Mr. President,

The greatest wrong our nation has ever perpetrated, in a history perhaps unmatched for honor and generosity towards mankind, is one we have inflicted on a part of our own people.

Since the days when the settlers first came to this new and wild land, Americans have been consumed with an idea that departed entirely from the thought and custom of all previous history. This idea involved a new way of looking at the character of man.

Our government, also for the first time in history, was built on this principle. As Abraham Lincoln once said:

"Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of the equal rights of men. Ours began by affirming those rights. They said 'some men are too ignorant and vicious to share in government.' 'Possibly so,' said we, 'and by your system you would always keep them ignorant and vicious. We propose to give all a chance; and we expect the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant wiser and all better and happier together.'"

Yet here in the first country of the world which was dedicated to this idea, in the country which has been responsible for keeping it alive in times of darkness ever since, and is responsible today, we have not worked or cared to see it scrupulously applied among our own people.

We have given reasons, some of us, and others have closed their eyes and turned their backs upon laws, practices and attitudes which we should long ago have fought to have abolished. It has never been easy for men to forgive others for being different from themselves, whether in some superficial feature like shape or color or even in less noticeable differences, such as the minor tenets of one's religion. Laws cannot change the hearts of men, and we will not change the hearts of men by this law if indeed we are able to enact it.

Some have said to me, the Negroes have not earned full citizenship; they have not shown they will take the responsibility to be good citizens. I answer that it is hard enough just to earn a living without education, without
justice in the protection of the laws, without self-respect or hope for improvement, and with hate and repugnance their all too constant welcome.

What effect would these surroundings have on any man? I do not know but I believe the Negro people have, on the whole, returned our two plus centuries of injustice with almost miraculous forgiveness and restraint.

To change these living habits of so long a time does not come easy, and we must do all within our power to see that the change is as little disruptive, and as little painful as it can possibly be. This will require still more restraint on the part of those who have already waited so long. But change we must, and this requires restraint on the part of those who must endure the change. This remark is not directed at the South, for what section of the country can say that it has held out its hand and heart to the Negroes in every area of human activity and in the way that must be done if they are ever to become truly members of the community.

I feel, however, that this attitude is changing. Many factors lead me to believe so, from the inspirational march in Washington last summer to the new desire for tolerance on the part of all Americans since the death of our martyred President. Injustice is, after all, alien to our natures, and its existence has exacted a price from the consciences of those who have allowed it to go on as well from those who have suffered under it. The treatment of the Negroes and other minority peoples in our country has been, as the poet Archibald MacLeish once said:

"...antithesis of America -- the passionate repudiation of the American proposition, and thus the implicit rejection of America itself...

"If the American proposition is no longer the proposition to which the American heart and mind were committed at our beginning, then America is finished and the only question left is when she will fall."

I do not believe America will fall now or in the future, and I further believe this one great infirmity, this inconsistency in our national character and in our view of ourselves will in time be healed.

Although new law is not the only solution, it is part of the solution and it is the part that we, the lawmakers, are responsible to provide. The rest must be provided in the churches, in the schools and in the consciences
of the people. And as this long debate begins let us consider that there are no special privileges being sought here. This bill attempts to give by law what should have been, but has not been provided by practice -- an even chance. A chance to go to school and vote and hold a job, simple things which the rest of us have enjoyed without a moment's thought. It is time for all Americans to be included in the American dream.

Justice Holmes once said that a desire for the superlative seemed to him to be "at the bottom of the philosopher's effort to prove that truth is absolute" and that those who believed in natural law made the mistake of accepting what was familiar as being something which must be accepted by all men everywhere.

I do not know whether such a thing as Justice exists outside of the mind of man. But I am impressed by the fact that through the centuries the overwhelming number of men have longed for it, have recognized its absence or presence without being told, have fought for it, and have sacrificed their lives to attain it for their posterity.

Whether it exists in the mind of man only or whether Justice is in fact a Being of its Own, its attraction seems irresistible.

Each man knows in his own heart what he believes Justice to be. Let us each follow this inner dictate in the debate we have begun.
SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER SAID TODAY IN ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA, THAT "the greatest tragedy of all is that the breakdown of law and order should be an issue in this campaign for the highest office in the land."

I DISAGREE.

I BELIEVE THE GREATEST TRAGEDY OF ALL IS THAT A MAN IS RUNNING FOR THE PRESIDENCY WHO, WHEN OFFERED THE CHANCE TO HELP REMOVE THE CAUSES OF CRIME, REJECTED THAT OPPORTUNITY.

IF SENATOR GOLDWATER WOULD MAKE EVEN A SUPERFICIAL STUDY OF THE CRIME THAT ALLEGEDLY ALARMS HIM, HE WOULD DISCOVER THAT CRIME RATES ARE CLOSELY CONNECTED WITH THE NUMBER OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN A COMMUNITY. SINCE OUR YOUTH POPULATION IS HIGHER THAN EVER, THE CRIME RATE IS UP.

SIMILARLY, THE SUREST WAY OF REDUCING THE CRIME RATE IS TO PROVIDE AVENUES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE TO CHANNEL THEIR INTERESTS AND THEIR ENERGIES OUT OF THE STREETS AND INTO THE CLASSROOM, THE FACTORY, OR THE OFFICE -- TO ENCOURAGE THEM TO STUDY, TO LEARN, TO FIND JOBS THAT INTEREST THEM.

BUT SENATOR GOLDWATER WANTS NONE OF THIS.
HE HAS VOTED AGAINST TRAINING UNEMPLOYED YOUTHS TO FIND JOBS.

HE HAS VOTED AGAINST A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS THAT WOULD GET YOUNGSTERS OUT OF SQUALID CRIME-BREEDING AREAS AND INTO THE FRESH, CLEAN AIR OF THE COUNTRY WHERE THEY WOULD OBTAIN A NEW PERSPECTIVE.

HE HAS VOTED AGAINST MONEY TO BUILD SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARSHIPS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE TO ATTEND COLLEGE.

HE HAS VOTED AGAINST ASSISTING ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS.

HE HAS VOTED AGAINST INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE.

IN EFFECT, SENATOR GOLDWATER VOTED FOR UNEMPLOYMENT, IGNORANCE, AND STAGNATION.

IF THERE IS A CRIME IN THIS ELECTION, IT IS THE VOTING RECORD OF SENATOR GOLDWATER WHO HAS DURING HIS PUBLIC CAREER OPPOSED EVERY GROUP OF AMERICANS WHO LOOKED TOWARD THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT FOR GUIDANCE AND COURAGE.
Since last Wednesday, August the 12th, I have sat in this Senate listening to the proponents and opponents of the amendment which seeks to authorize temporary stays in execution of court orders for immediate institution of reapportionment in state legislatures based upon the principle of "one man, one vote." Except for a relatively brief period when the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois held forth, the discussions have mainly centered on substantive questions concerning the validity or invalidity of the arguments presented in the series of Supreme Court cases handed down last June. Facts and figures have been cited to prove or disprove, as the case may be, the under or over representation, of rural or urban areas.

Authorities ranging from James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, and John Adams to William S. White have been liberally, if not always accurately, quoted in support of various arguments.

I have no particular brief against such discussions for the Supreme Court decisions most certainly are based on concrete and specific cases from Alabama to Colorado, all dealing with substantive questions of the equity or inequity of the prevailing mode of representation in the various state legislatures. Political and other social scientists have for years written scholarly articles analyzing the merits or demerits of a system of apportionment tending to favor the non-urban areas of our various state
governments. Historians have pointed to various tracts from American history for the purposes of either proving or disproving whatever line of reasoning they were inclined to follow. Far be it for me to cover ground so well traveled by so many experts.

However, I personally believe that a more constructive approach to the question before us is to face up to the procedural questions involved. Indeed, the amendment itself does not raise substantive questions of the propriety or impropriety of the Court's decisions, although much has already been implied on this floor. The issue raised is mainly procedural. And that issue is one which goes to the very nerve center of our Constitutional form of government.

I am deeply convinced that any tampering with this nerve center is to seriously endanger a system which has enabled this country to endure and survive a multitude of internal and external stresses and strains which have weakened or destroyed a number of governments not as prudently endowed. Were I to be aligned against the majority of the justices in the Supreme Court decisions, I would still have to raise my voice against the present attempt to initiate by legislative fiat an inexorable deterioration of the very structure of constitutional government. For to say that the issue is procedural only underscores the fact that the basic precepts of American Constitutionalism are being undermined.
Without any attempt to delve into the motives of the sponsors of
the amendment, and without trying to analyze what appears to be a puzzling
conflict in interpretation of the two major sponsors as to the ultimate
purpose behind it, I can only see the effect as being detrimental to the concept
of separation of powers. I do not know, at this point, whether the aim is to
buy time so as to enable Congress and the states to initiate and ratify a
constitutional amendment leaving inviolable existing systems of apportion-
ment or simply to provide the time necessary for the various state legisla-
tures to work out reapportionment schemes more closely in line with the
case of Reynolds vs. Sims. I do not know that these varying opinions
are necessarily germane to the basic procedural question. All that I do
know is that the Senate, and the Congress, are being asked to stay an
interpretation delivered by the Supreme Court. All that I do know is that
this amounts to a temporary restraining order from the legislative arm
preventing the due execution of a decision rendered by the judicial branch
of our government. And may I add that the period of validity of the restraining
order has also very little to do with the procedural question involved.

The fact of the matter, it seems to me, is that a judicial decision
has been deemed to be in dire need of legislative moderation. If this
can be done with Reynolds vs. Sims, and Lucas vs. The Forty-Fourth
General Assembly of Colorado, then why was it not done with
Brown vs. The Board of Education of Topeka? And why cannot it be done with any and all Supreme Court decisions which may run counter to the political interests of those affected?

I am sorry to say that I believe a precedent is being created by this amendment which would wreak havoc with our traditional views that the judicial and legislative functions should be kept separate. What other possible interpretation is there for the proposed amendment? A judicial decision has been made. The Constitution has been held to be violated by the existent system. The Court has said, in effect, correct that system so as to make it consonant with the Constitution. But correct it within certain reservations, to wit:

"Remedial technique in this new and developing area of the law will probably often differ with the circumstances of the challenged apportionment and a variety of local conditions. It is enough to say now that, once a state's legislative apportionment scheme has been found to be unconstitutional, it would be the unusual case in which a court would be justified in not taking appropriate action to insure that no further elections are conducted under the invalid plan. However, under certain circumstances, such as where an impending election is imminent and a State's election machinery is already in progress, equitable considerations might justify a court in withholding the granting of immediately effective relief in a legislative apportionment case, even though the existing apportionment scheme was found invalid."
How more reasonable can the Supreme Court be?

The founding fathers were very clear about the division of legislative, judicial, and executive powers. As the wording of Article Three, section one of the Constitution states, "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Section two sets forth the jurisdiction of the court as "the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution." The only power Congress has over the Courts is in the establishment of them, and in the approval of appointees. The founding fathers were very careful to limit the judicial power of the legislative branch to cases of impeachment only.

Since we are quoting authorities while debating an idea as revolutionary as this amendment, it would be wise to re-read the thoughts of the framers of the Constitution on the doctrine of separation of powers. What do they say? Alexander Hamilton in Federalist paper number 78 states: "The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited Constitution. By a limited Constitution, I understand one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority, such for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex-post facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of courts of justice, whose duty must be to declare acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing."
Further on in the same paper Hamilton discusses the question of
the supremacy. If the legislature and Constitution are divergent in their views,
"The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the
courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges,
as a fundamental law. It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning,
as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative
body. If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the
two, that which has the superior obligation and validity, ought, of course,
to be preferred; or, in other words, the Constitution ought to be preferred
to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of their agents."

Yet by this amendment, I think that we are saying that Congress
is supreme. The Supreme Court in Reynolds vs. Sims and Lucas vs The
Forty-Fourth General Assembly of Colorado, held that the Equal Protection
Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees to all citizens the principle
"one man, one vote." This amendment, by saying that these decisions may
not be enforced, at least for a period of time, is overriding the Supreme
Court. I am certain that all of us are familiar with the case, Marbury vs
Madison, a case known to all school children, which sets forth the principle
of judicial review and supremacy of the judicial branch as the proper one
to determine the constitutionality of our laws. This proposal comes
dangerously close to violating that principle by denying the courts the right
to execute their decisions.
In addition, not only would this amendment violate the law of the land, it would force others to do the same. By forbidding the execution of the law, it would be hampering the legal process and force law abiding citizens to live under and vote for unconstitutional governments. In other words, we may be enacting a law to force citizens to live under unconstitutional governments, as it were.

There have been charges that law and order will give way to chaos and uncertainty if the state legislatures followed the Court's decision and reapportioned immediately. But the effect of this measure is far worse--it would validate unconstitutional assemblies, and force by an act of Congress, the people of the United States, in effect, to disobey and ignore the supreme law of the land.

Another factor to consider is that a dangerous precedent would be set by this proposed amendment. The execution of any reapportionment order could be permanently stayed. The proposed amendment would grant stays to January 1, 1966. But what would prevent Congress from changing the year to January 1, 1976, or January 1, 1986? The time limit of this proposal could be extended indefinitely, permanently usurping the power of the Supreme Court to execute its proper functions. What guarantees would there be that this proposal would only be "temporary?" Temporary, emergency laws have an unusual habit of taking on the character of permanence.
As I have previously intimated, even if all sorts of guarantees were given that this measure will be a temporary one, that it will not be extended beyond its original duration, it will still set a dangerous precedent. For while this bill is limited to granting stays only in cases dealing with reapportionment, the principle of the legislature interfering with the functions of the judiciary would have been set. The original purposes, including the "special factors" which compose the situation may be forgotten in the future. What is to stop Congress from passing other bills staying the execution of court orders in any field which any member of Congress finds repugnant? Reapportionment is the issue today. What is to stop voter registration from being the issue tomorrow or the practice of certain religions the issue next week? This amendment would strip the courts of their constitutional power and thereby tend to undermine the Constitution. It would tend to reduce the judiciary to a position of subservience to the legislature. It would render it a branch whose pronouncements could only be executed by the grace of Congress. Cases would be decided, claims adjudicated, laws interpreted, but no executions would be allowed without the advice and consent of the Congress. Such a situation would make a mockery of the Constitution as the supreme law of the land. We would have, in effect, a system whereby the branch of government enacting a law, would decide the constitutionality and the enforcement of the law, a system which the framers of the Constitution regarded as tyranny, and a complete abdication of the rights of the people.
May I emphasize in closing that my remarks today were not made in haste nor with any intemperance or malice. I have given long and serious thought to the implications of the amendment as I personally saw them. I would be remiss were I to remain silent on the matter. The issue is much too great, far too significant, for one who is deeply committed to our system of government. The issue has far too many implications for the future of American Constitutionalism to be ignored.

Reapportionment may be right, or wrong, but the role of the Court and the doctrine of the supremacy of the Constitution can never be, should never be, challenged.
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DEEPLY REGRET ABSENCE FROM HAWAII I JOIN LEGION OF FRIENDS OF NAJO
IN HONORING HIS CANDIDACY FOR THE U S SENATE THE VALLEY ISLE
CAN BE RIGHTFULLY PROUD OF THIS FORTH RIGHT, EXPERIENCED
LEGISLATOR AND DEVOTED FIGHTER FOR HUMAN DIGNITY PLEASE EXTEND
MY SINCEREST BEST WISHES TO NAJO AND HIS LOYAL SUPPORTERS

DANIEL K INOUYE US SENATOR
6 August 1964

Mr. Noboru Furuya, President
Nippon Theatre, Ltd.
1031 Aala Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Dear Mr. Furuya:

I regret that I can only be present by proxy of my Hawaii staff to participate in the first presentation of the Kabuki drama in Hawaii.

I sincerely believe that the Grand Kabuki is not only entertainment of the highest order, but a classical and artistic vehicle for fostering appreciation of the best in the cultures of East and West.

Please extend my personal best wishes to Mr. Takejiro Ohtani and all of the other illustrious members of this great event. I hope that this occasion will be the forerunner of greater interchange of precious art treasures and endeavors between our two great nations.

Warmest aloha.

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator
Honorable Daniel K. Inouye  
U.S. Senator  
850 Richards Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii  

Dear Sir:

We are most happy for the opportunity to introduce for the first time in Hawaii one of Japan's great classical arts, the Kabuki drama.

The forty-five member troupe which is scheduled to perform at the new Honolulu International Center, Concert-Theatre starting August 7th thru the 16th consists of several of the leading Kabuki performers such as Nakamura Utaemon, Ichimura Takenojo, Ichikawa Ennosuke, Sawamura Tanosuke and others.

We sincerely hope that the presentation of Kabuki will not only offer entertainment to the people of Hawaii but will help towards better relationship and understanding between the East and West.

Although we are faced with a tremendous task, we feel certain that with your co-operation and help, the "Grand Kabuki" will be a success.

Enclosed are your complimentary tickets. We will be looking forward for your attendance.

Very truly yours,

NIPPO THEATRE, LTD.

Noboru Furuya, President
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July 27, 1964
CONGRATULATIONS FROM DANIEL K. INOUYE, UNITED STATES SENATOR

May I extend my sincerest congratulations and best wishes to the Majikinas, Yuuko, Yoshinae, Yoshikuni and Yoshino, for their presentation of the best in dances and music of the Ryukyus.

This event will enhance the fostering of a deep and enduring understanding and a genuine appreciation of the cultural heritages of the Ryukyus exemplified to the highest degree by the Majikinas.
17 June 1964

Mr. Diosdado G. Avecilla  
President, United Filipino Council of Hawaii  
1120 Nuuanu Avenue  
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Avecilla:

Enclosed is a message of congratulations from Senator Inouye which was sent to me for transmittal to you.

I should like to add my personal best wishes for success to you and your outstanding organization.

Sincerely,

MORIO OMORI  
Executive Assistant

Enclosure
17 June 1964

Mr. Diosdado G. Avecilla
President, United Filipino Council of Hawaii
1120 Nuuanu Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Avecilla:

I wish to extend my best wishes and congratulations to the Sixth Annual Convention of the United Filipino Council of Hawaii.

The colorful pageantry, balanced by a seriousness of cultural purpose of Fiesta Filipina and Miss Hawaii Filipinas, has been one of the highlights of life in our islands.

Maggie and I hope that before too long we may be able to enjoy first hand the activities of the Council.

Again, our sincerest best wishes for success in your future undertakings.

Warmest aloha.

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:eyh
Honorable Daniel K. Inouye  
Suite 602, Capital Investment Bldg.  
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Senator Inouye:

On the occasion of our Sixth Annual Convention of the United Filipino Council of Hawaii, we wish to request a congratulatory message from you to be read during the convention.

Your kind and immediate attention to this matter is highly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Diosdado G. Avecilla  
President

DGA/ved
10 June 1964

Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
442 Old Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D. D.

Dear Dan:

Mr. Paul Devens, co-chairman of the kick-off dinner for Masato Doi, has requested a cable or letter from you for the dinner which takes place on the night of June 23rd. Please send the message to Chairman, Kick-Off Dinner, Room 518 Honolulu Merchandise Mart Building.

Please remember that Bob Dodge is being mentioned as another democratic mayoralty candidate.

Aloha,

MORIO OMORI

MO:eyh
Mr. Morio Omori
602 Capital Investment
Building
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Morio:

Attached is a copy of my message to the Chairman of the Kick-Off Dinner for Masato Doi, scheduled for June 23d.

