be eliminated from the campus, then you yourselves, the vast majority of students, will have to take the lead. You must make clear that violence and coercive tactics are unacceptable.

It is not enough merely to *avoid* violence and interference with rights of others. The time has come to *do* something about it, to play an active role in calming the campus, and to do it with care, with thought, and with courage.

And you must analyze within your own groups whether you have become too narrow-minded in your commitment. Are you merely talking to and persuading those who already agree with you? Have you invested enough thought and time in broadening your appeal and seeking to convince your natural allies and your potential constituencies outside the campus? Or have you acted as though you don't believe outsiders can understand, as if only the college-educated, or the young, can truly identify with your underlying goals, and your immediate purposes?

Already the feeling is too widespread that students are out for a self-indulgent ego-trip, for adventure, for excitement, for a closed game of "how much self-satisfaction can I get?"

You must disprove that notion. You must communicate with others, persuade them, broaden your base of support and their base of hope. You must listen to the hard hat, the fireman, and the bus driver.

You must understand their problems, and not just vent your problems on them.

And you must measure your own priorities. If you are to persuade others, you must be able to reach out to them beyond your own life. Too often, the trappings and habits of youth preclude the opportunity for any contact whatever. It may be unjust and irra-

tional and maddening that the length of someone's hair should influence the effect of his discourse, but it is fact of today's life.

If you are going to move out beyond the campus, you have the choice:

You can maintain your lifestyle and appearance, and bear the double burden of persuading your listeners of the validity of both the medium and the message, with the risk that if you fail on the first, you get no chance on the second.

Or you can move right to the message, by sacrificing, at least temporarily, some of the trappings that antagonize others.

It is simply a matter of priorities. How important is it to you that your message get through? How much time and energy do you want to spend convincing people that students with beards are really normal citizens, before you can start convincing them that the war and other abuses in society are immoral?

And finally, I think it is vital to realize that successful political action involves changing institutions not only from the outside but from the inside as well.

There are many public service functions where direct participation by America's youth could not only revitalize the institutions, but also help produce the generational dialogue and understanding which the Nation needs so badly.

In our hospitals and health centers, in our city and county governments, in our police departments and criminal justice agencies, in poverty programs and educational systems, the problems of our society can be exposed to daylight. They can be confronted and attacked.

These areas are the front lines, where actions have direct and measurable results, where hard work can bring personal gratification and social contribution at the same time.

For surely there is a clear element of snobbery in constant criticism of institutions and agencies without any willingness to enter them and see if a better job can be done.

Dissent, like so many things in the America of 1970, has become too comfortable.

It takes 5 minutes to draw the letters on a protest sign, but it takes a lifetime of dedicated service to make a contribution to society.

In the decade of the sixties, students in North and South joined together to awaken the Nation's conscience.

A generation of freedom rides, sit-ins, and voter registration helped to launch the drive to banish racism from our social structure.

Those who came before you in recent years were the first to call attention to the critical moral issue of our day, our participation in the Vietnam war.

As troop levels and bombing raids began to escalate, it was the academic community which first raised the voice of protest, which first questioned the validity of our means and ends in Vietnam, and which began to transform the nature of all our international commitments.

In hundreds of respects, our students of the past have made vital and lasting contributions to the quality of our life.

What difference will you make? What challenge will you meet? What burden will you carry? What service will you give? Will it be enough to shout your protest, or will you also help the rest of us to bring your dreams to life?

A man of Massachusetts, one of the greatest prophets in the history of our Nation, put this thought very simply, in words as timely now as they were on Memorial Day in 1884:

It was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who said:

"As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time, at peril of being judged not to have lived."

Indeed, we are in a time of change, of

new problems, and new answers. You must help your university to remain a place of scholarship and learning, a place of growth and wisdom, a springboard for new ideas and new ways.

It is you and millions like you around the country who will determine how your university and your Nation will continue to exist. The responsibility is yours. I hope you will bear it well.

### OUR SLUGGISH ARMY NEEDS DRASTIC REFORM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the editorial section of the Washington Post, on September 13, was published a most informative and penetrating article written by former lieutenant colonel of the U.S. Army Edward L. King. This article is important, and is a factually correct assessment of what is wrong with our Army, and in particular as to what is wrong with the topmost generals and other officers from the Joint Chiefs of Staff down.

