

the maintenance of a dynamic corps of men required for our modern military establishment.

America must also continue to encourage the establishment of effective peacekeeping mechanisms. The Near East crisis has shown dramatically how the United Nations has failed to provide workable means of preventing armed conflict. This weakness derives from the continued unwillingness of the Soviet Union to accept its role as a responsible world power. The United Nations Security Council was created to provide a meeting place for the relatively few nations which control the predominance of economic and military resources. It cannot be supplanted by the General Assembly, a conclave of nations in which the vote of the United States can be cancelled out by Mauritania. The General Assembly has its value, but it does not represent the power realities of our world. It provides no avenue for agreement among the Great Powers. In these increasingly threatening times, it is this agreement which is vitally needed.

In the search for means to keep the peace there is an expanding role for the genius of our modern industry. Certainly in this just cause the world can ill-afford to forego the inventive talent of American enterprise. The space and aeronautics industry has already demonstrated its ability to contribute in this cause. The same equipment used in our civilian lunar orbiter program could be employed in keeping watch over large-scale military movements in regions of potential conflict. It might be possible, for example, to place a satellite over the Near Eastern area to observe movements of potentially hostile forces. The information gained by this means and placed at the disposal of an effective peacekeeping organization could provide a timely warning that could give nations interested in keeping the peace an opportunity to take effective action. This would be a far cry from idle hand-wringing that followed this outbreak of conflict in the Sinai Desert last month.

Above all, the United States must continue as it has in the past to honor its commitments to collective security and to speak with moral force in the councils of nations. In 1956, President Eisenhower, by a bold stroke of diplomacy, was able to bring peace to the Near East after a bitter struggle over the Suez Canal. That move was possible because all nations concerned had full respect for the word of our government, and because they knew we would keep that word.

They knew that America is devoted to peace with justice and for human liberty. They knew that America opposes aggression and devotedly believes in the self-determination of nations. And they should know today that the hour is growing late.

Twenty-two years ago, as the Second World War came to a close, General Douglas MacArthur spoke to the American people:

"Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Various methods through the ages have been attempted to devise an international process to prevent or settle disputes between nations. From the very start workable methods were found insofar as individual citizens were concerned, but the mechanics of an instrumentality of larger international scope have never been successful. Military alliances, balance of power, Leagues of Nations all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we do not devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past two thousand years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not over 5 minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WOUNDS OF DISTRUST

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the monstrous act occurred at Dealey Plaza, in Dallas that fateful November 22, 1963, our country suddenly experienced the pain, and the disbelief of a crushing national tragedy. The life of a Nation's youthful President had been taken by an assassin's bullet. Every American was moved deeply by the shock of that loss, and by the sorrow of the days that followed. But history will record not only the wounds that caused the death of a President, but also the deep hurt of suspicion and distrust which flourished in the aftermath of the assassination and which persist to this day.

It was hoped that all the accumulating ugly fantasies would be cleared away by the appointment of a Commission to sift carefully the evidence and to ascertain the facts of the assassination—a Commission of seven distinguished and unimpeachable Americans whose collective judgment would be honored by men. On November 29, 1963, pursuant to Executive Order No. 11130, such a Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Chief Justice Earl Warren.

After 10 months of intensive hearings and investigations, the Commission, with the assistance of a highly competent staff of able lawyers, on September 24, 1964, presented its findings. They were spread across an 888-page report, supported by 26 additional volumes of exhibits and hearings. The now familiar conclusion of the report, based on the overwhelming weight of the evidence, was: Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, had assassinated the President.

Mr. President, the people of America and the world have every reason to place their trust in the competence, the care, and the labor of the members of that Commission. The Presidentially appointed members were men of unimpeachable stature, each with a high national repute. Each witness had been questioned closely. Every fact was analyzed carefully. Alternative potential theories of how the crime took place were explored. And yet, in the two and a half years since the report, a steady and growing number of books, magazine articles, theatrical productions, and a motion picture continue to challenge the Commission and its findings.

This highly commercialized stream of lurid, speculative, dark and bizarre conspiracies may, alas, have an impact on the public. Critics of the report have fanned the flames of rumor and disbelief at home and abroad. They have given sustenance to the doubts, which some abroad hoped to engender, on the integrity and probity of U.S. institutions and political figures. Today, according to a recent Harris poll, seven out of 10 Americans distrust the conclusions of the

Warren Report. It is a matter of national concern when the people lose faith in the work of those who must serve the people and bear the public trust.

But what have the critics presented to warrant this distrust in the report?