Aloha,

DKI:ki
United States Senator

Enc.
Chairman, Kick-Off Dinner
for Masato Doi
518 Honolulu Merchandise Mart
Building
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am in receipt of your most cordial invitation to join you and your friends in attending a special dinner in honor of Masato Doi on June 23rd.

Because of the unusually heavy legislative schedule, I find that I am unable to join you to personally pay my respects to my warm and dear friend, Masato.

During World War II, Masato and I were privileged to serve in the 442d Infantry Regimental Combat Team. His wartime record of leadership and gallantry was an impressive one. Since our wartime service, we have been exceedingly close friends. In 1954 we jointly decided to offer ourselves as candidates for the then Territorial House of Representatives. History records that we were successful.

Since then, I have watched his progress with great personal satisfaction. His service as Chairman of the City Council has been a most inspiring one. He has added great luster to the word "politician." He has indeed made a political career an honorable one.

I have just recited the above to indicate to you how much I regret my inability to be with you this evening. I am proud to count myself as one of Masato's multitude of admirers. I wish you a great and successful evening and, through you, may I convey my best wishes to Masato Doi.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

bcc: Mr. Morio Omori
Dear Friends:

I sincerely regret that a previous commitment has taken me to the island of Hawaii on this memorable night.

However, Maggie and I wish to be counted among the thousands of grateful citizens of Hawaii who enjoyed the fruits of the dedicated service of Assistant Chief Dewey O. Mookini. I wish to be counted not only as a public official, but as a personal friend and admirer, paying homage and offering sincere best wishes for many, many more years of dignified and fruitful living after this testimonial night.

Mahalo and warmest aloha, Assistant Chief Dewey Mookini.

DAN K. INOUYE
Message from Senator Dan Inouye

To the Graduates of Kaimuki High School -

You are now embarking on the greatest adventure of your life after a fine academic preparation through the dedicated efforts of your teachers.

Those of us who have preceded you on this road of life remember with nostalgia, the hopes and fears with which we viewed the future.

In retrospect, we realize that life is what each individual makes it. Success is a promise, failure a pitfall omnipresent and available to all.

Success and happiness are the ultimate products of hard work and dedication to high purpose in life. At this point of embarkation, I extend to you my very personal wishes for success and happiness in your future endeavors.

Warmest aloha.

DAN K. INOUYE
United States Senator
9 April 1964

Any man who fathered a son as distinguished as Hawaii's Congressman Spark Matsunaga must have been a great man.

I join Hawaii's people in saluting him and thanking him for his many contributions.

Sparky, my sympathies are with you today.

Aloha,

DAN K. INOUYE
MR. ED. YAMANAKA
FIRST NATIONAL BANK, KING SMITH BRANCH
782 NORTH KING STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII

I SORELY REGRET MY ABSENCE FROM HAWAII DURING THE INTER-
NATIONALLY PROMINENT CHERRY BLOSSOM FESTIVITIES SPONSORED BY MY
FRIENDS IN THE CHAMBER. TO QUEEN VIVIAN HONDA AND HER BEAUTIFUL
COURT AND TO ALL OF YOU PRESENT AT THE CHERRY BLOSSOM CORONATION
BALL, I SEND YOU SINCERE GREETINGS FROM WASHINGTON AND BEST WISHES
FOR CONTINUED SUCCESS IN YOUR COMMUNITY SERVICE. ALOHA, DAN INOUYE,
U. S. SENATOR
TO MR. ED. YAMANAKA
FIRST NATIONAL BANK, KING-SMITH BRANCH
782 NORTH KING STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII

I SORELY REGRET MY ABSENCE FROM HAWAII DURING THE INTERNATIONALLY PROMINENT CHERRY BLOSSOM FESTIVITIES SPONSORED BY MY FRIENDS IN THE CHAMBER, TO QUEEN VIVIAN HONDA AND HER BEAUTIFUL COURT AND TO ALL OF YOU PRESENT AT THE CHERRY BLOSSOM CORONATION BALL, I SEND YOU SINCERE GREETINGS FROM WASHINGTON AND BEST WISHES FOR CONTINUED SUCCESS IN YOUR COMMUNITY SERVICE. ALOHA, DAN INOUYE, U. S. SENATOR

Direct Connection in the United States with Western Union
Send the above telegram subject to the conditions, regulations, and rates as set forth in the applicable tariff of RCA Communications, Inc., and on file with the regulatory authorities.

RCA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., A SERVICE OF RADIO CORPORATION OF AMERICA
Brig. General Francis S. Takemoto
c/o Hawaiian Village Dome
2005 Kalia Road
Honolulu, Hawaii

My dear General Takemoto:

With great pride and pleasure I join your many friends and colleagues in a testimonial to your ability, dedication and achievements.

I rejoice in your historic achievement of a General officer’s rank in the service of our nation. I know that the trust and honor bestowed on you are richly deserved. I am confident that you will continue to reflect great credit on the people of the State of Hawaii and the United States of America.

I regret that I cannot be with you to personally convey my best wishes to you this evening.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
United States Senator

DKI:eyh
13 January 1964

Mr. Thomas Fukunaga  
c/o Service Motors Co., Ltd.  
105 S. Kam Highway  
Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii  

Dear Tommy:  

I was pleased to learn today that you have been promoted to manager of Service Motors.  

My congratulations to you upon your promotion and my congratulations to the management for selecting one so well prepared for this position.  

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE  
United States Senator  

DKI:eyh
The meaning of the radical right-wing movement has been discussed a great deal recently. Some have glorified it; others have damnified it, but in either case the implication has been that it was something new in American politics, a "rising tide" gathering momentum across our land.

If it is true that this philosophy is becoming more appealing, we should find out why, and consider what its meaning is for our future. It is possible that a candidate in the next presidential campaign will be a man who, if he has not entirely embraced the creed of arch-conservatism, was surely baptised in its waters and steadfastly refuses to dry off. His candidacy requires us to examine the philosophy he represents, and to decide on its usefulness as a practical platform for the conduct of national affairs.

I do not believe that either the dogma or the relative strength of the right wing philosophy is new in America. A review of American history confirms the fact that a segment of public opinion has consistently voiced attitudes similar to those advanced today by the ultraconservative. Perhaps it is oversimplification to claim that the arch conservative philosophy is quite so simple, but its creed appears to center around three main tenets so far as political relationships are concerned. First -- suspicion of any contact or relationship with foreign nations; second -- fear and intolerance of unfamiliar ideas. These the arch conservative sees as potential threats to American society. Third -- unwillingness to endure an unsettled state of affairs and a corresponding disposition to immediately bring every frustrating, complex or competitive situation to a conclusion by use of force.
If this is a fair representation of ultraconservative political postulates, and I think it is, two characteristics are apparent. The first is that these tenets or rules of conduct rely on emotion for their strength and direction. There is no attempt to examine or analyze whether the unfamiliar idea might be useful, whether the foreign relationship might be beneficial, or whether the frustrating situation is one to be most successfully met by force. In short, the ultraconservative philosophy rejects reason and embraces emotion as the basis for dealing with the outside world.

Second, despite the fact that the ultraconservative claims his philosophy is one of action, hard, tough and therefore a return to the ruggedness associated with the early American frontier, it is not a philosophy of action but a philosophy of reaction. Instead of originating action or ideas it is instead a reaction to the ideas or actions of others and is therefore both morally and intellectually passive.

For example, today we find the ultraconservative and the radical right-wing opposing minimum wage legislation; opposing workmen's compensation laws; opposing child labor laws; opposing aid to education; opposing medical care for the aged; opposing the Peace Corps; opposing civil rights legislation. This list could go on for several pages, but I am certain you too must have heard these "patriotic" speeches and read these "Americanism" pamphlets in which opposition is voiced to any program and proposal which offers our Nation a more hopeful and peaceful future. As an American and also as a Christian, I resent the use of the terms "patriotic," "American" and "Christian" by those who advocate these reactionary proposals. I have seen many organizations in the name of patriotic Christianity publish vile and vulgar anti-Semitic pamphlets. I have seen these same organizations issue unbelievable statements against minority groups in the United States.

It is important to note this fact for, although the philosophy seems entirely unworkable today, as well as dangerous, some of these attitudes have a respectable tradition in American history and others, though perhaps not as respectable, are by no means new to American political life.

It is this fact which accounts in large part, I believe, for much of what limited appeal the right wing has found. For example, a policy against foreign involvement was wisely recommended by George Washington in his Farewell Address and was followed as basic American policy with
few exceptions until the First World War. That war was evidence to many in the country that conditions in the world had so changed in the century since Washington's address that what had been wise policy in 1796 was no longer wise but dangerous, and as inadequate protection as a suit of armour is at ground zero. Even then Wilson's efforts to win American participation in the League of Nations was defeated as public opinion still would not accept a policy of internationalism. This was confirmed in 1920 by the election of President Harding. America turned her back on the world in hopes that it would go away, and thereby lost an opportunity. This failure contributed to the inevitability of the Second World War, in which thousands of young Americans lost their lives. The question may well be asked, need they have done so?

The Second War convinced most Americans that our oceans, which had effectively sheltered our adolescent years, could no longer isolate us from the outside world. Few Americans wished to become ensnared in the antagonistic affairs of Europe and Asia, but experience had painfully shown us there was no other course. As is often true in life, wisdom lay in the opposite direction from instinct and so grudgingly we threw ourselves into total involvement with all the dedication of Americans doing anything once they have decided upon it. This policy, with critical moments, has on the whole been successful, particularly as we became more adept at the rules of an unfamiliar game. Today, not quite twenty years after the Second World War, we are at peace, not in the old sense but in a new kind of competitive and tension-filled peace where wisdom, energy and action are required every moment and where the frustrations of insoluble problems appear to be a permanent condition. This is nevertheless an improvement. Twenty years after the First World War, the Second had already started.

Today the forces of reason and restraint are overtaking those of passion and fear, and the possibility of unlimited human achievement stretches out on the plain before us. But conceive of what the picture would be if there had been no steadfast determination to face the problems of the world, no Truman Doctrine, no Marshall plan, no NATO, no aid to under-developed nations. The prospect of an entire world under totalitarian rule, facing a "Fortress America" or as it would have more probably been a "fortress United States" is a bleak one for Americans, and for mankind.

The isolation of the arch conservative does have a long background in American tradition, but such a policy today would eventually find us alone facing whoever survived the struggle for the remainder of the world. Even America would find it most difficult to win a war against an enemy who controlled the resources of the rest of the globe.
The second tenet of ultraconservative philosophy, fear and intolerance of unfamiliar ideas and customs is not new to our history either, and its past may be traced through the burning of witches, the laws of Sedition and in the 'American Party' of 100 years ago which proudly called itself the Know Nothings.

The 'Scopes' trial in which a high school instructor was convicted and sentenced for teaching Darwin's theory of evolution is in the line of these traditions, and the followers of McCarthyism yesterday are paid-up lifetime members of the John Birch Society today. This aspect of the ultra-right equates diversity and subversion, and labels dissent as disloyalty.

Dissent is never popular. It is by definition the statement of what is not popular. But as all new life is the creation of two separate and different beings, so new ideas are formed by the germination of dissent. As one scholar has noted:

"Having ideas and disseminating them, is a risky business. It has always been so - and therein lies a strange paradox. The march of civilization has been quick or slow in direct ratio to the production, testing and acceptance of ideas; yet virtually all great ideas were opposed when they were introduced. Their authors and teachers have been censured, ostracized, exiled, martyred, and crucified usually because the ideas clashed with an accepted set of beliefs or prejudices or with the interests of a ruler or privileged class."

There are always forces that oppose ideas not their own, and some who would destroy both the idea and its source rather than suffer the discomfort of thought. These people do not accept the basic principle of democracy, for doubt of man's ability to choose is the ultimate object of their fear. It is not surprising that the result of their teachings are identical in effect to the totalitarian state they profess to abhor. It is the essence of freedom they hate, a man or woman who disagrees. Dissent is intrinsic in the growth of any free government. There is no better proof of this than the history of the United States Supreme Court which has seen time after time the original dissenting view become some years later the opinion of the Court.

It is natural in a democracy that among the ideas men are free to follow will be those opposed to the democracy. To protect even these ideas and yet preserve the society that allows them is one of the most difficult
moral problems a democracy faces, and it faces it continually. Government and law, being parties to the dispute, will always be inadequate to solve the problem satisfactorily, and ultimately the society must look for its protection against ideas that would destroy it to the people themselves.

The final tenet of the ultraconservative, that of reacting to frustration and competition by resort to military power, is also a habit born of history. Our nation in the past has a tradition of success in almost every foreign venture we have undertaken. Today our historical desire to resolve by force every unsatisfactory situation that arises anywhere in the world is just no longer practical. American might, though great, is not infinite. We must learn to differentiate those situations where the nation's interests are vital from those where they are not and, where they are judged to be significant, we must use not only force but every implement including force that may contribute to success. Failure to apply a broad coordinated program, economic, political, and technical, as well as military, is responsible, I believe, for our failure in Viet Nam.

The use of other means than force has been dubbed by the right as "being soft on Communism." The utter fallacy of this accusation has been expressed in unanswerable terms by Senator J. William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and deserves thought by us all.

"It seems to me that it is these extremists who are advocating a soft approach. Their oversimplifications and their baseless generalizations reflect the softness of those who cannot bear to face the burdens of a continuing struggle against a powerful and resourceful enemy. A truly tough approach, in my judgment, is one which accepts the challenge of communism with the courage and determination to meet it with every instrumentality of foreign policy -- political and economic as well as military, and with the willingness to see the struggle through as far into the future as may be necessary. Those who seek to meet the challenge -- or, in reality, to evade it -- by bold adventures abroad and witch hunts at home are the real devotees of softness -- the softness of seeking escape from painful realities by resort to illusory panaceas."

The dogma of the radical right have precedent in all of history, for they are based on emotion and instinct which in times past might have been reliable guides for self-preservation. But today the world changes faster than the human instinctual apparatus can adjust, and our only hope of dealing with these changes is by use of creative intelligence and reason.
Our protection against the mistakes of emotion and intolerance has always been the good sense of our people. It is my firm conviction that with time and understanding this same good sense will be our protection now.

In closing, may I remind you of the statement made a long time ago by a truly great American, Thomas Jefferson:

"I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."
Mr. President:

I am somewhat hesitant about addressing a subject on which so much expert testimony has been delivered by so many with so thorough knowledge in the various committees. I have heard equally impressive arguments on the floor of this Senate, both for and against the ratification of the test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union. It would take either a person with highly informed technical knowledge or one very deeply committed to attempt to cover the same ground. I feel that although I speak essentially as a result of the latter stimulus, there are many other Americans who feel the same way as I do. We are not experts but we have listened to them carefully and feel the choice must now be made.

During the various committee hearings on the subject, I indicated in a speech to my constituents that if I find myself personally convinced that the treaty will reasonably and adequately safeguard the national interests of our people, then I would do everything possible to seek its successful ratification. Although the Senate deliberations are yet to be completed, I now find myself convinced that ratification is imperative to our national interests.

I have listened to expert witnesses in committee. I have thoroughly studied the reports of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, and sat through many a session of the Armed Services Committee.

I have sat and listened to my distinguished colleagues here on the Senate floor, some with years of experience in the field of weapons development, others with invaluable insights into the intricacies of diplomatic relationships. I have listened to the statement of the President, to the learned exposition of the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and to the truly magnificent extemporaneous delivery of the distinguished leader of the minority party. They have all been eloquent, and have shown remarkable perception of the possible military, technological, and political consequences of ratification or non-ratification.

I need not review all the arguments either for or against the treaty. We have all heard them here on the Senate floor. Moreover, anyone who has taken the time to read the one-thousand page report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with arguments ranging the entire spectrum from that of
Secretary of Defense McNamara to that of Dr. Edward Teller, or who has studied the tightly argued and technical twenty-five page report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, knows full well the testimony of the experts. He should also have more than a layman's understanding of how multimegaton, low-megaton, and submegaton weapon capabilities may or may not be hindered by the ratification. He should understand the arguments and counter-arguments on how the treaty may affect United States development of very high yield atomic warheads equal to or surpassing Soviet achievements.

And if he has heard or read Dr. Teller's testimony and compared it with that of the Secretary of Defense he should have some notion of the arguments revolving around the question of the effects of the treaty on our ability to develop further our anti-ballistic missile defense capabilities.

Frankly, I must confess that I am not enough of a military weapons expert or an applied physicist to understand thoroughly all of the various technical points raised in these arguments and counter-arguments. Moreover, I must confess that I am not completely at home in the legal technicalities concerning international law and the theory of abrogation of treaties, so ably covered by Senator Fulbright in his opening remarks. However, I am painfully aware that the Soviets have not established a particularly enviable reputation for adhering to treaties.

I do know the thesis which underlies practically every military and scientific argument against the ratification of the treaty. That thesis, variously stated, is that the Soviets would not have agreed to the test-ban treaty unless it was to their advantage and clearly detrimental to the United States; that the Soviets have already attained the knowledge required for an effective anti-ballistic missile defense complex; that they have already developed advanced technical data on high yield blast, shock, communications blackout, and radiation and electromagnetic phenomena through their 1961-62 series of nuclear fission tests called by Dr. Teller "the most powerful, the most plentiful, the most repetitious, the most solid ever carried out by any nation"; that the Soviets will not be prevented from cheating because of their ideology but that we will suffer because we will be honest due to our moral commitments; and finally, that we simply cannot trust the Soviets.

I think that those who have argued for ratification have not dismissed these theses lightly. Rather, they have seriously considered them and have pondered their consequences. But in the end, I must agree with the Secretary of State who has said: "If there may be marginal risks in it, they are far less... than the risks that will result if we accept the thought that rational man must pursue an unlimited competition in nuclear weapons."
The risks that will result from an unlimited nuclear arms race are clearly apparent. At the worst, it may mean staring ultimately into the inferno of thermonuclear destruction. At the least, it means bequeathing to still unborn generations the fall-out from additional nuclear blasts, the precise number of which we may never know in our time.

I think it is logical to conclude that the very worst may be anticipated because a spiralling arms race can only result ultimately in a confrontation of adversaries. And a spiralling arms race is inevitable in the argument of those who say the treaty will prevent the United States from engaging in this experiment or that test to further develop ABM capabilities, or nuclear warhead re-entry into the atmosphere, or any number of military nuclear capabilities.

At the very least, we can expect the cumulative residue from nuclear explosions past, present, and future, to add up to proportions with which statistics and statisticians need not bother. This would be especially so if in the absence of a test-ban, more and more countries would eventually conduct more and more tests. What makes this possibility even more foreboding is the fact that countries entering the nuclear arms race in the future may have neither the technical means nor the necessary incentive to try to control excessive fall-out. As has been said: "We have a high obligation to safeguard life and health and the genetic integrity of the human race." In many ways, the test-ban treaty is as close a guarantee which we can have today that future generations will not be required to meet costly installments in genetics for thermonuclear experiments today.

It is a rather interesting and significant fact to me that although we most certainly have had conflicting testimony both in the present discussions on this treaty and in the past, I can recall no one who has in any way intimated that continued exposure to radiation has no harmful effects. Grand promises of a more bountiful future are completely devoid of any meaning if we simultaneously bequeath to the future radioactive pollution of the essentials of life on earth.