Lieutenant Colonel King, the author, who had requested retirement last year because of his opposition to our involvement in Southeast Asia and doubtless for other very valid reasons set forth in his statement, served overseas in the Korean war. Recently, before his voluntary retirement, he was with the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I hope that millions of Americans, including Members of Congress, our GI's and officers and men now serving in our Armed Forces, particularly the draftees, read this article, entitled "Sluggish Army Needs Drastic Reform."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### SLUGGISH ARMY NEEDS DRASTIC REFORM (By Edward L. King)

The United States Army needs reform. One aspect of this need has been examined by the President's commission to establish an all-volunteer armed force, and public debate about reform has focused almost exclusively on the volunteer army.

But little critical thinking has been devoted to two other areas crying—so far, in the wilderness—for public attention: the officer corps and the armed services' organization. If both of these are ignored, the U.S. Army will continue to be badly led and badly organized, regardless of whether the enlisted men are volunteers or draftees.

For roughly the last 15 years, the quality of military leadership has been declining. The deterioration has been all too vividly revealed by the Vietnam war. The Army developed the concepts of "limited brushfire wars" and counterinsurgency to ensure a military component for the international political realities of the late 1950s and early 1960s. These doctrines found natural application in Vietnam. That conflict began as a counterinsurgency situation that quickly grew into a "brushfire" war with the Green Berets as the limited warriors.

But they couldn't win, and the Army was forced into a crash program in 1964 to form an air mobile division—the First Air Cavalry Division—which was essentially a forerunner for largescale conventional war. The Air Cavalry was unable to stop the "brushfire," so the buildup of standard infantry divisions began and Vietnam became a small-scale replica of World War II—hardly what the

limited war proponents had sold to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

A further deception in Army thinking is the oft repeated assertion by high-ranking officers that political, not military, constraints have inhibited the Army's success in Vietnam. Yet the limited war concept itself is sharply restricted to achieving specific tactical objectives within a narrowly defined geographic area. It would not include offensive operations such as attacking across the DMZ, bombing Haiphong or invading Cambodia.

Vietnam has revealed the limited war concept for what it really is—a mercenary expedient to assure military participation in international affairs, and the money to go with it, without any meaningful adjustment in large war force structures or any relationship to contemporary political priorities.

In short, the Army first urged and now perpetuates the war for its own parochial internal purposes, with little sense of national responsibility. And from a purely military viewpoint, the command of our forces in Southeast Asia has been egregiously mismanaged because it has been guided by the wish to maximize career opportunities for senior officers rather than maximize the effectiveness of our forces.

#### TOLERABLE CASUALTIES

For example, a single combat command assignment is today an unwritten prerequisite for promotion from colonel to brigadier general, and additional such assignments are virtual guarantees of further rapid promotion. To accommodate the eagerness for promotion, combat command assignments are rotated every six months. This results in more promotions for career officers. It also means that combat in Vietnam is generally led by green officers inexperienced in local battlefield command, in the past tactics and characteristics of the enemy's troops, in the experience and ability of their own troops and in the climate and terrain over which they must fight.

Under such circumstances, it is virtually inevitable that more promotions for eager commanders would be accompanied by more dead enlisted soldiers than would have been the case had the Army been given stable, experienced combat leadership at all levels as a matter of policy. But the casualties of such a policy would have been career improvements for hundreds of officers. In the eyes of today's general officers, such casualties are less tolerable than the lives of soldiers who died in superfluous agony.

The situation has grown unchecked because of complete internal conformity; deviating from the Army party line is discouraged and punished. Internal criticism and disagreement are nonexistent. And needless to say, the reprisals against criticism in public are swift and vigorous. Consequently, the uniform face put on for the public and Congress by the Army's officer corps is not that of healthy consensus but of strict and sterile convention.

The futility of the war and the personal self-interest of most commanding officers have not been lost on lower ranking junior officers and GIs. Many continue to serve and toe an undeviating line out of fear of court-martial and jail or because of a strong desire not to let their buddies down. Officers remain silent and seek promotions in the only way available because they, like other men, have home mortgages to pay, children to send to college and higher paid retirement to anticipate.

Yet the doubts are growing daily, particularly among younger officers. Among these young men, service to the nation and their subordinates, and dedication to justice, individual dignity and self-respect, would be more appealing attributes of military life than service to their own careers first and to the existing system a close second.

It is difficult to imagine that bitterness