They have exploited its every sentence—distorting, questioning, and editing. They have made grave charges, created uncertainty and certainly made money. They have produced appraisals which range from sensation-seeking fantasies, through several grades of hyperbolic emotionalism, to detailed analyses of the report. No important new evidence has been adduced. The report has been for too long the target of critics who sought, out of whole cloth, to undermine it.

Recently, however, articles, books, and television programs have begun to appear which objectively analyze the views of the critics' and, which in the end, support the conclusions of the Warren report. Two outstanding examples of such reporting occurred within the last few weeks.

In a recent article appearing in the Outlook section of the Washington Post, Bernard Gavzer and Sid Moody of the Associated Press state:

The critics have produced little in the way of new evidence. They have used the commission's 26 volumes of testimony and exhibits—but to different conclusions. The critics' case rests on the same base as the commission's—the Warren Report. . . . The critics have sat in judgment of the Warren Commission and found it wanting. But they are not judges. They have been prosecutors, making a case. Where fact has served, they have used it. Where it has not, they have not.

This particular article surveys some of the basic questions upon which critics have based their case—the single bullet theory, the circumstances of the autopsy, the possibility of an assassin on the grassy knoll, and the various theories of conspiracy. In each case, the theories of critics are analyzed along with the conclusions of the Warren report. The result is a renewed confidence in the work of the Commission. The writers conclude:

One may interpret what the commission found, and the critics have abundantly. But while, as of this date, there may be doubters, books and speculation, the critics have yet to produce that one essential of proof: evidence.

In a recent four-part television program entitled "The Warren Report," CBS News performed, I think, an excellent public service by conducting a careful and independent inquiry into some of the critical questions about the assassination. The program concluded with these words:

We have found that most objections to the Report—and certainly all objections that go to the heart of the Report—vanish when they are exposed to the light of honest inquiry. It is a strange kind of tribute to the Warren Report that every objection that can be raised against it is to be found in the Report itself. . . . Measured against the alternatives, the Warren Commission Report is the easiest to believe and that is all the Report claims. But, we have found also that there has been a loss of morale, a loss of confidence among the American people toward their own government and the men who serve it. And that

is perhaps more wounding than the assassination itself.

Mr. President, there is little question but that these most grievous wounds of distrust persist today and may linger on. Commercialization of the event was a regrettable but perhaps foreseeable consequence. But sheer unfounded sensation is simply pandering to those who have everything to gain by undermining confidence in the integrity of one of the most important American commissions to be convened in this century.

The President of the United States, in his Executive order creating the Commission, directed it:

To examine the evidence developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and any additional evidence that may hereafter come to light or be uncovered by federal or state authorities; to make such further investigation as the Commission finds desirable; to evaluate all the facts and circumstances surrounding such assassination . . . and to report to me its findings and conclusions.

I believe that the conclusions of the Commission, as reported to the President, are unassailable. It has satisfied itself that the truth is known as far as it can be discovered. Despite the criticisms that have been produced, none have been able to shake the indisputable evidence which supported the conclusions of the Commission. Until this could be done, and I doubt that day will ever arise, the Warren Commission report will stand the test of time and trust.

SANTA BARBARA MADRIGAL SINGERS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Madrigal Singers of Santa Barbara came to Washington last month. They were a superb hit. I ask unanimous consent that the text of an article which acclaims the performance of the Madrigal group, appearing in the Washington Post on Tuesday, June 27, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

TEENAGERS AT MUSEUM—MADRIGAL GROUP SINGS EXQUISITELY

(By Alan M. Kriegsman)

When I set out for the concert last night at the Museum Auditorium, I was not aware that the Santa Barbara Madrigal Singers was a high school ensemble. Moreover, the standard of their singing is so high one would scarcely guess, the fact, except possibly through the youthful timbre of their voices.

This excellently trained group of 16 teenagers has the right size, the right sound, and the right sort of leadership. The group's compact size enables it to achieve the cohesion and transparency that makes part-singing a delight to hear.

The sound is well-contained and beautifully modulated, but full of power when necessary. As for the leadership, William Hatcher not only commands unswerving attention and sharp response from his charges, but instilled in them remarkable qualities of musicianship as well.

The group is in Washington on the first leg of an international tour. This was reflected, too vividly perhaps, in the program, a soup-to-nuts affair that displayed the versatility of the ensemble, occasionally at the expense of artistic level.

There was much fine music, including a Latin motet, English and Italian madrigals,

chansons, and part-songs from America and other nations. Mixed in with these, however, was a passel of novelties, slapstick gimmicks, glee club potboilers, spirituals, folk songs, and even an operatic aria.

Not that there is anything wrong with any of this repertoire, nor is there any reason why high school madrigalists should not be enjoying themselves with the entire musical spectrum.