I am not willing to leave this legacy of contamination.

I am not eager simply to increase the potential of each megaton to kill more effectively.

I am deeply concerned that we renew with increased vigor the attack on the problems of human misery in this nation and throughout the world.
In short, I am very much disturbed that we should emphasize the art of war rather than the art of peaceful living.

Last week, the President informed us that more than 90 nations, excluding Communist China and France, have already ratified the test-ban treaty. The collective eyes of the rest of the world are focused upon the Senate of the United States. In an important sense, we are also staking our position of international leadership. We have been continuously asking for some sort of modus vivendi on the problem of nuclear tests between East and West. This marks the third administration which has attempted to do so. Both political parties have been on record to reach some sort of accord. We have never been closer. If we do not ratify this treaty, we can never rest assured that nations not now involved in nuclear development and testing will not enter, however reluctantly, the mad race to attain nuclear capabilities. The secrets of thermonuclear fission are surely not perpetually secure from the rest of the world.

The chain reaction first conceived in the Manhattan Project, then given birth on the sands of Alamogordo, received its fiery baptism at Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Since then, it has reached across the Siberian wastelands of the Soviet Union, tropical Christmas Island in the Pacific, and into the desert of the Saharas. From what we now know, it may reverberate in the hinterlands of Red China in the near future.

How soon will we see the ominous mushroom clouds over the horizons of other nations? We will see them as certainly as we now see the setting sun. We will see them just as soon as these countries reach scientific maturity and technical competence. Yes, we will see them so long as there is no test-ban agreement among the leaders of the world.

But, by then, it may be too late. In the collective quest for nuclear proficiency, the world might be just a step away from total annihilation. In chasing the thermonuclear tiger's tail, we may all just melt away.

The ratification of this treaty by all the three major powers involved may, therefore, have a salutary effect not only amongst these signatory nations but upon the nuclear and military ambitions of the entire world. At least, I think that this is a legitimate hope. The National Council of the Churches of Christ thinks so: "The Treaty is a first step," says the Council. "It does not halt production or reduce existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons; but it may slow up the nuclear arms race and will diminish the health hazards from radioactive fall-out to this and future generations.
"Of itself it does not prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to nations without them but it does prohibit assistance to other nations in making tests in the environments which it specifically proscribes. It does not end the threat of nuclear war or outlaw the use of nuclear weapons; but it opens the way to further agreements and thereby reduces the threat of war."

Certainly, these are words of eminent theologians. But there will be those who will ask, rather understandably: Are there any scientific minds supporting a similar position? After all, is this not ultimately a scientific and technological question?

Some of the nation's top scientists have issued a very similar statement, although much more tersely worded as perhaps befits their objective nature. This statement issued by a group of 54 scientists, including 19 Nobel Laureates, from Harvard and MIT to Stanford and Cal-Tech, state: "We have widely divergent views on almost every conceivable subject. But all of us agree on the importance and urgency of supporting the nuclear test ban treaty. What is it that unites us on this issue? These inescapable facts:

1. The Treaty will reduce the likelihood of nuclear war;

2. The Treaty will discourage the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear powers;

3. The Treaty will create a better climate on both sides for a slow-up of the arms race;

4. The Treaty will protect us and our children from exposure to additional doses of contamination from radioactive fall-out;

5. The risk of continued testing is greater than the risk of a test ban. The Treaty will protect the national security of the United States. Furthermore, under the terms of the treaty, we can resume testing if we ever feel our national security is threatened."

This is as succinct a statement as I have ever read nailing down the precise reasons why ratification must be had. Included in the list of eminent scientists who have signed their names to the foregoing statement are Dr. James R. Killian, Dr. George Kistiakowsky and James J. Wadsworth, all names highly respected for their scientific and social objectivity.

After all has been said and re-said, I think that it is reasonable to conclude that the basis of most of the objections to ratification of the treaty is that
the Soviets cannot be trusted... that the record of past duplicity in diplomatic negotiations should lead us to suspect the Soviet motive in the signing of the test-ban treaty.

Let me repeat here that the Soviet's past record in this regard is not especially encouraging. But Senator Fulbright, in his remarks to this Senate, indicated that in order to obtain a proper perspective on this question, it should be noted that the Soviets have satisfactorily observed a significant number of multilateral and bilateral agreements to which it has been a party. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas went on to say that the Soviets indeed have used the criterion of national interest in adhering to or abrogating treaties. However, the Senator reminded us of various factors which he considered definitely to the interests of the Soviet Union in adhering to the conditions of this treaty.

These factors of national interest to the Soviets included the conclusion that they have achieved a position of comparable technical parity with the United States in nuclear weapons development as a result of the 1961-62 tests, that the Cuban crisis forced the Soviets to realize how close they were to nuclear holocaust, that the Soviets are concerned over the Chinese Communists' position of intransigence.

And then, of course, he concluded: "I do not think we can be so self-righteous as to say this country has never violated a treaty. I did not follow it closely, but I believe the Seneca Indians have been saying that this Government violated its treaty with the Seneca Indians in New York."

For half a century, we in Hawaii, like the Seneca Indians, had almost come to believe that the promise of eventual statehood was never to be fulfilled, until that glorious day in 1959 finally arrived.

But I think that the most compelling argument against the charge that this treaty rests purely on trust of the Soviets has already been delivered by Secretary of State Rusk in answer to a question during the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Let me remind you of it for I think it is the best answer that I have heard throughout the hearings as well as the deliberations on this floor. Said the Secretary:

"If we thought that we could rely upon trust we should probably be discussing a comprehensive test-ban treaty rather than one in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water. I do not believe that an agreement of this sort can rest upon the element of faith and trust because it relates deeply to our own elementary security
needs. I do think that we must ask ourselves two questions: Is this treaty, if it is complied with, in the interests of the United States, and are the arrangements in the event the treaty is not complied with adequate for our safety and security? I think the answer to both those questions is 'Yes'. We will know if there are significant violations of this treaty, we will be free to do whatever is necessary in our own security, and I would think that this is not a matter of trust."

I can personally conceive of no better or more effective way to close my remarks today than by quoting the masterful and moving speech by the leader of the minority party on Wednesday, September 11, 1963, a date on which I was privileged to preside over this body. Said the Senator: "I want to take a first step, Mr. President. I am not a young man; I am almost as old as the oldest Member of the Senate, certainly am older than a great many Senators. One of my age thinks about his destiny a little. I should not like to have written on my tombstone: 'He knew what happened at Hiroshima, but he did not take a first step.'"

Mr. President: I support the ratification of this limited test ban treaty, without reservations or amendments.
Mr. Chairman, I have previously submitted a statement recording my urgent request for restoration of a major portion of the House reductions to the appropriation request of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, Honolulu, Hawaii. In addition, I have submitted a general record of past accomplishments and present operations of the Center.

Today, I would like to concentrate on two major items not covered in my previous testimony.

A. First, I would like to present my personal evaluation of the contributions of the East-West Center gathered through person-to-person contacts with various Center officials, Senior Scholars, East-West student grantees, and others intimately associated with its activities.

B. Furthermore, I am concerned to show that the Federal appropriations involved in the present case, as well as in previous years, are not to be conceived as financial grants to the University of Hawaii or to the State of Hawaii alone. Rather, these Federal appropriations have always been considered to be part of a joint venture with the State of Hawaii contributing its own funds in the national interest. Moreover, whenever and wherever practicable or economically feasible, EWC facilities have been kept as separate entities.

A. Personal Evaluation.

Admittedly, what I have to say here is in the realm of subjective evaluation. However, it is the result of personal contact with and observation of the personnel and work connected with the Center. It is also the result of close association with the development of the Center from my days of service with the House of Representatives. Finally, it is the result of detailed study of the various programs and activities carried out by the three component elements of the Center; the Office of Student Programs, the Institute of Technical Interchange, and the Institute of Advanced Projects.

In my numerous trips to Hawaii in connection with Federal-State matters, I have had several interviews with members of the Center administration, Senior Scholars in residence at the Institute of Advanced Projects, exchange students from both the mainland United States and Asia, and teaching personnel connected with the University of Hawaii and other secondary educational institutions. I have also conferred with government and industrial leaders in the State of Hawaii. Almost to a man, the people with whom I have conversed agree that the East-West Center has shown and continues to show tremendous possibilities in the area of mutual exchange of technical and cultural experiences and information. If I can perceive any single dominant theme running throughout these conversations, I would have to say that it is the idea not only of mutual interchange between the United States and the rest of Asia but amongst the Asians themselves, as well as amongst the Americans themselves.
On August 28, when I talked to a group of some thirty visiting students from the Center in my Washington office I was struck by the mutual give and take discussions on common problems which transpired between a group of Indian and Pakistani students. Japanese students have argued and agreed on many problems with Koreans, and Koreans with students from the Philippines.

I shared the same experiences with a group of middle management experts from Asia who were touring Washington Federal government offices for a first hand observation of administrative techniques under the auspices of the Institute of Technical Interchange.

In the same vein, students from East Coast colleges, Midwestern and West Coast universities have debated and learned from each other, as well as from their Asian brethren about mutual problems.

The same theme has carried over into the Senior Scholar Program of the East-West Center. Public administration experts from the Philippines, Thailand, and Korea exchanged points of view and differences of experiences in administrative work in their respective countries with the seminar being led by an American expert from the University of Indiana, who in turn traded his views and experiences with fellow public administration experts from various parts of the United States.

The Institute of Advanced Projects recently held a scientific meeting in Hong Kong for the purpose of facilitating the exchange of scientific information among the countries of Asia. From all indications, the event was a great success not only in terms of the conference purpose, but also in terms of impressing Asians with the fact that the United States was very much concerned about the problem and willing to help solve it through the auspices of the East-West Center.

The Institute of Technical Interchange has held pilot training projects such as that for Vocational Education and Cooperative Agricultural Extension. Vocational specialists and Agricultural Extension experts from Japan, Taiwan, and Hawaii have pooled their resources, as well as their training facilities. The training conducted under the latter project, for example, took place in Hawaii, Japan, and Taiwan in order to use the distinctive advantages of these countries. Hawaii provided certain advantages for practical work in agricultural extension, soil conservation, and control of insect pests. Japan contributed her specialized skills in the development of farm machinery designed for the small Asian farm. Taiwan contributed advanced fertilizing skills which is a necessity on Asian farms.

After my many hours of conversation and study, I am convinced that the Center is providing a crucial vehicle not only for East-West relations but also for better relations among Americans and Asians themselves.

B. State-Federal Venture.

So that there be no misunderstanding, let me be the first here to say that the East-West Center would not have been possible without the financial assistance of the Federal government and the support of the U.S. Congress in its early formative years. However, I should like to point out that the State of Hawaii has also contributed considerable funds, personnel, and physical facilities, because it has felt that by doing so,
it would be able to manifest more concretely the general feeling that this was a joint venture for the good of the entire nation.

For example, here are the facts and figures on the kind of aid and the amount of funds provided by the State of Hawaii for various institutions and programs at the Center: As far as I can ascertain, these figures are accurate and up to date.

Medical coverage for EWC employees............$9,600 annual
Grounds maintenance.......................... 14,400 annual
Theatre-auditorium maintenance............. 29,000 annual
Theatre-auditorium equipment................. 225,000 total
Original planning for EWC...................... 35,000 total
Institute of Advanced Projects planning 32,000 total
State land for EWC buildings.................1,641,723 total
Gateway House ofr partial EWC occupancy 84,000 total

TOTAL...$2,070,723

The total amount appropriated by the State for the land upon which various EWC buildings have been or are being constructed may be prorated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hawaii</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Food Services...$363,309</td>
<td>1,939,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Quarters...............230,382</td>
<td>779,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Auditorium..................490,800</td>
<td>1,211,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Dormitory.................225,975</td>
<td>2,237,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Dormitory..................205,257</td>
<td>615,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory-Classroom................126,000</td>
<td>893,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway House Dormitory..............84,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,725,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional $1,283,289 for construction and furnishings</td>
<td>1,283,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,009,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of Gateway House, most of these buildings are mainly for East-West Center personnel. There are instances where facilities can be either economically or practically used by both EWC and University of Hawaii personnel. For example, University faculty and graduate students will be permitted to use meals at the EWC Administration and Food Service building because feeding operations when confined solely to EWC personnel would not be economically feasible. In the case of the laboratory-classroom, there will be both EWC grantees and non-EWC students in attendance. This is because the building was built on the understanding that the Federal government would construct classroom space roughly enough to care for the number of students added to the University of Hawaii student enrollment by virtue of the student grantee program. In the case of the Gateway House dormitory, any EWC student grantee unable to find accommodations in either the High or Low Rise dormitories of the EWC complex, will be given accommodations here.

The further point which I am making in the foregoing is that Federal appropriations to the East-West Center should not be construed as an outright gift to the University of Hawaii, or for that matter, to the State of Hawaii. Where economically and practically feasible, institutional facilities and programs are being kept separate from the University. The University and the State of Hawaii, on the other hand, have placed their physical and financial resources where and when
available at the disposal of the EWC. The firm conviction of both the University and the State is that the EWC is a joint Federal-State enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by saying that it is the hope not only of the State of Hawaii and the University of Hawaii that this committee decide favorably on the question of restoration of the House cut on the Center appropriations but also of the many, many administrators, professors and students, from all of the 49 other states of the Union as well as from all the countries of the Pacific Basin, Southeast Asian, South Asian, and the East Asian countries.

I would also like to request that the report of the International Advisory Panel to the East-West Center as it pertains to the Institute of Advanced Projects, be made a part of the record.

Thank you very much.
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
BY
SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE

Mr. President:

I will not take up my colleagues' valuable time with a dissertation on the many attractions which Hawaii has to offer for they are too well known.

But a new attraction is now under construction on the island of Oahu and I think it may be of interest. Mr. Bob Considine, well-known author and commentator, recently wrote a column for King Features Syndicate about Sea Life Park on Oahu and what is also to become the Pacific Oceans Institute.

The project is headed by Mr. Taylor A. Pryor, son of Mr. Sam Pryor, Vice President of Pan American World Airways, and Mr. Kenneth S. Norris, a prominent marine biologist from U.C.L.A.

If there are no objections I submit the article for insertion in the Record.

SEA LIFE PARK

Sea Life Park, Makapuu Point, Oahu--an intrepid child we know, named Debbie, went for a brisk ride today by a somewhat unusual method of transportation. She was hanging on to the dorsal fin of a 6-foot porpoise named Haole.

Both mammals seemed to enjoy the experience. Haole, a former resident of the neighboring Pacific, chatted cheerfully to the three other porpoises in the deep pool.

"This is great!" Debbie said, holding on for dear life, "it's like. . . ."

She would have continued the sentence, but Haole submerged just then and Debbie went under with him. Both reappeared eventually, smiling. In a nearby pool, with no guard net dividing it from the pool in which the girl and porpoises played, sulked a Pygmy Killer whale, one of the few ever captured alive.

In another pool three Pitch-Black Pilot whales cruised slowly about, oblivious to the clowning of three bottle nose dolphins. In still another pool, two magnificent spotted porpoises
leaped over a high-jump bar and slid back into the water with hardly a sound or ripple.

We had come upon the impressive beginnings of what promises to be one of the wonders of the world, Sea Life Park. These were the training pools of what soon will be the most impressive and extensive marine exhibit in the world. In time, also, the pools will serve as laboratories for the Pacific Oceans Institute, chartered for the purpose of marine research and education.

Sea Life Park and the institute are the dreams come-true of a virile young ex-marine helicopter pilot and shark specialist named Taylor A. Pryor, son of the Vice President of Pan Am, and Kenneth S. Norris, famed marine biologist of U.C.L.A.

When completed, the park will not be an aquarium. Tap, as Pryor is called, winced at the sound of the word. The 300,000 gallon main pool, designed after Frank Lloyd Wright's coiled-path Guggenheim Art Museum in New York, will permit the strolling visitor to descend from a bird's eye view of the surface-loving fish to the spooky depths of coral caves infested with razor-toothed morays--without getting wet or, for that matter, devoured.

Dozens of different species will make of the tank a realistic cross-section of life in these waters. We asked Tap what would prevent the bigger exhibits from eating the smaller exhibits.

"They will, for a while," he said with a grin. "But after a time this tank will become a kind of welfare state. We'll be feeding all of them so well that they'll prefer to get their food from us rather than by the old strenuous method of going hunting for it."

Elsewhere in the park will be a shark pool, a glassed-in porpoise theater, a big open seawater pool for whales and spinning porpoises like Haole, a pool for seals, sea turtles and sea birds, replicas of the square-rigged ship Pequod and the french Frigate Shoal, and an area where visitors may watch underwater activities off nearby Rabbit Island by a means of television cameras located on the ocean floor.

Pryor and his associates, including two blond-bearded mammal trainers named Chris Varez and Garry Andersen, and a pretty trainer named Dotty Sampson, a tiny girl who swims with tons of blubber, are teaching their pupils astounding tricks.
Porpoises and dolphins, responding to electronically simulated mammal sounds, leap and twist in the air, jump over hurdles, swim together in perfect symmetry.

They are being taught to locate objects as small as a BB shot, though blindfolded. The bottle nosed dolphins are learning not to expect a fish to be thrown to them after every trick but to accept a large wooden "poker chip" instead, stack the chips until they have ten of them, then cash them in for a smelt.

They'll be running this state before long.
WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

As a child, I looked forward to parades and the proud display of our flag. We always stood at attention and saluted our flag and without fail experienced a lump in our throats. But people tell me times have changed and that we have a new America.

And what of this new America? Can we love this nation as fiercely and passionately as we did in those dark days of the early 1940's when we resolved to cleanse the world—once and for all—of totalitarianism in all its evil forms?

Have we suffered the deep, visceral pains of total disillusionment and ultimate cynicism as we saw another and yet another great totalitarian power threaten our dominant position in the postwar years?

Yes— we have known great disillusionment. But we have not become a nation of cynics. We have not because we have a great, yet simple, heritage. It is the heritage of hope. We have believed in our future since the very beginning of our history. We have believed in it and we have never stopped believing in it.

It is this indomitable spirit of America—a thing of astonishing vigor, endurance, and confidence, that binds me inseparably to her. It is this unquenchable spirit in our people which pours forth as a great river to irrigate the potential deserts of the soul and to keep the flowers of spring eternally
BLOOMING THERE.

BUT OUR AMERICA TODAY IS NOT THE SAME AMERICA WE KNEW TWO DECADES--OR EVEN ONE DECADE AGO.

WE USED TO SPEAK OF SOMETHING "AS AMERICAN AS APPLE PIE." WE KNEW HOW TO "WIELD A BIG STICK IN WORLD AFFAIRS AND WE SAID TO IT THAT OUR DAUGHTERS STAYED CLOSE TO THE KITCHEN UNTIL IT WAS TIME FOR THEM TO MARRY AND BEAR CHILDREN.

THIS USED TO BE A LAND WHERE A LYNCHING WAS SOMETHING WE READ ABOUT IN A HEARST SUNDAY SUPPLEMENT, WEEKS OR MONTHS AFTER IT HAPPENED. SOMEHOW IT WAS NEVER CLOSE TO HOME.

THIS USED TO BE A LAND WHERE WE TAUGHT A MAN NAMED AL SMITH THAT A CATHOLIC COULD NEVER ASPIRE TO BE PRESIDENT.

THIS USED TO BE A LAND WHERE A MAN WHO SUGGESTED THAT HITLER'S "PEOPLE'S CAR" WOULD BECOME THE MOST POPULAR FOREIGN CAR IN AMERICA WOULD HAVE BEEN LAUGHED OUT OF THE COUNTRY.

THIS USED TO BE A LAND WHERE IT WAS GENERALLY BELIEVED THAT EVERYTHING THAT COULD BE DONE FOR THE AMERICAN NEGRO HAD BEEN DONE BY AN AMERICAN PRESIDENT NAMED ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

THE POINT I AM TRYING TO MAKE IS ALL TOO OBVIOUS. PERHAPS I AM THE BEST POINT OF ALL--AN AMERICAN OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

AMERICA HAS TAKEN GIANT STEPS TOWARD MATURITY IN RECENT DECADES. BUT MATURITY IS NOT TO BE CONFUSED WITH OLD AGE OR SENILITY. HER MUSCLES ARE JUST AS STRONG AND SUPPLE AS EVER--BUT HER VISION IS A LITTLE KEENER, HER DECISIONS, I THINK, A
LITTLE WISER.

TODAY WE SEND OUR SONS AND DAUGHTERS OUT TO THE BARRIOS OF THE PHILIPPINES, THE NATIVE VILLAGES OF NIGERIA, FAR UP THE CROCODILE-INFESTED RIVERS OF BORNEO TO DO VOLUNTARY WORK FOR OUR PEACE CORPS. INSTEAD OF FLAGS AND GUNS THEY BRING BOOKS AND UNDERSTANDING FOR THE UNEDUCATED, AND THE GENTLE HAND OF MERCY AND COMPASSION FOR THE SICK.

TODAY WE FIND OUR FIRST CATHOLIC PRESIDENT LEADING A CAMPAIGN TO GUARANTEED CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE AMERICAN NEGRO, AND POSSIBLY JEOPARDIZING HIS OWN POLITICAL FUTURE IN THE PROCESS.

WITH ALL THESE CHANGES, AND I HAVE NAMED BUT A FEW, WE HAVE LIVED AND PROGRESSED WITH THE DARK KNOWLEDGE THAT WHOLE NATIONS CAN NOW BE ANNIHILATED IN A PUSH-BUTTON WAR. BUT DURING THIS PERIOD WE POURED BILLIONS INTO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES, AGAIN DEMONSTRATING OUR GREAT FAITH AND HOPE IN THE FUTURE OF NOT ONLY OUR NATION, BUT THE FUTURE OF OUR WORLD--THE WORLD WE LIVE IN AND THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN IT.

EVEN MORE THAN THIS--WE HAVE BORNE CHILDREN INTO THIS WORLD BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT GIVEN AN ADEQUATE OPPORTUNITY, THEY CAN SURPASS OUR OWN ACHIEVEMENTS, EVEN AS WE SURPASSED THOSE OF OUR FATHERS.

AS A PEOPLE TODAY OUR INTERESTS HAVE BROADENED IMMENSELY. WE ARE ONLY NOW ENTERING AN ERA UNPRECEDENTED IN THE FIELD OF
COMMUNICATIONS. WE ARE NOW ABLE TO SEE AN EVENT WHEN IT TAKES PLACE IN MANY PARTS OF THE WORLD. BUT MORE IMPORTANT, BECAUSE WE ARE BETTER EDUCATED, WE ARE BETTER ABLE TO INTERPRET AND DRAW CONCLUSIONS FROM SUCH EVENTS—INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS—which tend to influence the course of our ship of state in a more desirable manner.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION WHICH HAS BECOME LAW IN RECENT TIMES AS WELL AS PROPOSED LEGISLATION WHICH ALREADY HAS WIDESPREAD ACCEPTANCE—INDICATES BEYOND ANY DOUBT THAT WE HAVE DEVELOPED A MUCH GREATER INTEREST IN, AND A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR, THE WELFARE OF OUR FELLOW MAN.

WE HAVE COME TO ACCEPT THE FACT THAT THERE ARE TIMES WHEN EVEN OUR SACRED CONSTITUTION MUST BE INTERPRETED IN THE LIGHT OF THE TIMES WE LIVE IN AND IN TERMS OF A SOCIETY WHOSE VERY COMPLEXITY WAS NEVER ENVISIONED BY OUR FOUNDING FATHERS.

OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM, DESPITE THE SHIFTING SURFACE PATTERNS, HAS SURVIVED THE TEST OF TIME. AND YET WE STRIVE FOR STILL A BETTER SYSTEM BY SUCH MEANS AS REAPPORTIONMENT TO ENSURE EQUAL REPRESENTATION FOR ALL.

TODAY WE LOOK TO THE MOON AND THE PLANETS WITH A SENSE OF CONFIDENCE THAT SOME DAY—AND A DAY NOT TOO DISTANT—ONE OF US OR ONE OF OUR CHILDREN WILL SET FOOT ON THOSE STRANGE AND ALIEN SOILS.
BUT THIS IS NOT WHAT MAKES AMERICA GREAT. RATHER IT IS THE SPIRITUAL SENSE OF AMERICA WHICH REACHES OUT EVEN BEYOND THE STARS AND INTO ETERNITY. IT IS THIS GREAT YEARNING FOR A BETTER TOMORROW--A YEARNING FOUNDED UPON THE LOVE OF GOD AS WELL AS THE LOVE OF FELLOW MAN--IT IS THIS YEARNING WHICH HAS BROUGHT AMERICA TO HER FINEST HOUR.

AMERICA TODAY IS BETTER THAN IT EVER WAS AND WE, AS AMERICANS, ARE BETTER EQUIPPED TO FACE THE FUTURE. IF THIS IS A LAND FOUNDED ON HOPE AND CONFIDENCE, THEN WE WERE NEVER MORE HOPEFUL--NEVER MORE CONFIDENT.

IF THIS WAS TO BE A LAND OF PROMISE, THEN I SAY IT HAS EXCEEDED ALL EXPECTATIONS.

IF THIS NATION IS THE HOPE OF THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD, THEN I SAY IT SHALL NOT FAIL.

OUR NATION WILL SURVIVE SO LONG AS ITS SPIRIT LIVES--AND ITS SPIRIT IS ONE OF LIVE EVERLASTING.

THIS, THEN, IS WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME.
My dear Friends:

Contrary to the outcry of many of our critics, I firmly believe that this session of the United States Congress is destined to be a most historic one. In addition to the perennial problems involving appropriations, agriculture, public works, defense, natural resources, public health and education, we in the Senate are presently faced with the following grave problems:

First, legislation to resolve the threatened railroad strike; second, the President's tax program; third, the long over-due civil rights legislation; and, fourth, and most recently, the ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

Because of the gravity of this limited test ban treaty, I would like to spend a few moments with you to discuss this matter.

The first important article of this treaty provides that upon its signing and ratification, the signatory nations -- the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Soviet Union -- will immediately cease all testing and firing of nuclear and thermo-nuclear devices in the atmosphere, outer space and underwater. It should be noted that the prohibition of testing does not extend to underground firings. However, these underground tests shall be carried on in a manner whereby radioactive debris and nuclear fallout will not extend beyond the territorial limits of the testing nations.

Another article provides that amendments may be made to the treaty provided all three signatory nations -- the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain -- and 50 per cent of the participating nations agree to such amendments. In other words, the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, will all have the veto power. If we feel that any given amendment will be contrary to the national interests of our country, we may exercise this veto. At the same time, it should be noted that under this proposed treaty, Great Britain and the Soviet Union may also exercise their respective vetoes for the same reasons
relative to the interests of their country. And, furthermore, any amendment to the treaty will be subject to ratification by the United States Senate.

The third significant article relates to withdrawal from the treaty. This article provides that any nation which feels compelled to withdraw from the treaty because of circumstances contrary to national interests and security, may do so upon giving the other two signatory nations a written notice of 90 days. However, like all international treaties, the abrogation of the conditions by one nation will result in the immediate termination of the treaty itself. In other words, if the Soviet Union should suddenly resume testing, it will mean that at that instance, the United States and Great Britain and all other participating nations will no longer be subject to the treaty provisions.

It should also be noted that the treaty provides that all regimes, states and governments may participate in the treaty. Therefore, there may be a possibility that nations not presently recognized by the United States may participate. However, I wish to emphasize that the participation by a non-recognized nation will not in any way mean diplomatic recognition by our country.

To be more specific, if Communist China should eventually decide to join the other nations in signing this treaty, it will not mean that upon such signing the United States grants recognition, diplomatic or otherwise, to Red China.

I realize that the foregoing has been brief and rather sketchy; however, because of the limitation of time, I have indicated only the most salient points. The question now arises; How should I, as a member of the United States Senate vote on the ratification of this treaty?

Deeply aware of my responsibilities, I wish to indicate to you that I am presently strongly inclined to vote for the ratification of this treaty. I would naturally prefer to be much more definitive; however, as you know, we have just begun our Senate Committee hearings.

For example, before leaving Washington, I participated in executive or secret sessions listening to the testimony and participating in the interrogation of persons such as Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Under Secretary Averell Harriman and several scientists who are presently in charge of the nuclear program of the United States.
In addition to these witnesses, we are presently scheduled to hear the testimony of many other key figures, such as the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, scientists of National and International renown, members of the Disarmament Agency and officials of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Upon completion of all our hearings, deliberations and debates, if I find myself personally convinced that the treaty will reasonably and adequately safeguard the national interests of our people, then I will do everything to seek its successful ratification. After digesting the testimony I have heard to date, and all the secret documents I have been privileged to read, I wish to advise you that if I were to cast my vote now, I would certainly cast my vote in favor of ratification. However, I feel that before making my final decision, a decision which will in all likelihood affect the future and well-being of our nation and the world, I must with all deliberateness consider every aspect of the problem -- military, moral, political and international and listen to all the testimony available.

Unlike some in our nation, I cannot irrationally and arbitrarily refuse to consider the treaty. Some have advocated that the United States should not enter into any treaty with the Russians at any time. They claim that the Russians would never have concluded this treaty if it were not to their advantage. They also claim that the Russians would never hesitate to break a treaty if it is to their advantage. Thus, the United States should not ratify this treaty. I must admit that the Soviet's past record in this regard is not especially encouraging. But if our nation were to assume a position of intransigence, it would mean that we will be closing the door forever to discussions which could bring about relaxation in the Cold War and world tensions.

There will be advantages to the United States and to the world. Undoubtedly, there will be certain risks; but if the advantages far outweigh the risks, then I say that the Senate should join in the ratification. As the President of the United States pointed out, the acceptance of this treaty by the three nations could serve as the most significant step taken by the most powerful nations towards the relaxation of world tensions, towards the hopefully prayed for world peace, and towards a guarantee that future generations will not be required to make costly installments in genetics to thermonuclear experiments today.

Let me point out that if the Senate should decide to approve this treaty, there is no reason to assume that we in the Senate have suddenly become naive to the Communist threat. We do not for a moment believe
that the Soviets have definitely changed their designs for world conquest. Nor do we believe that they have become soft and amenable.

In the same vein, it should not be assumed that we ourselves have suddenly become weak, that we have forgotten our commitment to the essentials of democracy, that we have been duped by clever Soviet diplomats. We will continue to be militarily, economically, and morally strong; we will always remember the goals we strive for and the goals which the Soviet Union denies to her captive nations; we will not forget the fact that the Soviets have a past history of diplomatic duplicity.

We will continue to oppose the Soviet Union's open design for world conquest. We are confident that in the struggle between Communism and the United States, we will emerge victorious, not by means of nuclear annihilation, but by economic, moral and intellectual supremacy.

But in all my considerations on the test ban treaty, I shall be constantly mindful of the future which we have promised to preserve for our children and our children's children. I shall be mindful of the fact that this promise of a future is meaningless if we simultaneously bequeath to them radioactive pollution of the very air they will breathe, the food they will eat, and the water they will drink. This legacy of contamination, I am not willing to leave.

I will concede that different scientists have differing views on the extent of radioactive fallout danger to the human species as a result of continuing tests. But I have yet to hear a responsible man of science tell me that a little fallout is good for whatever ails you. Any fallout, from brand "A" to brand "X", is not conducive to the health of the human organism. Any man, woman, or child in any country exposed to any brand of radioactivity for a prolonged period will inevitably suffer, no matter what ideological line he or she professes to follow.

In my study of the treaty, I shall also be guided by the conviction that the secrets of thermonuclear fission cannot be perpetually locked from the rest of the world.

The chain reaction first ignited by the United States on the sands of Alamogordo, has reached across the Siberian wastelands of the Soviet Union, tropical Christmas Island in the Pacific, and the Desert of the Sahara. From what our learned scientists tell us, it is due to reverberate in the hinterlands of Red China in the near future.
How soon will we see the ominous mushroom clouds over the horizons of other nations? We will see it as certainly as we now see the setting sun. We will see it just as soon as these countries reach scientific maturity and technical competence. Yes, we will see it so long as there is no test ban agreement among the leaders of the world.

But, by then, it may be too late. In the collective quest for military security, the world might be just a step away from total annihilation. In chasing the thermonuclear tiger's tail, we may all just melt away.

I feel that this test ban treaty among the three great powers of the world today may have a salutary effect not only amongst the signatory nations but upon the nuclear ambitions of the entire world. At least, I think that this is a legitimate hope.

The President has said that the test ban treaty is a step in the right direction, although a very small step. A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a first step, he has further said. I wish to paraphrase that saying by suggesting that the first step is always taken by the leader to mark a trail for others to follow.

I wish to assure you that the Senate's final decision will be based upon many, many hours and days of study, deliberation and consideration. Let us pray that our nation will be able to take this significant step towards the abolition of the threat of annihilation by nuclear war. We owe this to ourselves, to our children, and to mankind in general. Thank you very much.
MY DEAR FRIENDS:

THIS SESSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS IS DESTINED TO BE A MOST HISTORIC ONE. IN ADDITION TO THE PERENNIAL PROBLEMS INVOLVING APPROPRIATIONS, AGRICULTURE, PUBLIC WORKS, DEFENSE, NATURAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC HEALTH, WE IN THE SENATE ARE PRESENTLY FACED WITH THE FOLLOWING GRAVE PROBLEMS:

FIRST, LEGISLATION TO RESOLVE THE THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE:

BECAUSE OF THE GRAVITY OF THIS LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY, I WOULD LIKE TO SPEND A FEW MOMENTS WITH YOU TO DISCUSS THIS MATTER.

THE IMPORTANT ARTICLES OF THIS PROPOSED TREATY PROVIDE THAT UPON ITS SIGNING AND RATIFICATION, THE SIGNATORY NATIONS--THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND THE SOVIET UNION-- WILL IMMEDIATELY CEASE ALL TESTING AND FIRING OF NUCLEAR AND THERMO-NUCLEAR DEVICES IN THE ATMOSPHERE, OUTER SPACE AND UNDERWATER. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE PROHIBITION OF TESTING DOES NOT EXTEND TO UNDERGROUND FIRINGS. HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT AGREEMENT WAS HAD THAT UNDERGROUND TESTS SHALL BE CARRIED ON IN A MANNER WHEREBY RADIOACTIVE DEBRIS AND
NUCLEAR FALLOUT WILL NOT EXTEND BEYOND THE TERRITORIAL LIMITS OF THE SIGNATORY NATIONS.

THE TREATY ALSO PROVIDES THAT ALL NATIONS OF THIS WORLD MAY EVENTUALLY JOIN THE SIGNATORY NATIONS IN ABIDING WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY.

ANOTHER ARTICLE PROVIDES THAT AMENDMENTS MAY BE MADE TO THE TREATY PROVIDED ALL THREE SIGNATORY NATIONS—UNITED STATES, THE SOVIET UNION AND GREAT BRITAIN—AND 50 PER CENT OF THE PARTICIPATING NATIONS AGREE TO SUCH AMENDMENTS. IN OTHER WORDS, THE UNITED STATES, GREAT BRITAIN AND THE SOVIET UNION, WILL ALL HAVE THE VETO POWER. IF WE FEEL THAT ANY GIVEN AMENDMENT WILL BE CONTRARY TO THE NATIONAL INTERESTS OF OUR COUNTRY, WE MAY EXERCISE THIS VETO. AT THE SAME TIME, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT UNDER THIS PROPOSED TREATY, GREAT BRITAIN AND THE SOVIET UNION MAY ALSO EXERCISE THEIR RESPECTIVE VETOES. AND, FURTHERMORE, ANY AMENDMENT TO THE TREATY WILL BE SUBJECT TO RATIFICATION BY THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

THE THIRD SIGNIFICANT ARTICLE RELATES TO WITHDRAWAL FROM THE TREATY. THIS ARTICLE PROVIDES THAT ANY NATION WHICH FEELS COMPELLED TO WITHDRAW FROM THE TREATY BECAUSE OF CIRCUMSTANCES CONTRARY TO NATIONAL INTERESTS AND SECURITY, MAY DO SO UPON GIVING THE OTHER TWO SIGNATORY NATIONS A WRITTEN NOTICE OF 90 days. HOWEVER, LIKE ALL INTERNATIONAL TREATIES, THE ABROGATION OF THE CONDITIONS BY ONE NATION WILL RESULT IN THE IMMEDIATE TERMINATION OF THE TREATY ITSELF. IN OTHER WORDS, IF THE SOVIET UNION SHOULD
SUDDENLY RESUME TESTING, IT WILL MEAN THAT AT THAT INSTANCE, THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN AND ALL OTHER PARTICIPATING NATIONS WILL NO LONGER BE SUBJECT TO THE TREATY PROVISIONS.

IT SHOULD ALSO BE NOTED THAT THE TREATY PROVIDES, AS INDICATED EARLIER, THAT ALL REGIMES, STATES AND GOVERNMENTS MAY PARTICIPATE IN THE TREATY. THEREFORE, THERE MAY BE A POSSIBILITY THAT NATIONS NOT PRESENTLY RECOGNIZED BY THE UNITED STATES MAY PARTICIPATE. HOWEVER, PLEASE BE ASSURED THAT THE PARTICIPATION BY A NON-RECOGNIZED NATION WILL NOT IN ANY WAY MEAN DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION BY OUR COUNTRY.

TO BE MORE SPECIFIC, IF COMMUNIST CHINA SHOULD DECIDE TO JOIN THE OTHER NATIONS IN SIGNING THIS TREATY, IT WILL NOT MEAN THAT UPON SUCH SIGNING THE UNITED STATES GRANTS RECOGNITION, DIPLOMATIC OR OTHERWISE, TO RED CHINA.

I REALIZE THAT THE FOREGOING HAS BEEN BRIEF AND RATHER SKETCHY; HOWEVER, BECAUSE OF THE LIMITATION OF TIME, THIS WILL HAVE TO SUFFICE AT THIS TIME. THE QUESTION NOW ARISES: HOW SHOULD I, AS A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE VOTE ON THE RATIFICATION OF THIS TREATY?

DEEPLY AWARE OF MY RESPONSIBILITIES, I WISH TO INDICATE TO THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII THAT I AM PRESENTLY STRONGLY INCLINED TO VOTE FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THIS TREATY. I WOULD NATURALLY PREFER TO BE MUCH MORE DEFINITIVE: HOWEVER, AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE JUST BEGUN OUR SENATE COMMITTEE HEARINGS.
EXAMPLE, AS OF THIS MOMENT, I HAVE PARTICIPATED IN EXECUTIVE OR SECRET SESSIONS LISTENING TO THE TESTIMONY AND PARTICIPATING IN THE INTERROGATION OF PERSONS SUCH AS SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK, UNDER SECRETARY AVERELL HARRIMAN AND SEVERAL SCIENTISTS WHO ARE PRESENTLY IN CHARGE OF THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES.