It just seems something of a waste of abilities when a group that can sing a work like the Hassler Missa Secunda so exquisitely fails to put its talents to use in a concert program of undiluted strength.

The Hassler Mass was one of the evening's highlights. The performance took full cognizance of the work's mingling of sacred and secular styles, by emphasizing, for example, the skipping dance rhythms of the "Et in terra," and the romantic expressivity of the "Agnus" melodies. Equally rewarding were the performances of first-rate pieces by Lassus, Morley and Halsey Stevens.

The group is now off on a jaunt which will take it as far as Greece. We wish the members bon voyage and every success.

LET US WITHDRAW MORE SOLDIERS AND DEPENDENTS FROM WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, to the brass at the Pentagon from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on down and to bureaucrats of our State Department it is a despicable sacrilege to talk of withdrawing any sizable number of our highly trained, extremely competent, combat-ready divisions in West Germany and of sending two of these divisions, most of whose officers are career soldiers, to Vietnam for combat in the jungles of the central highlands and in the swamps and rice paddies in the Mekong Delta.

To those general officers and their dependents and field grade officers and their dependents who have been and are living high on the hog, with their servants, in the various and divers American enclaves in West Germany it has always seemed unthinkable that their gracious manner of living be abruptly taken from them. There have been howls of anguish whenever a Senator suggests even mildly that our draftees could well be sent over to West Germany and other places in Western Europe and instead of condemning these youngsters to combat in an ugly civil war in Southeast Asia we should withdraw from the peaceful paradise of West Germany two of our divisions and send them where, apparently according to General Westmoreland, at least 100,000 more highly trained American soldiers are needed?

We read in the newspapers in recent weeks that the West German Government has adopted an austerity program to save money for its taxpayers. The government of Chancellor Kiesinger now proposes to reduce the armed forces of the West German Republic by 61,000. Let us hope the executive branch of our Government, which has sent more than 500,000 young men to Vietnam and Thailand to engage in an American ground war in Vietnam which is of no strategic importance whatsoever to the defense of our country, will take similar sensible action and reduce our forces in Western Europe by 61,000 or more.

Following the end of World War II when Stalin was dictator of the Soviet

Union, and during the final years of the administration of our great President, Harry S. Truman, the situation in Western Europe was grim and threatening. A bitter cold war was being waged against us by a bloodthirsty unscrupulous dictator, Stalin, whose memory is not even respected at this time in his own native land. In those days of the blockade of Berlin and the airlift, there was reason for apprehension that a border incident in Central or Eastern Europe might erupt into a third world war. Since that time and to the present time the Soviet Union has ceased to be a have-not nation. It is a have nation. It is veering toward capitalism. It is seeking trade with the nations of the free world. Its people envy our automobiles, our homes and the consumer goods piled in our stores. Their leaders appear to be seeking above everything else to raise the standard of living of the Russian people.

Even bureaucrats in the State and Defense Departments must admit to themselves that the Russians have not been gully of an act of aggression or of seeking to expand their borders in the European sector by even one yard at any time within the last half dozen years.

It is well known that our nuclear and missile superiority over the Soviet Union is probably of a ratio of 3 to 1. Our atomic missile manned Polaris submarines roam the seven seas. With our missile power, our overwhelming air superiority over the Soviet Union and our naval superiority above the waves and below the surface of the seas we have tremendous superiority over the armaments of the Soviet Union. On their part, they know that even were they to strike first and destroy many of our cities and airbases and kill millions of Americans, our power of instant retaliation is so great that within a matter of 2 or 3 hours at the most we would destroy every great city within the Soviet Union, every staging area for its armed forces and every airbase and missile site. The atomic destruction on both sides would be too terrible to contemplate. Their leaders know that, and those of their citizenry who are intelligent are aware of that fact. Our American leaders and most of our citizens also know this.

The possibility of offensive action by the Soviet Union in Western Europe is so remote as to be nonexistent. Hence, we in the Congress should speak out repeatedly and loudly and finally pound into the ears of the bureaucrats in the executive branch of our Government that it is the sensible and self-evident operation for us to, without delay, cut down our huge forces in Western Europe whose generals and colonels never had it so good. Take them out of Western Europe and send these highly trained officers and men of our Armed Forces where they are needed. In their stead we could send a reasonable number of young draftees to Western Europe for their training. I do not even see much sense in maintaining more than a nominal force over there. The fact is that we have the demonstrated capability to immediately airlift combat trained fighting men from continental United States to Western Europe in a matter of 48 hours and place them in the field battle ready to repel any aggressor.