IN ADDITION TO THESE WITNESSES, WE ARE PRESENTLY SCHEDULED TO HEAR THE TESTIMONY OF MANY OTHER IMPORTANT PEOPLE SUCH AS THE MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, SCIENTISTS OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL REKEN 'N AND MEMBERS OF THE DISARMAMENT AGENCY.

UPON COMPLETION OF OUR HEARINGS, DELIBERATIONS AND DEBATES, IF I FIND MYSELF PERSONALLY CONVINCED THAT THE TREATY WILL REASONABLY AND ADEQUATELY SAFEGUARD THE NATIONAL INTERESTS OF OUR PEOPLE, YOU MAY BE ASSURED THAT I WILL DO EVERYTHING TO SEEK ITS SUCCESSFUL RATIFICATION. I FEEL MOST CERTAIN THAT IN YOUR APPROVAL OF MY CANDIDACY FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE, YOU DID NOT EXPECT ME TO FOLLOW 'LINDLY THE POLICIES OR DIRECTIONS OF ANY ADMINISTRATION WHETHER IT BE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN, ESPECIALLY IN A MATTER OF THIS SERIOUSNESS AND GRAVITY. I FEEL THAT BEFORE MAKING ANY DECISION, A DECISION WHICH WILL IN ALL LIKELIHOOD AFFECT THE FUTURE AND WELL-BEING OF OUR NATION... AND WORLD, I MUST WITH ALL DELIBERATENESS CONSIDER EVERY ASPECT OF THE PROBLEM—MILITARY, MORAL, POLITICAL AND INTERNATIONAL.
HOWEVER, UNLIKE SOME IN OUR NATION, I CAN'T IRRATIONALITY AND ARBITRARILY REFUSE TO CONSIDER THE TREATY. SOME HAVE ADVOCATED THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT ENTER INTO ANY TREATY WITH THE RUSSIANS AT ANY TIME. IF OUR NATION WERE TO TAKE THIS STAND, IT WOULD MEAN THAT WE WILL BE CLOSING THE DOOR TO DISCUSSIONS WHICH I FEEL SHOULD BE KEPT OPEN IF WE ARE TO BRING ABOUT ANY RELAXATION IN WORLD TENSIONS, OR IF WE ARE HOPEFUL OF EFFECTIVELY PURSUING THE GOAL OF WORLD PEACE.


PLEASE BE ASSURED THAT MY FINAL DECISION WILL BE BASED UPON MANY, MANY HOURS AND DAYS OF STUDY, DELIBERATION AND CONSIDERATION. LET US PRAY THAT OUR NATION WILL BE ABLE TO TAKE THIS SIGNIFICANT STEP TOWARDS THE ABOLITION OF THE THREAT OF ANNIHILATION BY NUCLEAR WAR. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
AUGUST 6, 1963

The following statement was submitted today to the Senate Commerce Committee by Senator Daniel K. Inouye.

STATEMENT OF
SENIOR DANIEL K. INOUYE
RE S. 1732
THE PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS BILL

As one of the co-sponsors of this bill, I am pleased to make a statement in support of it. The necessity of guaranteeing the civil rights of all American citizens has captured the imagination of the entire country, and made it a paramount issue in this session of Congress.

The bill to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations, S. 1732, hits directly at one of the most basic issues of the current civil rights crisis. Although questions of equal opportunities to vote, to get a good job, to live in a decent neighborhood, and to go to a good school are all important aspects of the civil rights problem, it is in such places of ostensible public accommodation as segregated restaurants, segregated theaters, segregated hotels, segregated department stores and segregated lunch counters that the daily insult of discrimination is imposed upon minorities.

There has been a great deal of debate about whether or not this bill is constitutional. Far too little has been said about whether or not it is right. As far as I am concerned the right of all Americans to use public accommodations equally is perfectly self-evident. I know the vast majority of Americans also feel that this is self-evident. A recent poll published in the Washington Post
shows that 74 percent of Americans felt that the Federal Government should guarantee the right to use public accommodations to all citizens.

In this issue, human rights are paramount, not states' rights or property rights alone. When we talk about states' rights we forget that they have no value as an end, but only as a means of protecting personal rights, supposedly against the federal government. As a Senator from a small and isolated state, I am certainly concerned about states' rights, and I voted to preserve Rule 22 because I felt that this was a necessary protection for states' and minority rights. I think that it would be far better if the states and localities were willing to take the necessary action to prevent discrimination. The record of recent years clearly indicates, however, that some of our states simply are not willing to protect these basic human rights. If the states default, then the federal government must act.

The apparent conflict between property rights and human rights may have been overdrawn in some quarters. Property is valuable only because it is useful in the "pursuit of happiness." The right of property is not an absolute one, and we have long recognized that property rights, if they are used for coercion or to destroy freedom, must be limited. The Sherman Act is just one example of how property rights have been so limited. Western history is replete with such controls over property.

This bill applies only to those businesses which profess to serve the public convenience. I do not think it is such a terrible imposition to ask these businessmen to serve everyone, regardless of personal preference.
Of course these preferences are based on attitudes, and it is a truism to say that we cannot legislate attitudes or morality. Everyone knows this. But the government can make certain that these attitudes and moral beliefs do not result in actions which are extremely insulting and degrading to minority groups. That is all that this bill does.

Furthermore, although the state cannot make men moral, it can do much to create social conditions in which they are able to develop a responsible moral character for themselves.

With regard to the Constitutional question, lawyers who are a great deal more skillful than I have argued that an approach based on either the 14th Amendment or the Commerce Clause, or both, would be Constitutional. I am much more concerned that we should pass the strongest possible bill and that this should be done by both parties, united in a common effort to guarantee civil rights. There is no room for partisanship in this issue, for both parties must be vitally concerned with making certain that the philosophy that "...all men are created equal..." remains the philosophy of our great nation.
Mr. President:

As the newest State in our great nation, Hawaii is considered by most Americans as the land that furnishes pineapples for their tables, a vacation spot to get away from the humdrum of their daily routine or the site of one of our mightiest military bases, Pearl Harbor.

The American people conceive of Hawaii as a land of lush vegetations, of brown-skinned men and women riding surfboards off sandy beaches on the rolling swells of the Pacific, of blue skies and warm tropical winds.

Rarely, however, is Hawaii's place in American industrial life, and the State's contribution to the country's space efforts considered, and it is with some pride that I point today to our new and growing aerospace industry.

The strategic location of the Hawaiian Islands in the geographic center of the vast Pacific Missile Range has opened up new scientific horizons for the Hawaiian people. Although numerous island companies, such as Hawaiian Telephone Company with its interest in Satellite communications and Hawaiian Electric's continuing concern with new power sources show great promise in the exploitation of space and science, today's major...
commercial link with the nation's multi-billion dollar aerospace business is Kentron Hawaii, Limited, a State of Hawaii chartered company with close family ties to Ling-Temco-Vought of Dallas, Texas, one of the acknowledged leaders in the nation's aerospace industry.

Kentron has succeeded in establishing a Hawaiian Company which combines years of technical experience of its Dallas parent Chance Vought, with the rapidly expanding scientific potential of the Islands' people. In cooperation with local technical schools and the University of Hawaii, this organization has within the short span of two years been able to transform a small electronics repair facility into a multi-million dollar aerospace company employing some 70% local island people and bringing to the mid Pacific the identical calibre of engineering services available anywhere in the nation.

And, I am proud to point out that this Hawaiian organization plays an important and diverse role in space operations in the Pacific. As a prime technical contractor to the U. S. Navy administered Pacific Missile Range, Kentron operates and maintains the all important National Aeronautics and Space Administration Tracking Station at Kokee Park on the island of Kauai. It was Astronaut Scott Carpenter who described the Kokee Station after the recent Gordon Cooper flight, "The best group in the best station of them all."
On this garden island of Kauai, the company also operates for the U. S. Navy its complicated fleet training center at Barking Sands. Moving westward to the Kwajalein Atoll, in mid Pacific, Kentron is the technical contractor for the Pacific Missile Range facilities in support of the Army-sponsored Nike Zeus anti-missile program. These activities include the technical communication services, the largest and most modern film processing center in the Pacific, a tracking control and instrumentation complex which extends to the outer islands of Ennylabegan, Gugeegue and Roi-Namur. In Honolulu the company maintains the only commercial primary type standards laboratory in the entire Pacific with precision directly traceable to the National Bureau of Standards. This facility serves the various national and state government agencies and the mid Pacific business community, including the calibration and repair of the vast complex of precise instrumentation required in the Pacific Missile Range.

Our new state is tuning in on this adolescent industry. The business planners are acutely aware of the necessity of supplementing the traditional economies of agriculture and tourism with more stable growth enterprises. The space electronics field attracts the calibre of new residents that we desire. New emphasis is being placed on science and engineering in our educational institutions. In coordination with such companies as Hawaiian Telephone, Hawaiian Electric, Kaiser Industries, and Kentron, the island government is exploring the possibility of
establishment of a research and development center which will exploit the advantages of Hawaii's geography, and natural environment.

In short, the people of Hawaii are actively participating in our nation's space and scientific activities and look to the future with confidence that their State will play an ever increasing role. I salute the new technically oriented youth of Hawaii and the spirit of aggressive cooperation with which Kentron Hawaii, Limited, has blended the high calibre of technical services supplied to the U. S. Government and industry for some forty years by the Chance Vought Corp. with the inherent capabilities of our Island people. Together they offer the nation a new technical capability in the Pacific which holds great promise for the future economic development of the State of Hawaii.
Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request permission to present the following statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee concerning the budget of the East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii.

The Center has been put through the appropriations wringer. That is the long and the short of it. But let me cite the following facts and figures to show what was requested for which specific phase of the Center program, and what was eliminated in House action.

The Center requested a total of $6,345,000 for administration and operation of the East-West Center for Fiscal Year 1964. That figure was reduced to $5,690,000 as a result of discussions with the Bureau of the Budget. The final budget, as presented by the President, recommended the same amount. This was then believed the minimum operating budget necessary to carry out the various programs of the Center.

In House action, that amount was further reduced to $4,460,000, or a net reduction of $1,230,000 from the minimum $5,690,000 considered necessary to run the Center effectively.

The Center is asking the Senate to restore $1,147,500 of the $1,230,000 eliminated by the House. This restoration figure is absolutely imperative if the Center is to carry out its tasks as originally
conceived in Chapter 7 of PL 86-472 in 1960.

In terms of specific programs, the House cut of $1,230,000 was prorated in the following manner:

1. **$542,000** was eliminated from the President's request for **$2,002,000** for Operations. Thus we now have **$1,460,000**. (The same amount was allocated for Fiscal Year 1963.)

2. **$388,000** was eliminated from the President's request for **$3,388,000** for Scholarships and Grants. Thus we now have **$3,000,000**. ($5,425,000 was allocated for Fiscal Year 1963)

3. **$300,000** was eliminated from the President's request for **$300,000** for Construction Planning funds. There is nothing left here. ($1,455,000 was allocated for Fiscal Year 1963)

The restoration figure of **$1,147,500** being requested can be prorated as follows for the three programs:

1. **$534,100** of the **$542,000** cut for Operations.

2. **$313,400** of the **$388,000** cut for Scholarships and Grants.

3. **$300,000** of the **$300,000** cut for Construction Planning.

What effect would each of these cuts have in the specific program areas?

1. A **$542,000** cut for Operations would mean that the various supporting activities for students, scholars, technical trainees, and conference participants would have to be maintained at or below the FY 1963 level. Of course, no further development would be possible.
Supporting activities here means selection and screening procedures for student grantees from both the United States and Asia, academic advising on curriculum problems and special language instruction once these grantees arrive at the Center. It also means collection and cataloguing of various research material, translation services, and research assistance for members of the Senior Scholar program. It further means administrative and housekeeping assistance to participants at conferences and symposia conducted by the Center. Finally, it means maintaining the buildings and facilities required by each of the foregoing activities.

Although the House has actually held the Center to the FY 63 dollar amount level, there is contemplated a significant increase in the total number of students, scholars, trainees, and conference participants for FY 64 in line with original program development plans laid down in 1960-61 and as a result of success in running previous programs. In FY 64, 100 technical trainees or about 50 more than FY 63 are expected. In FY 64, 30 Senior Scholars are expected in comparison to the 20 in FY 63. 50 per cent more conference participants are expected in FY 64 as against FY 63.

In addition, the FY 63 dollar amount level to which the Center is held by the House does not take into account the fact that the new buildings recently occupied must now be maintained. A conservative
estimate places the cost of upkeep and maintenance for the Center complex at $40,000 for FY 64.

In certain program areas, the House reduction would result in substantial program reductions. Collecting of original publications of Asia and the Pacific area would have to operate with a budget reduced from $172,000 to $75,000. The holding of various conferences with participants from Asia and the United States would be limited by a reduction from $45,000 to $25,000. Printing and publishing the results of research and discussions would be reduced from $40,000 to $18,280. Official travel allowances for all administrative officers to the United States and Asia for purposes ranging from academic liaison with university officials to conferences with governmental and private agencies working together with the Center would be reduced from $67,650 to $20,000.

The Center believes that at least $534,100 of the $542,000 cut by the House should be restored to enable such programs to continue and to develop. As the attached material will indicate, much has been accomplished so far. Much needs to be accomplished.

2. A $388,400 reduction in Scholarships and Grants, with the proviso that "no funds have been provided for senior scholar grants," means a cut in the jugular veins of the Center, the Senior Scholar program and
the Institute of Advanced Projects.

The reduction by the House means that 20 grants to Asian-Pacific area scholars and 10 grants to American scholars at $16,000 each for a twelve month period have been completely eliminated.

Although a strong case can be made that $16,000 for a twelve month period for established Senior Scholars in Asia and the United States is not out of line with other grants being offered and with salaries presently being received, I respectfully urge reconsideration of the House cut to enable the same proportionate number of Senior Scholars to accept grants at $13,500 each for a similar period. In short, I am willing to face up to a $75,000 reduction from the President's budget in order to retain the Senior Scholar program, which, incidentally, has been viewed by many Asian and American experts in the field as the heart of the Center complex.

Thus far, 38 Senior Scholars from both the Asian-Pacific area and the United States have had the opportunity to work together on problems of mutual concern such as public administration procedures for developing countries, public health administration and educational planning. 30 Senior Scholars have been committed for 63-64 representing the United States and 14 countries of Asia and the Pacific. Attached is a detailed report of the activities of the Senior Scholars program.

At the Tenth Pacific Science Congress held in Honolulu, a group of
consultants reported that their greatest interest in the Center lay "in the Institute of Advanced Projects. In fact, our most forceful impression is that the future success of the Center is intimately bound up with its development." The House reduction, which actually eliminates this Senior Scholar program, seriously cripples the Institute of Advanced Projects of which it is a basic component.

3. A $300,000 reduction in Construction Planning money completely eliminates funds for the planning of an Institute of Advanced Projects building and a Residence Apartment for married students. $225,000 was originally requested for the Advanced Projects building and $75,000 for the Residence Apartment.

Right now, the Senior Scholars are housed in temporary quarters scattered in various parts of the Center building complex. Research facilities for these Scholars are practically non-existent. Library resources are extremely limited. The Institute of Advanced Projects building would have remedied this situation. If my argument for restoration of the Senior Scholar program is sound, then the argument for restoration of funds for planning of a building to house the personnel and facilities must also be a sound one.

I think that anyone familiar with American college campuses today recognizes a prevailing biological and sociological fact of life among our graduate students. The majority of them pursue academic
interests concomitantly with connubial bliss. Graduate students at
the Center from both the continental United States and Asia are no
different in this regard. However, heretofore, these students were
not permitted to bring their spouses due to inadequate facilities. Such
separations worked undue hardships on both partners. Restoration of
the $75,000 for a Residence Apartment would help solve this problem.

If I were to list the order of priority for the two projects mentioned
above, I would have to say the Institute of Advanced Projects building.
In fact, I am willing to suffer the slings and arrows of outraged pas-
sion by going along with the House cut on the Residence Apartment,
if this would mean saving the Institute of Advanced Projects building.

Although the Center suffers from lack of press agentry and the right
kind of rotogravure coverage, let me assure you that the East-West
Center has rapidly developed into one of the most promising instru-
ments for establishment of United States prestige overseas. Where
the Peace Corps is involved with the barrios of the Philippines, the
Center is involved with present and potential government, educational,
labor and industrial leaders in Manila, Bangkok, Saigon, and Rangoon.

I think enough of the East-West Center program's contribution to the
American image overseas in Asia and the Pacific area, to make an
urgent plea for restoration of funds as outlined above.
REVIEW OF OPERATIONS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(From The Second Annual Report, 1962, of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West)

The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West was initially organized as an integral part of the University of Hawaii. In June, 1961, a committee of consultants under the chairmanship of Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, submitted a report recommending specific changes in the Center's organization, programs and activities designed to give the Center greater administrative autonomy and flexibility, and a sharper focus of its program. The Kerr Committee report was subsequently adopted by the University of Hawaii Regents. The Center and the University have attempted to implement the recommendations of the Kerr Committee as rapidly as feasible.

As a new type of educational instrument, with few guide lines to follow, The Center has an abundance of problems. It has been impossible to solve them all, and it has been necessary to select the most important for concentrated attention. During the past year, effort has been focused on the following areas:

ORGANIZATION

The Center has been reorganized under a new administrative position, that of the Chancellor of the Center, who is responsible to the Regents of the University of Hawaii through the President. The Center's activities have been organized into three main programs: Institute of Advanced Projects,
International Training Agency (now called Institute of Technical Interchange), and Office of Student Programs. Each of these is directed by a Vice-Chancellor, assisted by a small group of project directors and officers.

This three-fold division is based on the kinds of individuals the Center is designed to serve. The Institute of Advanced Projects supports the work of scholars in advanced research. The International Training Agency supports projects in the field of technical training. The Office of Student Programs is concerned with the exchange of foreign and American students, primarily at the graduate level, and with their academic progress.

The University of Hawaii Regents are responsible under the grant-in-aid agreement with the Department of State for the successful conduct of the Center. The Center must therefore develop clear-cut and mutually satisfactory relationships with those branches of the University on which the Center must depend for support. At the same time, the Center must develop fruitful relations with other institutions and agencies, both in the United States and Asian-Pacific countries, in the conduct of its work. These are organizational matters to which the Center staff has given earnest attention. They are by no means solved and will require much time and effort in the year ahead.

INTERNATIONAL PANEL OF ADVISERS

Following the assumption of his duties on January 1, 1962, the Chancellor's immediate task was to procure the services of an international Panel of Advisers to the Center. The following distinguished group of nine
individuals has accepted appointments to the Center's first Panel of Advisers:

CLARK KERR, President, University of California
DETLEV BRONK, President, Rockefeller Institute
RALPH J. BUNCHE, Under-Secretary, United Nations
KATHARINE E. McBRIDE, President, Bryn Mawr College
GERALD W. FISHER, President, Bishop Trust Company, Honolulu
YOICHI MAEDA, Professor in the Humanities, University of Tokyo
JUAN SALCEDO, JR., Assistant to the President of the Republic of the Philippines
CHAKRATONG TONGYAI, Under-Secretary of State for Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Thailand
A. C. JOSHI, Vice-Chancellor, Punjab University, India

The Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs will serve as an ex officio member of the Panel. The Panel of Advisers will serve a term of two years. The first meeting of the Panel took place in Honolulu in December, 1962.

I

INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED PROJECTS

The objective of the Institute is to utilize exchange at the senior scholar level in order to increase knowledge and to facilitate its dissemination. Of the three programs of the Center, the Institute has the most immediate promise simply because the senior scholars participating in the work of the Institute are accustomed to international exchange as a facet of their daily work. (This is the institute most affected by the House cut in appropriations.)
SENIOR SCHOLARS

Sixteen Senior Scholars were in residence during 1962 from Japan, India, Indonesia, Australia and the United States. They are listed below with their fields of study:

P. KOTESWARAM, Meteorological Office, India. Meteorology.
TAKDIR ALISJAHBANA, Indonesia. Indonesian Culture.
KUMIZI IIDA Nagoya University, Japan. Seismology (tsunamis).
ROY MILLER, International Christian University, Japan. Linguistics.
WILLIAM P. LEBRA, University of Pittsburgh, U.S.A. Anthropology (Ryukyus).
EDWARD W. WEIDNER, Michigan State University, U.S.A. Political Science
IWAO AYUSAWA, International Christian University, Japan. Labor Relations.
GEORGE D. HUBBLE, Cunningham Laboratory, Australia. Soil Science.
MOTOKAZU ASANO, Tohoku University, Japan. Oceanography.
RYUSAKU TSUNODA, Columbia University, U.S.A. History (Ryukyus).
SHUNCHO HIGA, Japan. History (Ryukyus).
ZENCHU NAKAHARA, Japan. History (Ryukyus).

CONFERENCES

The Center believes that the small international conference addressed to a single important problem is a very effective means of furthering mutual understanding and disseminating knowledge, and stimulating significant research. Three such conferences were held during the year.

The Hydrodynamics of Tsunamis. The Tenth Pacific Science Congress, held in August, 1961, brought together an internationally distinguished group of scientists in oceanography and seismology. To take advantage of this occasion, the Center supported a special conference on tsunami (tidal wave)
hydrodynamics, organized by Doak Cox, Director of the Tsunami Research Program of the Institute of Geophysics at the University of Hawaii. An increased understanding of the behavior of tidal waves is not only scientifically important but is fundamental to continued improvement in international tidal wave warning systems. The conference was designed to stimulate research in this field.

Labor-Management Relations. In April-May, 1962, a three weeks conference was held on labor-management relations among seven countries of the Pacific area. Representatives from Australia, New Zealand, India, Japan, the Philippines, Canada and the United States participated. The increasing industrialization of countries in the Asian-Pacific area has led to the rapid growth of labor and management organizations, which will play an increasingly larger role in guiding and formulating policy in those countries. The conference reviewed on a comparative basis current methods of dispute prevention and settlement, and identified areas for further research. The Center hopes that the conference has been a beginning toward closer working relationships among the countries concerned in the important field of labor-management relations. The conference was organized by Harold S. Roberts, Senior Professor of Personnel and Industrial Relations at the University of Hawaii.

Scholarly Publishing. In June, 1962, under the joint sponsorship of the Center and the University of Hawaii Press, a conference was organized by Thomas Nickerson on the problems of scholarly publishing in the Asian-Pacific area.
Since World War II there has been a tremendous increase in the amount of scientific and scholarly work in this region. The development of scholarly publishing outlets for this research, and the reduction of national barriers to the dissemination and free flow of published knowledge were among the subjects to which the conference addressed itself. Participants were from Australia, Burma, Canada, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Republic of China, the Philippines, Mexico, and the United States. The Center will assist in such practical ways as it can to further international cooperation in scholarly publishing in the region of the Center's interest.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Through the visiting scholar program, studies on the history and culture of the Ryukyu Islands were continued, and a project inaugurated to increase library holdings through the microfilming of privately held documents in the Ryukyus. An Indonesian word frequency project is also underway, and the survey of Asian economic research institutions and their activities was continued.

RESEARCH TRANSLATIONS

With only three staff members, the volume of translation work required outside assistance. University faculty, graduate students, and individual translators in the community and abroad were called upon. Center student grantees provided translation services as part of their obligation to the Center when correspondence and other documents were received in the
languages of their countries. In the immediate future, recourse to these sources of assistance will continue. To aid in the work of Research Translations, in the previous year a registry of local linguists was compiled in cooperation with the Hawaii Association of Language Teachers. This registry was expanded to include personnel abroad as well.

The work of the year centered around the following principal projects:

1. **Chinese-English dictionary of current usage.** The revolutionary changes in written Chinese since World War II, with the influx of new terms, compounds, and idioms, has led Research Translations to compile a dictionary of current Chinese words and phrases to assist the American student. The initial effort was a modest mimeographed compilation of 7,000 words prepared for the summer of 1962.  

2. **The compilation and translation of a book of source materials on the "Japanese Image of America."**  

3. **In connection with the interest aroused by the Tsunami Conference, abstracting and translating Japanese scientific work on tsunamis, including material for publication of an annotated bibliography by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.**  

4. **Check-editing of a large manuscript translated into English from Japanese on a Survey of Documentary Materials in Asia.**  

5. **Check-editing of deZwaan's Races of the Indonesian Archipelago.**  

6. **Translation of a lengthy article from the Japanese journal Chuo Koron dealing with foreign students in Japan.**  

Among the plans for the immediate future are: (1) Expansion of the Chinese-English dictionary of current usage by using Chinese graduate students to scan newspapers and journals for new terms and phrases, and to
add these to the words in the first edition. (2) Expansion of the source book on the "American Image in Asia" to include Korean and Chinese views about America. (3) Check-editing other Japanese studies of the Institute of Asian Economic Affairs. (4) The translation and analysis of the Rekidai Hoan, a Ryukyuan chronicle covering in particular Ryukyuan voyages to Southeast Asia during the 15th and 16th centuries. This study will be especially valuable on the subject of maritime relations in the Far East and in Southeast Asia.

Other translation projects yet unspecified will be in support of the Institute of Advanced Projects in the areas of development economics, development education, urbanization, and village development.

II
INTERNATIONAL TRAINING AGENCY
(Now called Institute of Technical Interchange)

As one of the three principal divisions of the Center, the International Training Agency is the technical training arm of the Center. Sudhir Sen of the United Nations Technical Assistance Board, after an intensive study in 1961 of Hawaii's facilities, recommended that the International Training Agency emphasize training programs especially in tropical agriculture, public health, and vocational training. The Kerr Committee, as well as other consultants to the Center, have likewise recommended that the Center place major emphasis on its technical training program.

Prior to April, 1961 the International Training Agency was known as the International Cooperation Center and was attached to the office of the
Governor of the State of Hawaii. Together with its predecessor, the International Training Agency has provided observation, study, and training for more than 3,000 men and women from 31 foreign countries during the past eight years. These participants were referred to ITA by organizations such as the Agency for International Development (formerly ICA), the United Nations specialized agencies, national foundations, and foreign governments. More than 100 programs, in cooperation with both public and private agencies throughout the State of Hawaii, have been offered.

During the past fiscal year, the funds to support the ITA program have come primarily from the Agency for International Development (AID) under a two-year contract (ending June 30, 1963) between AID and the University of Hawaii. The Center itself has provided modest funds for the development of two pilot projects in agricultural extension and vocational education. The State of Hawaii and non-AID agencies have also provided financial assistance. The Center is particularly grateful to the more than 100 private and governmental agencies whose cooperation has made possible the actual instruction of trainees. These cooperating agencies include the University of Hawaii, State Department of Education, State Department of Public Health, Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association, dozens of other private agencies, and practically all divisions of the federal, state, and municipal governments.

During fiscal year 1962, ITA programmed 208 technicians from 22 countries for an average of 33 man-days of training per participant. One-hundred fifty-seven of this total were AID-sponsored (e.g. World Health
Organization, Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, foreign governments). Areas of training of the 208 participants follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number Trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (tropical)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 208 programmed for the year, 26 or 12.5 per cent had the combined academic-field-training types of programs. Their study areas were in tropical agriculture, education, social welfare and public-health nursing. Their academic work was scheduled with the University of Hawaii and their field-training with the various agencies of the community. The field-training of those whose programs were primarily academic was scheduled during their vacation periods (e.g. Christmas, Easter, semester breaks, summer). With the exception of two participants in the above category, all needed and were provided with additional English refresher training ranging from three to five hours a week.

During fiscal year 1962, ITA also programmed an additional 42 AID and UN technicians and administrators on study visits in Hawaii, including briefing them on Hawaii training resources and scheduling their community contacts in other activities.
ITA also developed two pilot training projects, as Center projects. The first of two 4-month classes in Vocational Education was completed in June, 1962. The second began in October, 1962. Both classes have the following objectives: (1) develop the skills of participants in a number of trades; (2) provide them with on-the-job training in managing and operating technical schools; (3) assist them in acquiring skills and experiences in curriculum development for teacher-education and for vocational training; and (4) expose participants to a variety of technical programs in both rural and urban areas of Hawaii. All training was accomplished in Hawaii, particularly in the well-equipped and excellently staffed vocational schools of the State Department of Education.

The first of two 4 1/2-month classes in Cooperative Agricultural Extension was completed in August, 1962. Like the project in Vocational Education, the second class in this area began in October, 1962. Its objectives are the following: (1) assist participants to expand their horizons in selected technical fields within their areas of interest; (2) help them learn the job of county agricultural agents through actual involvement; (3) provide opportunities for them to understand and appreciate some of the more important skills in human relations necessary to carry on successful extension work; and (4) provide opportunities for them to disseminate their own information and to demonstrate their skills.

The training conducted under this project took place in Hawaii, Japan, and Taiwan to utilize the distinctive opportunities of these three countries.
Hawaii provided particular advantages for training in practical agricultural extension, soil conservation, and biological control of insect pests, Japan the development of farm machinery specially designed for the relatively small Asian farm; and Taiwan, composting techniques on which many Asian farmers must depend.

ITA has also completed plans for a 6-month pilot training project in Middle Management on Fiscal Administration to start in January, 1963.

ITA has greatly benefitted from the consultive services rendered by a 27-man Advisory Committee appointed during the year by the Chancellor. Committee members advise ITA on policy and serve as resource personnel to the Agency staff. They represent a cross-section of the community's leadership, including those in education, health, agriculture, industry, research, and the mass media.

As a result of its experience and of the consultive services rendered to it, ITA has identified certain problems and needs which are being considered in the development of its program. Among these are the following:

1. Longer periods of training in fewer locales are more productive than short periods of training in many places.

2. Hawaii has a number of great resource strengths for technical training. ITA must concentrate on these areas of strength and not dissipate its energies by spreading its efforts too thin. In other words, ITA should more aggressively initiate and development programs on which it can do well and for which strong resources are available.
3. Foreign participants have different backgrounds and aspirations. They must have individual attention, especially when they take academic work, and often require special assistance in developing proficiency in English.

4. As ITA develops new projects, adjusted to the needs of Asian-Pacific countries, it must have available sufficient competent professional training staff for such projects and not depend on already overworked community, private, and governmental agencies. These agencies have been extremely cooperative, but there is a limit to the voluntary services they can reasonably be expected to offer.

III
OFFICE OF STUDENT PROGRAMS

The Office of Student Programs administers scholarship grants for selected university students from the United States and 24 areas and countries in Asia and the Pacific Ocean area. These students, with a few exceptions from countries and areas not having four-year higher education, are mature graduate students (average age is 26). American students are generally engaged in the study of an Asian language or area study program. Students from Asia and the Pacific are working in most of the available fields of graduate study at the University of Hawaii, but particularly in those fields having relevance to the needs and interests of the country from which they come. Nearly all students spend either a summer session, a semester, or occasionally a year on the mainland U.S.A. or in Asia for enrichment of their academic and cultural programs and for preparation of graduate theses, dissertations, or journal articles.
EAST-WEST CENTER GRANTEES, NATIONAL DISTRIBUTION
(Febuary 1961 - February 1962)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>February 1961</th>
<th>September 1961</th>
<th>February 1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Borneo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Trust Territory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
<td><strong>251</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one on leave

STUDENT SELECTION

During fiscal 1962, that section of Student Programs which processes admissions to the East-West Center received 1,399 inquiries from potential American candidates and 2,218 inquiries from students in Asia and the Pacific. This does not include thousands of inquiries received by U.S. agencies abroad. The Center receives direct applications from American candidates and
candidates from North Borneo, Brunei, Sarawak, New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands. Students applying from Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Malaya, Nepal, Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam, make their initial application through United States Information Service; while students from Australia, Pakistan, and India apply through the United States Educational Foundation. In Hong Kong, the initial application is made through the Mencius Education Foundation; in Singapore through the Ministry of Education; and in Okinawa through the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands. Whenever possible, these applications are screened by bi-national committees in the field.

In February 1962, the Center admitted 5 students from the United States and 14 students from Asia and the Pacific Islands. For the September 1962 selection, the East-West Center received 325 applications from the United States and 426 locally screened applications from Asia. Between 250 and 260 new student grantees arrived by September, about 90 of whom were Americans.

The initial applications from abroad were made to one of the agencies mentioned above after having been publicized in the country. These applications were then screened in terms of the student's objectives, academic record, English proficiency, and general fitness to be a member of the East-West Center community. The applications of those students who had successfully passed this initial screening were then forwarded to the East-West Center. In certain countries it was the policy to indicate principal and
alternate candidates. In others, a slate of acceptable students was submitted to the Center with regional preferences indicated. In others, it was the policy simply to submit to the East-West Center the applications of those students which the screening agency deemed to be fit. The Center asked the initial screening agencies to file their applications by February 1, 1962. It was not possible for all country agencies to meet this date.

The Admissions Secretary read all of the applications from the various countries, interpreted the student's records, and made comments concerning each individual application. The applications were then signed out to the academic departments for review and recommendations. The applications were then returned to the Admissions Secretary by way of the University of Hawaii Graduate School or the Office of Admissions. The applications were then reviewed again by a final screening committee convened by the Center to determine the candidate's qualifications, and the awards were made.

In addition to the selection of students from abroad and the United States, four additional programs were in part administered through the Office of the Admissions Secretary: the Teacher Interchange Program, Academic Year Institute, the National Income Workshop, and the Summer Institute on Asian Studies.

The main goal of academic advising in the East-West Center is assuring that each individual will follow the academic program that most nearly answers his needs. It is recognized this can only be done by careful consultation, which correlates the home-country situation with student abilities and
interests with University resources. This in turn requires collaboration between the Center and those University departments that carry on the training.

The Center maintains card files on each student's semester program and a cumulative academic record file for permanent reference. Follow up on academic progress is continuously carried on, chiefly through individual conferences between the Academic Adviser and the grantees.

Many students seek advice on matters such as interpretation of instructions, examination difficulties, and need for research materials. A good deal of this kind of consultation is the result of the student's need for interpretation of the American educational system.

Provision is made for tutoring services when students have difficulty getting started in a course or run into special difficulty during the semester. These tutoring services have been found to be extremely helpful; they provide the student with a free atmosphere where he can question the tutor until his understanding is real.

Academic orientation was minimal for the September 1961 new grantee group, chiefly because the Academic Adviser had just been added to the Center staff. Planning ahead for the September 1962 new grantees was carried on jointly by the Center and the Foreign Student Adviser of the University. Asian grantees will be introduced to the American college system (which differs so markedly from their own) and to academic standards and regulations; scheduled for conferences with their departmental advisers;
tested in such special areas as mathematics, reading, and languages; and oriented toward a program of Center services which will be carried on during the first semester. These will be small groups in library research, reading improvement, American examinations, and writing of term papers. This will be the first time these services have been available to students on a planned basis. Their scheduling is based on demonstrated need during the 1961-62 academic year.

During the spring of 1962, the University faculty were invited to make their suggestions for orientation of new Center grantees in September, and many responded with excellent ideas. These are being incorporated into planning. Students were invited to do the same in small discussion groups; consequently, the orientation during the year 1962-63 should be considerably improved. However, the Center recognizes that orientation is a special area which must receive concentrated attention.

The academic performance of scholarship grantees, considering the newness of the Center in relation to the magnitude of the selection problem, has been gratifying. The median grade point average of all Center grantees was 3.2, with an average of 3.14. Twelve per cent received 4.00 or a straight A average; 20 per cent had 3.5 or better; 72 per cent had 3.0, B or better; and 93 per cent 2.0, C or better.

STUDY TOURS

A special feature of the scholarship grant is the opportunity for Asian-Pacific students to qualify for a study tour on the United States mainland and
for American students to qualify for a study tour in Asia. Study tours are granted only to students who have made purposeful plans.

Normally, for Asian-Pacific students the first two semesters of the grant are spent at the University of Hawaii. The tour then takes place during the following summer or during the third semester. Students generally plan to spend their final term at the University of Hawaii, in order to finish their academic work and to share with others the knowledge and experience they have acquired while away.

Most students use their study tours as an opportunity to enroll in a mainland university as special, or short-term, students. Either before or after the school session, an opportunity is provided to travel for a period of about 21 days to visit American cities, national parks, historical sites, etc., as the student chooses, provided they are on or near the line of normal travel as he moves across the country to or from his study destination.

Grantees involved in serious independent research may be permitted to visit various libraries and research centers instead of enrolling at a single university. While students are on the mainland, all normal expenses, including housing, meals, tuition and transportation, are provided by the Center. The allowances are similar to those received when at the University of Hawaii.

Universities and other institutions in which Asian grantees have enrolled while on study tours:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>NO. OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Teachers College</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American National Theatre and Academy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill-Palmer Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed College</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripp's Institute of Oceanography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Teachers College (Towson, Maryland)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Music Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Harbor Laboratories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Marine Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College, New York</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Summer School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Stations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Government and other agencies</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A special feature of the mainland study tours has been the services extended by The Experiment in International Living and by The Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students. The first organization arranges home-stays for Asian grantees on the mainland. Although only two students completed home-stays during the report period, an additional 36 completed arrangements for home-stays to take place during the 1962-63 fiscal year. The second group arranges short-term hospitality for foreign students visiting towns and cities across the United States. Nearly every student leaving during the spring of 1962 planned to use this hospitality while travelling.

American students are normally expected to spend their study tour in the Asian country related to their academic field of interest. Otherwise, the same general principles have obtained as in Mainland Study Tours. During the year only two American students were on Asian Study Tours, and the Center does not yet have sufficient experience to report on this aspect of its scholarship program.

Inter-Island Study Tours are arranged to permit students to visit the islands of Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, Lanai, or Kauai, if their course of study would be enhanced by research on one or more of these islands. Other student groups may request trips to the outer islands in order to permit an adequate cultural exchange between grantees and outer island residents. These groups usually plan discussion groups or music and drama presentation.

The C. Brewer Company of Honolulu arranged during the year to take
two groups of 20 and 16 students in agriculture to the outer islands at no cost to the East-West Center for an intensive study of agricultural practices in the Hawaiian Islands. The tour was most successful and the Center records its appreciation to the C. Brewer Company for their generous cooperation.

The success of the Inter-Island field trips depends upon the resources available to meet the student's research requirements. In some areas, such as soil science and social work, the experience has been very beneficial. In other areas, experience has shown that much more careful planning is necessary.

These are, then, the three main components of the Center. All of them will be affected by the House reduction. The one most affected is the Institute of Advanced Projects.
A JOB LEFT FOR LABOR

The editorial from the June 1963 issue of your magazine THE ADVOCATE proclaims that the eyes of the entire Retail Clerks International Association will turn to Chicago on June 24, as this 24th Constitutional Convention opens. I would like to say that not only are the eyes of RCIA cast in the direction of Chicago in this, your Diamond Jubilee Year, but the collective attention of most of the United States is riveted here in the Windy City.

I say this because a strongly objective study of your Union sponsored by the Ford Foundation claims that "by the end of the 60's, it may well be that the RCIA will be one of the two or three largest, and perhaps the most powerful labor institution in the United States."

I think that both the rank and file members, as well as the top leaders of the RCIA must certainly realize that today is marked not only on their calendars but in the minds of many in the top echelons of business and industry, as well as government. There is no denying that the RCIA is destined to become one of the most outspoken, most influential, and most responsible unions in this country of free unions.

The record of the RCIA is one of outstanding accomplishment and substantiates the claim made for your organization by the Ford Foundation study. For example, I have no doubt of the claim made by your organization that today retail clerks enrolled under the banner of RCIA are the highest paid group of store employees in the world.

Because of what I have said for the past minute or so, I think that it is especially commendable that you have the kind of leadership which all unions ought to have. This Convention as well as others in the past have...own your leaders to be very much concerned about the structure and procedure of union democracy. They have taken pains to permit the free flow of criticism and expression of opinion from the lowest levels of union organization to the highest. Of course, such a commitment to democratic practices ultimately makes for more effective labor unions. In this regard, I might add that you also have one of the smartest set of leaders. Nevertheless, I think it is especially commendable that the union which has been characterized as potentially one of the most powerful in this decade also realizes very clearly its responsibilities.
After these opening remarks, I should realize that I am a little ahead in this game. But politicians are much like union negotiators -- we hate to give up an opening. I hope you will bear with me.

I think you will have to agree with me that there is a large number of people whose reaction to increasing labor union activities is, to say the least, unfavorable. Such individuals are not to be found in any particular economic stratum of society. Nor do they predominate among those who have a certain social background. I think it is rather widespread and covers the entire spectrum of American society. What are some of these reactions? Let us try to list them.

1) **Labor Unions are too powerful.** It has often been said that certain of our labor unions have become much too demanding as a result of previous victories won. Labor unions are no longer satisfied with 2 or 3 per cent increases but incline towards greater and greater annual increases with the sky as the limit. Unions are too obsessed with lining their own purses and not given to any concern for the health or welfare of the national economy.

2) **Labor unions are dominated by racketeers and racketeers.** As a result of certain evidences uncovered by Senate investigators with regard to a few isolated unions, there is a feeling that unscrupulous practices have been long tolerated throughout the labor movement, a feeling that labor union racketeering is widespread throughout the movement.

3) **Labor unions are too strike-happy.** They strike without provocation. They strike without cause. They strike without regard for the economic consequences to their neighbors. They strike because they want merely to flex their muscles.

Strikes have wreaked havoc on the national economy leading to decreased production and internal debilitation. Strikes have resulted in indefensible loss of man hours and salaries leading to a generally weakened national economy. If all the lost man hours and salaries resulting from such strikes were to be added, it would far outweigh any minor gains made by labor unions. Strikes are the bane of the hard-working man as they are the haven of the inveterate loafer.

I do not think it is necessary for any of us here today to feign surprise at what I have just said. If we are honest with ourselves, we must surely realize that such images as I have presented have gained general acceptancy among our fellow citizens more and more in the last
decade. It seems to me reasonable to assume that the manipulators of image distortions have not been napping on their jobs. Journalists given to sensationalism have had more than one field day in which they have let their imaginations stray. As a result, many of our citizens have been influenced by such stories as I have cited.

In order to set the record straight, let us analyze those image distortions one by one.

I do not think that I need to spend much time on the argument that labor unions are too powerful or that they are merely self-interested in their own good. Labor unions are restricted as to monopolistic practices in much the same way as are industrial concerns. If labor is not satisfied with 2 - 3 per cent annual increases and feels that it deserves more and can substantiate these demands, then it appears to me that it is the responsibility of industry to refute them. Free enterprise was never an exclusive prerogative of industry.

As far as a regard for the national interest is concerned, I need only remind you of the Policy Resolutions on Community Service adopted in December 1961 by the AFL-CIO, for example. We find that particular labor organization committed to various community programs for the aging and the aged, rehabilitation for the physically disabled, consumer counseling, elimination of polio, blood banking, and service to children and youth.

That same Resolution recorded the position of the AFL-CIO as follows: The AFL-CIO recognizes that unions have a responsibility to the unemployed non-dues paying member as they have to the employed dues-paying member.

President George Meany expressed Labor's interest best by saying, "We look upon the handicapped workers just as we look upon any other group that suffers from prejudice, discrimination, and inadequate opportunity. We want to help them win their full status as citizens." Not only the AFL-CIO but other labor organizations as well have made impressive contributions of both time and money towards the establishment of local rehabilitation centers. Labor has effectively been represented on the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, as well as on various state advisory committees.

Another of the more interesting stereotypes of labor unions is that they are dominated by racketeers and convicted felons. This is a very prevalent image of unions not only in this country but throughout the world. But again, we ought to look at facts and figures.
A specific comparison between losses suffered by companies that furnish bonds to union officials, as well as officers of banks, savings and loan firms and similar financial institutions has been compiled to provide some very startling information which all of you should know -- especially since you may not get them in any other way.

These figures are not of my own concoction but have been obtained from leading bonding companies throughout the country. It shows that millions of dollars are handed out each year to cover thefts by those who are bonded in the various financial institutions of our country. As compared to this, losses are significantly smaller among the thousands of union officials who are now required to be bonded under the Landrum-Griffin Act.

These are the figures: In 1961, premiums paid by banks and other institutions totaled $23,944,000 with losses amounting to $17,095,000 for a loss ratio of 71.4%. In the same year, premiums paid by unions totaled $1,462,000 with losses at $257,000 for a loss ratio of 17.6%. In 1960, the difference was even greater. Premiums paid by banks and other institutions totaled $21,000,000 with losses at $17 million for a loss ratio of 81.0%. Unions paid a total of $1,402,000 in premiums with losses amounting to $104,000 for a loss ratio of 7.4%.

William Botkin, the International Secretary-Treasurer of the International Woodworkers of America, indicated that labor unions are now compiling figures over a five-year period including premiums, losses and the amounts recovered from guilty individuals to support labor's attempts to receive lower rates on bonds for union officials. I am sure that the figures will prove that labor deserves much lower rates on the basis of past, as well as present performance.

When the Landrum-Griffin Act became effective, bonding companies attached a 50% surcharge on the bond premiums of labor officials primarily because of the existing climate of opinion. "Labor corruption" as a tag hung indiscriminately on all union officials apparently led to such an exhorbitant surcharge. But that surcharge was later cut in half and now it appears on the basis of facts and figures today that the surcharge is not warranted.

It should not be concluded upon the basis of what I have said that all labor unions are pristine pure and lily white. Continuing effort must be made by labor organizations and labor officials to discharge the public trust fully and honestly. In this sense, we must be our brother's keeper. We must be very much concerned with organizations and officials who have
betrayed not only public confidence but the confidence of its members as well.

As to the charge that labor unions are strike-happy and given to irresponsible waste of man-hours and man-power, there are certain pertinent statistics readily available from the United States Department of Labor.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has said that: "Lost time -- and production -- from strikes has, during the past three years, represented a smaller percentage, about 1/7 of one per cent, of total man hours worked than during any other years since the end of the last War."

He went on to say that, "more potential man hours of production were lost in 1962 as the result of involuntary unemployment than have been lost from all strikes in the past three years. The public reacts more vehemently to a kick in the shins than to an attack of economic arthritis."

Secretary Wirtz's own Department provides us with interesting data. Let's look at the record.

A seemingly awesome total of 19 million man-days were lost as a result of strikes in 1962. But when one considers that this amounts to only .16 per cent of the total estimated working time in that year, somebody has managed to make a winter day look like one in summer. This amounts to less than two-tenths of one per cent of the total!

The purveyors of strike-fright have neglected to point out other equally pertinent facts. For example, they conveniently forget that many more man-hours of labor are lost through chronic unemployment as compared to strikes. The following are the percentages of unemployed in the civilian labor force by years: 5.6 per cent in 1960; 6.7 per cent in 1961; 5.6 per cent in 1962; and 5.6 per cent as of May 1963.

In other words, 28 to 33 times more man-days have been lost through chronic unemployment than through strikes in any given year.

Nor do these peddlers of strike-fright inform us of the increase of the gross national product from $482 billion in 1959 to $553 billion in 1962. They do not tell us that output per man-hour of labor in non-agricultural work has increased from 104.8 units in 1960 to 112.1 units in 1962, using the 1957-59 period as parity of 100 units.
Furthermore, they fan the fever of fright by withholding the fact that we have an unused plant capacity of 15 per cent. That is the amount of available industrial power which is simply not used.

In view of such incontrovertible facts, I submit that the problem is not one of an excess of strikes. It is one of balancing the supply and demand of our economic resources, especially human resources. This is our most important problem. We simply cannot afford such a high level of unused manpower as represented in unemployment statistics, and we cannot tolerate less than complete utilization of our industrial potential as seen in our 15 per cent unused plant capacity.

Lest my statements be misinterpreted, let me assure you that I am not in the least condoning frequent and impulsive resort to strikes as the ultimate weapon of labor dissatisfaction. A fair assessment must be made of the possible detrimental effects to non-participants in a strike situation.

Frequently, for example, both labor and industry participants in a strike situation have financial resources built up through the fat years for such eventualities. Strike benefit programs of one kind or another for labor and strike insurance programs of varied types for industry have tided over many a direct combatant manning either side of the barricade.

But the consuming public is often the victim. They have nothing in reserve to cushion the shock of a head-on labor-industry clash. Such victims can fall easy prey to malicious propaganda.

There is a current case which pointedly illustrates how stereotypes are formed and what can be done about them.

As a result of the disturbances in Philadelphia concerning certain employment practices, labor unions are being typed in some quarters as having no concern for civil rights. I think that any objective person will have to admit that certain of our unions, like certain of our commercial enterprises, have not always disregarded the color line. However, the same brush should not be used to tar all labor unions.

Most of the union movement have come of age in the matter of respect for civil rights. But that maturity is in danger of being impaired by the actions of a few and by the ramifications of that action among the people at large.
In the America of today, unions cannot afford the circulation of an image pock-marked by the pits of racial exclusion and inclusion. But please be assured that every effort will be made to cultivate that stereotype unless you speak out with the collective voice of conscience decrying such practices and demanding that the house of labor be cleansed.

The problem, of course, is not only peculiar with labor but cuts across all groups and all regions. But you in labor have a distinctive interest because you are committed to the cause of social and economic justice which you have so widely, and justly, publicized.

Forget this commitment, and you will automatically give license to all those who are only too eager and willing to tarnish the image of labor.

From what I have said, there appears to be no better antidote for the spread of the malady of anti-laboritis than a healthy dose of facts and figures. This is the most effective prescription which can be administered by anyone interested in the health and well-being of our country.

Those of you in the Retail Clerks International Association are in an especially favorable position to counter the effects of such misinformation. In your almost daily contacts with the public, you can seek to dispell the image which has been wrongfully created. You can do this simply by studying facts and figures which are readily available through organizations such as the Department of Labor and your own research departments.

I need not tell you of the consequences that may derive from a neglect of this essential responsibility. When public tolerance of any institution decreases either through valid appraisal of facts or through clever distortion of them, then a situation is created which eventually leads to restrictive legislation. I am certain that you can rise to the occasion, as you have done in the past, to man the ramparts of labor.
May the spirit of PT-109 spur the young democrats and older democrats of Hawaii to another resounding victory in '64.

Congratulations and best wishes to the Young Democrats of Hawaii for spearheading this admirable project.

Aloha,

DANIEL K. INOUYE
18 July 1963

Young Democrats of Hawaii
C/O Chinese American Club
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Fellow Democrats:

I regret that I am unable to be personally present to extend my greetings to the Young Democrats of Hawaii. I know our Congressman Tom Gill will ably express the sentiments of our Democratic contingent from Washington.

Please extend my sincere congratulations to the incoming officers, a grateful well-done to the outgoing officers and my heartfelt thanks to the aggressive membership of the Young Democrats of Hawaii.

Warmest aloha.

DAN INOUYE
The 25th of June has passed almost unnoticed by the majority of the American people and by the American press; but it has not passed unnoticed by the families of 27,704 U.S. soldiers who were killed or by the 72,596 who were wounded in fighting the Communist aggressors to maintain the freedom of the Republic of Korea. For it was on 25 June 1950—13 years ago—that the communist world initiated its first and so far only overt attack against a free-world nation since the bloodbath of the Second World War had terminated only about five years previously.

Three years and one month later, on the 27th of July 1953, an armistice was signed between the Communists and United Nations representatives at the small Korean town of Kansong. The Communist onslaught had been halted, and their forces driven back. A defeat of major proportions had been inflicted on them, but one which policy prevented pursuing to its logical conclusion, the complete annihilation of the enemy’s military power. The armistice that was signed brought a strange halt to a strange war.

But an armistice—even a ten-year old one—does not constitute peace, and the more than 26,000,000 South Koreans are painfully aware of this; their nation is an armed camp.
with almost 600,000 men in the armed forces, the second largest military force in the free world. The United States has spent about $2.1 billion since 1945 in the support of these Korean armed forces, plus an additional $3.3 billion in economic aid—a most impressive investment to say the least, but greatly outweighed in relative sacrifice by efforts of the brave Korean people in their own behalf.

Will the 27th of July also pass as a date generally unrecognized by the American people and press?

The 35,000-odd U.S. troops now stationed in Korea, separated from their families and loved ones, will certainly not let this date pass unnoticed. They, together with the Republic of Korea forces and small military units representing Turkey and Thailand, comprise the United Nations Command, with an American general as its Commander-in-Chief, which today is an effective deterrent to renewed communist aggression.

These troops all know why they are in Korea. They are there to protect the Republic of Korea and the free world from Communist aggression. Their presence makes a reality of American promises to free nations throughout the world that we stand behind them in their efforts to maintain their freedom and to thwart Communist aggression.
The dividing line in Korea between the Communist North and the free South is a 4,000 meter wide demilitarized zone that runs across the Peninsula near the 38th Parallel. South of this zone stand American troops, facing their Communist opposites to the north. These American troops are not working a 35 or 40 hour week and they get no extra pay for the long hours and weekends they spend on duty. Many are living in the field under conditions far from comfortable. All are separated from their families and their homes. In the past some have given their lives in the performance of their duties during this armistice period, and at this moment two Army captains are being illegally detained by the Communists. Yet in spite of these conditions, these American troops are willingly and cheerfully performing their duties in order that we at home and the peoples of all other free nations may enjoy the benefits of our freedom and our way of life.

I for one do not intend to let this 27th of July pass without notice. And I wish to publicly express my appreciation for what my fellow Americans serving with the armed forces in Korea are doing for me.
IT'S DIFFICULT TO BELIEVE THAT IT'S BEEN 20 YEARS SINCE WE BEGAN TOGETHER. LOOKING OUT AT FACES I REMEMBER SO WELL, IT SEEMS LIKE 20 MINUTES. LOOKING BACK AT WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE WORLD SINCE THEN, IT SEEMS LIKE A CENTURY.

CONSIDER WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN THE WORLD IN 1943 AND 1944. AMERICAN AND BRITISH ARMIES FACED THE GERMANS IN ITALY; RUSSIAN ARMIES FACED THE NAZIS IN THE UKRAINE. THE WESTERN PART OF THE ALLIANCE WAS FIRMLY CEMENTED, PREPARING TO INVADE NORTHERN EUROPE. ONE PRIME OBJECTIVE WAS TO LIBERATE FRANCE; ANOTHER WAS TO DESTROY THE MILITARY AND INDUSTRIAL POWER OF THE GERMAN HOMELAND. WE WERE SHIPPING GREAT QUANTITIES OF MILITARY HARDWARE TO RUSSIA, OUR ALLY IN THE EAST. IN THE ORIENT, WE WERE SUPPORTING THE CHINESE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT DEEP IN THE INTERIOR. THERE WAS ANOTHER CHINESE ARMY, IN THE NORTH, BUT OUR CONTACTS WITH IT WERE FEW. IN CHICAGO AND LOS ALAMOS OUR SCIENTISTS WERE WORKING ON A WEAPON OF UNPRECEDENTED VIOLENCE.

CONSIDER, TOO, WHAT WAS NOT HAPPENING. THE GREAT CONTINENT OF

Africa was quiet -
AFRICA WAS QUIET - ALMOST ALL OF IT STILL IN THE CONTROL OF COLONIAL POWERS.

LATIN AMERICA WAS QUIET - OR DISTURBED ONLY BY THOSE ARMY REVOLTS WE HAD COME TO REGARD AS MUSICAL COMEDIES. THE MIDDLE EAST WAS RELATIVELY QUIET, WATCHED OVER BY THE BRITISH FLEET; AND IN INDIA THE BRITISH VICEROY STILL GOVERNED IN THE NAME OF THE KING. IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH, THE NEGRO PEOPLE WERE QUIET.

DOES IT SEEM POSSIBLE THAT SO MANY CHANGES COULD HAVE BEEN MADE ON THE FACE OF THE EARTH SINCE THEN? DOES IT SEEM LIKELY THAT 20 YEARS COULD INCLUDE A COMMUNIST THREAT IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN, AND OUR ACTION, THROUGH AID TO GRECE AND TURKEY, TO CONTAIN IT; A MASSIVE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO EUROPE, THAT BROUGHT THE CONTINENT FROM RUIN TO PROSPERITY WITHIN A DECADE; THE BEGINNINGS OF A PROLONGED STRUGGLE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA, SOMETIMES INVOLVING THE THREAT OF IMMINENT WAR, SOMETIMES SUBVERSION AND CIVIL UNREST; THE RIGID DIVISION OF GERMANY INTO TWO STATES; THE CAPTURE OF POWER IN CHINA BY A COMMUNIST PARTY MORE RUTHLESS THAN THAT OF PRESENT-DAY RUSSIA; THE SUDDEN EMERGENCE OF INDEPENDENT STATES ALL OVER ASIA AND AFRICA, AND THE CORRESPONDING shrinking of the
SHRINKING OF THE BRITISH AND FRENCH COLONIAL EMPIRES; THE COMMENCEMENT OF AN AID PROGRAM THAT HAS POURED BILLIONS INTO THE PRIMITIVE ECONOMIES OF THE WORLD'S POOR; THE MAKING OF A HYDROGEN BOMB THOUSANDS OF TIMES MORE POWERFUL THAN THE ATOM BOMB OF WORLD WAR II, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NUCLEAR STALEMATE BETWEEN THE TWO SUPER-POWERS; MAN'S ENTRY INTO SPACE, FOR PEACEFUL AND MILITARY PURPOSES; AT HOME, A STEADY AND DETERMINED DRIVE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS BY AN AROUSED NEGRO POPULATION; AN ECONOMY ABLE TO SUPPORT A $60 BILLION DEFENSE EFFORT YEARLY; AND NOW, IT APPEARS, RADICAL SHIFTS WITHIN BOTH THE FREE WORLD'S AND THE COMMUNIST ALLIANCES.

IT IS ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME TO BELIEVE THAT ALL THIS HAS TAKEN PLACE SINCE OUR REGIMENT WAS FORMED IN 1943. CERTAINLY NO PERIOD OF 20 YEARS IN THE HISTORY OF MAN HAS CONTAINED SUCH AN EXPLOSION OF EVENTS.

IT IS ENOUGH TO BAFFLE THE BEST MINDS AMONG US. OCCURRENCES OF TERRIFIC IMPORTANCE TO THE LIVES OF EVERY PERSON ON EARTH HAVE TAKEN PLACE, ARE TAKING PLACE, AND WILL TAKE PLACE, ALL WITH A RAPIDITY AND IMPACT THAT HAS NO PRECEDENT. CERTAINLY IT HAS BEEN AN EXCITING PERIOD - IN SOME WAYS like the 15th
LIKE THE 15TH CENTURY, WHEN MEN BEGAN TO REACH OUT INTO THE UNKNOWN. BUT
IT HAS ALSO BEEN A PERIOD IN WHICH WE SOMETIMES HAD DIFFICULTY KEEPING OUR
BEARINGS. SOMETIMES THE NORTH STAR BY WHICH WE HAD SAILED WAS OBSCURED.
WHAT I MEAN IS THIS. WE HAD LIVED FOR A CENTURY UNDER A PRETTY
DEFINITE SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES. WE, AND THE REST OF THE WORLD, KNEW WHERE WE
STOOD. THE SUN ROSE AND SET ON THE BRITISH EMPIRE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED
STATES HAD FOUND WHAT APPEARED TO BE THE ROAD TO UTOPIA - PEACE AND AN
EVER-GREATER PROSPERITY AT HOME. THERE WERE TROUBLES ABROAD, TO BE SURE.
BUT THROUGH PRUDENT STATESMANSHIP WE BELIEVED WE COULD AVOID THE EFFECTS OF
REVOLUTIONS AND WARS OVERSEAS.

AND THEN, IN 1917, WE FOUND OURSELVES AT WAR IN EUROPE. WE HELPED
TO WIN IT, AND HAVING WON IT WE EXPECTED TO RETURN TO EVERY-DAY LIVING, WITH
THE WORLD PUT BACK TOGETHER AS IT HAD BEEN BEFORE. IT TOOK US SOME TIME TO
REALIZE THAT THINGS HAD CHANGED - THAT WE WERE AT LAST PART OF A WORLD ON THE
BRINK OF SWEEPING CHANGES. THE DEPRESSION, WHICH WAS WORLD-WIDE, WAS ONE
TEACHER; WORLD WAR II WAS ANOTHER; AND FOR THOSE WHO WERE REALLY SLOW TO LEARN,
THE EVENTS OF THE PAST 20 YEARS HAVE COMPLETED THEIR EDUCATION.

WE MET OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS MEMBERS OF THIS WORLD COMMUNITY IN THE BEST WAY WE KNEW HOW. WE KNEW WE HAD TO RESIST THE NAZI ARMIES, AND DESTROY HITLER WHO HAD CONVULSED THE WORLD WITH HIS BLITZKRIEG. IN THE LATE FORTIES WE KNEW WE COULD NOT PROSPER AND REMAIN SECURE UNLESS EUROPE PROSPERED TOO, AND SO WE INVESTED BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN HER RECOVERY FROM THE WAR. WE KNEW WE FACED A GREAT AND POWERFUL ENEMY IN THE SOVIET UNION, AND WE MOVED TO CONTAIN HER WHEN SHE REACHED BEYOND HER BORDERS - IN IRAN, IN GREECE, IN BERLIN, IN KOREA, AND IN CUBA. WE KNEW WE HAD TO CLOSE THE GAP BETWEEN THE VERY RICH NATIONS OF THE WORLD, AND THE DESPERATELY POOR. AND SO WE GAVE MONEY AND KNOWLEDGE TO PEOPLE WE HAD KNOWN BEFORE ONLY IN THE PAGES OF THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE.

WE DID THESE THINGS OUT OF ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST, AND OUT OF A HUMANITARIAN CONCERN FOR PEOPLE MUCH POORER AND WEAKER THAN OURSELVES. AND TO DO THESE THINGS WE MADE USE OF THE KNOW-HOW, THE DRIVE AND ENERGY, AND THE OPTIMISM WE HAD USED TO SUBDUE OUR OWN ROUGH CONTINENT AND TO MAKE IT A MARVEL OF THE WORLD.
OF THE WORLD.


BUT MANY THINGS WE SAW GAVE US NO COMFORT. RUSSIA WAS STILL IN EASTERN EUROPE, AND SHE, TOO, HAD THE HYDROGEN BOMB. THAT IN ITSELF LIMITED THE RANGE OF OUR ACTIONS. RED CHINA WAS NOW THE GREATEST SINGLE POWER IN ASIA. MANY OF THE POORER COUNTRIES, WHILE RECEIVING OUR AID, REMAINED NEUTRAL IN THE COLD WAR, OR ACTUALLY MADE OVERTURES OF FRIENDSHIP TO MOSCOW, AND THE AID PROGRAM COULD NOT BE CALLED AN UNQUALIFIED SUCCESS. SOME OF US THOUGHT THE INJECTION OF MONEY AND KNOWLEDGE WOULD REMAKE ASIA AND AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA OVERNIGHT. WHEN THAT FAILED TO HAPPEN, WE FELT THAT WE HAD BEEN FOOLLED.

SO, IN THE EARLY FIFTIES, A GROUP OF MEN APPEARED WHO HAD A READY ANSWER FOR OUR FAILURE TO REMODEL THE WORLD ON THE AMERICAN PLAN. THE REASON was, they said,
WAS, THEY SAID, THAT SINISTER FORCES WERE AT WORK WITHIN OUR OWN GOVERNMENT;

THAT THESE FORCES - CLERKS AND CABINET OFFICERS - WERE HAMSTRINGING OUR EFFORTS,

PREVENTING US FROM DOING WHAT EVERYBODY KNEW WAS RIGHT. THESE SUPER-PATRIOTS

SAID THAT THESE CLERKS AND OFFICERS WERE THE SERVANTS OF A MASTER PLAN,

DIRECTED BY MOSCOW AND THAT THEIR PLAN WAS TO BLEED US DRY, WEAKEN OUR WILL,

BRAINWASH OUR CHILDREN, CRIPPLE THE MILITARY, INFILTRATE OUR SCHOOLS, CHURCHES,

AND GOVERNMENT, AND AT LAST TO HAND US OVER ON A SILVER PLATTER TO THE KREMLIN.

TO MANY PEOPLE, THIS MADE SENSE. HOW ELSE COULD YOU EXPLAIN THE

CONTINUANCE OF WORLD PROBLEMS, YEAR AFTER YEAR, WHEN THE WILL AND ENERGY AND

RESOURCES OF THE WORLD'S ONLY OMNIPOTENT NATION HAD BEEN COMMITTED TO SOLVE

THEM?

THERE HAVE ALWAYS BEEN VILLAINS IN HISTORY, OF COURSE. AT ONE PERIOD

IN OUR HISTORY IT WAS THE BRITISH BANKERS; AT ANOTHER, THE GREAT INVESTMENT

HOUSES ON WALL STREET. FOR SOME WHITE PEOPLE IN THE SOUTH, IT WAS AND IS THOSE

NEGROES WHO WANT THEIR CHARTER OF LIBERTY AS FREE MEN, AND THOSE IN THE NORTH

AND WEST WHO ARE TRYING TO HELP THEM GET IT. FOR IRISHMEN, IT WAS ENGLISHMEN;

for Poles
FOR POLES, IT WAS GERMANS; FOR CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, FOR GENTILES, JEWS, AND VICE VERSA. FOR MANY PEOPLE IN 1941, YOU REMEMBER, IT WAS MEN AND WOMEN OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY.

THE TRUTH IS THAT MANY OF US NEED A VILLAIN, TO EXPLAIN THE "EVIL" OF THE WORLD. CHILDREN ARE PROTECTED FROM MUCH OF THE WORLD'S EVILS, AND WHEN THEY GROW UP AND FACE LIFE ON THEIR OWN, THEY ARE OFTEN SHOCKED AND RESENTFUL THAT THINGS DON'T ALWAYS GO ACCORDING TO HOYLE. THEY FIND THAT IN THEIR PRIVATE LIVES, GOOD WILL AND ENERGY AND MONEY DON'T SOLVE ALL THEIR PROBLEMS.

SO MANY OF THESE GROWN-UP CHILDREN WANT TO STRIKE OUT AND DESTROY THE NEAREST AND MOST LIKELY VILLAIN, BELIEVING THAT HAVING DESTROYED HIM, THINGS WILL RETURN TO "NORMALCY", WHERE TWO AND TWO IS FOUR AND ALL THE OTHER ANSWERS ARE JUST AS TIDY. AND WHILE THEY DO THIS, THEY NEED TO KEEP UP THEIR COURAGE BY ASSURING EACH OTHER THAT THEY, AND THEY ALONE, ARE RIGHT. THEY WANT LAWS TO BE DRAWN UP THAT WILL FORBID THE VILLAIN TO SPEAK; THEY WANT COURTS THAT WILL CONDEMN HIM TO OUTER DARKNESS, CONSTRUING THE CONSTITUTION TO PROTECT
TO PROTECT ONLY THOSE WHO LOOK LIKE AND SOUND LIKE THEMSELVES.

THESE GROWN-UP CHILDREN, WHO MAY CALL THEMSELVES LIBERALS OR CONSERVATIVES, SAY THAT THEY ARE TRYING TO PROTECT OUR LIBERTIES.

MAYBE THEY HAVE NEVER HEARD THE WORDS OF THE LATE LEARNED HAND, A GREAT JUDGE AND FIGHTER FOR HUMANITY, WHEN HE SAID THAT:

"LIBERTY LIES IN THE HEARTS OF MEN AND WOMEN; WHEN IT DIES THERE, NO CONSTITUTION, NO LAW, NO COURT CAN SAVE IT; NO CONSTITUTION, NO LAW, NO COURT CAN EVEN DO MUCH TO HELP IT. WHILE IT LIES THERE, IT NEEDS NO CONSTITUTION, NO LAW, NO COURTS TO SAVE IT...

"WHAT THEN IS THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY? I CANNOT DEFINE IT; I CAN ONLY TELL YOU MY OWN FAITH. THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY IS THE SPIRIT WHICH IS NOT TOO SURE THAT IT IS RIGHT; THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY IS THE SPIRIT WHICH SEeks TO UNDERSTAND THE MINDS OF OTHER MEN AND WOMEN; THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY IS THE SPIRIT WHICH WEIGHS THEIR INTERESTS ALONGSIDE ITS OWN WITHOUT BIAS; THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY REMEMBERS THAT NOT EVEN A SPARROW FALLS TO EARTH UNHEEDED; THE SPIRIT OF LIBERTY IS THE SPIRIT OF HIM WHO, NEARLY TWO THOUSAND YEARS AGO, TAUGHT MANKIND THAT LESSON IT HAS NEVER LEARNED BUT HAS NEVER QUITE FORGOTTEN: THAT THERE MAY BE A KINGDOM WHERE THE LEAST SHALL BE HEARD AND CONSIDERED SIDE BY SIDE WITH THE GREATEST."

For the truth is,
FOR THE TRUTH IS, THAT OUR LIBERTY CANNOT BE PRESERVED BY MEASURES BORN OUT OF FEAR. IT WAS NOT WON BY FEARFUL MEN; IT WAS NOT WRITTEN INTO THE CONSTITUTION BY FEARFUL HANDS; IT HAS NOT BEEN SAVED IN WAR BY FEARFUL SOLDIERS. IT IS THE FRUIT OF COURAGE - ON THE BATTLEFIELD WHERE MEN DIE FOR IT, AND IN THE CITIES AND SCHOOLS AND LEGISLATIVE HALLS WHERE MEN STAND READY TO SPEAK THEIR MINDS, HOWEVER OBNOXIOUS THEIR WORDS MAY BE TO THE PREVAILING PHILOSOPHY; AND OTHER MEN STAND READY TO PROTECT THEIR RIGHT TO SPEAK.

WHAT WE WANT FOR THE WORLD IS THAT KIND OF LIBERTY. EVERYWHERE MEN ARE ASKING FOR IT - IN AFRICA, IN ASIA, IN MISSISSIPPI. MUCH TO OUR SURPRISE MEMBERS OF OUR OWN WESTERN ALLIANCE SEEM TO WANT IT - FROM US. WE HEAR THAT EVEN RUSSIAN CITIZENS ARE BEGINNING TO CALL FOR IT PUBLICLY. AND YET SOME OF OUR OWN PEOPLE, HAVING KNOWN LIBERTY FOR GENERATIONS, WANT US TO RETURN TO THAT RELATIVELY SIMPLE WORLD OF OUR NATIONAL CHILDHOOD, TO A WORLD WHERE LIBERTY IS GUARANTEED ONLY TO THOSE WHO FIT THE RIGHT DESCRIPTION, ONLY TO THOSE WHO RESPOND TO OUR TRUMPET CALL. BUT LIBERTY IS NOT CONFORMITY, TO US OR TO ANYBODY ELSE.

Liberty is a fire
LIBERTY IS A FIRE IN THE HEART. LIKE ALL FIRES IT CAN BE DANGEROUS TO ESTABLISHED WAYS OF DOING THINGS; IT MAY BURN DOWN HOUSES THAT ARE VERY VALUABLE TO US. BUT IT IS ALSO A TORCH THAT LIGHTS OUR WAY IN A WORLD OF SWIFT AND DANGEROUS EVENTS. IT THROWS ITS BRILLIANT LIGHT INTO CORNERS, TO SHOW US THAT THE VILLAINS WE THOUGHT WERE THERE WERE ONLY THE SHADOWS OF OUR OWN FEAR. IT CAN ONLY BE HELD BY THOSE WHO ARE WILLING TO DIE FOR THE RIGHT TO HOLD IT.

DO YOU REMEMBER THE DAY WE WERE ISSUED OUR OFFICIAL SHOULDER PATCHES?

I REMEMBER THAT DAY RATHER VIVIDLY. WE WERE IN OUR HUTMENT AFTER ONE OF THOSE LONG FORCED MARCHES. WE HAD UNLOADED OUR FULL FIELD PACKS AND WERE PARTICIPATING IN OUR FAVORITE PASTTIME—SHOOTING THE BULL. IN WALKED OUR PLATOON SERGEANT AND WITHOUT FANFARE GAVE EACH OF US FOUR SHOULDER PATCHES AND ORDERED US TO HAVE THEM SEWN ON OUR SLEEVES IN TIME FOR OUR WEEKLY RETREAT PARADE. I REMEMBER JENHATSU CHINEN LOOKING AT THE PATCH EVER SO SOLEMNLY AND LOUDLY DECLARING THAT IT LOOKED LIKE A COFFIN. YOU MUST ADMIT THAT IT DID RESEMBLE A COFFIN. A FEW MONTHS LATER, JENHATSU CHINEN DIED ON HILL 140 WITH HIS COFFIN SHOULDER PATCH.
SHOULDER PATCH ON HIS SLEEVE.

BUT ALTHOUGH THE OUTLINE OF OUR SHOULDER PATCH DID RESEMBLE A COFFIN, THE CENTRAL FIGURE WAS A TORCH OF LIBERTY. OUT OF THE DEATH OF OUR COMRADES, OUT OF OUR WILLINGNESS TO DIE TO KEEP THE FIRE ALIGHT, THAT TORCH EMERGES TO LIGHT THE WORLD FOR FREE MEN.
FOREIGN POLICY:
CRITICISM AND RESPONSIBILITY

The degree to which freedom of ideas is tolerated is often the single most valid criterion of an open society. Anyone who has traced the development of democratic governments anywhere will attest to that.

But the extent to which that freedom has been exercised with a degree of responsibility oftentimes marks the open society which has endured.

John Stuart Mill, the English exponent of the classic idea of freedom of discussion, emphasized the notion of responsibility as basic to the free discussion of ideas. To suggest that all corn dealers are starvers of the poor in a message printed in the local journal to be read leisurely over a cup of tea was one thing. To say the same thing in front of an enraged mob gathered before the house of a corn dealer never particularly noted for acts of public charity is quite another matter. We find the same concern for responsibility expressed in the pages of American Constitutional development. It was Justice Holmes who said that shouting "Fire" out on the street was quite a different thing from the same being uttered, without cause, in a crowded theatre.

Political philosophies and Supreme Court opinions may sound rather far-fetched in a speech on foreign policy. But what I have to say about the empirical world of politics and foreign policy is the result of what I have already said in a more theoretical vein. Permit me then, this extension.

In his news conference of February 15, President Kennedy commented, "For the period now, we are enjoying the luxury of internal dissension." Indeed we are enjoying that luxury, and it is both the privilege and the prerogative of a free people. But privileges are not to be enjoyed, and prerogatives are not to be exercised without responsibility and purpose. If we are to enjoy the luxury of internal dissension, we must do so with a sense of responsibility and purpose which transcends
mere partisanship for the sake of national security and unity. Lately, there are some who seem to have lost sight of this. They abuse this privilege by irresponsible attacks on the foreign policy of President Kennedy, which may jeopardize the security of this country.

During the past few weeks, we have again heard a growing chorus of criticism of the Kennedy Administration's handling of our foreign affairs. Curiously, this criticism is not general, but comes from certain members of the opposition party, especially those who are seeking public notoriety for political purposes. These Republicans have recklessly charged the Administration with ruthlessness in Europe, timidity in Cuba and, most important, bad faith with the American people.

They accuse the President of ruthlessness, when he has painstakingly given our Allies every consideration and has sought to increase their voices in the vital decisions of the Western Alliance. They accuse the President of timidity, when with courage and conviction he led this nation through one of the gravest crises in Cuba this world has known. They accuse the President of bad faith, when he has taken every possible step and has risked revealing our intelligence sources in order to assure the American people that we are awake to the dangers of the Cuban situation, and that we have the situation in hand. Secretary McNamara's briefing of the press on the Cuban situation underscored the President's good faith in the American people to understand once and for all the facts were known.

I am not opposed to criticism -- of foreign or domestic policy -- this is one of the strengths of our system. I do feel, however, that criticism should be temperate and positive. We should offer alternatives rather than simply arouse emotions. We should seek the constructive solutions to problems rather than simply to advance the political ambitions of one person or one party. I am afraid that many of the charges and counter-charges of the past days are no more meaningful than "political straws in the wind" for the '64 campaign.

The Republicans, using political dum-dum bullets, have once again chosen Cuba as their battle cry. Our success of last October and the dangerous days through which we passed, are lightly dismissed. Instead, the sabre-rattling of last summer is resumed. The Republicans would put greater faith in the rumors and reports of political pundits and right-wing agitators than in the intelligent and informed judgment of the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. And, while leveling these charges they rarely offer to support their charges by documentary proof.
I would argue that the attack of the opposition come now, not because of any failure of our foreign policy but because of its very success. The self-restraint and unity which are characteristic of a critical period have been abandoned now that the danger has eased. Because we confronted the Soviet Union last October and were willing to risk the destruction and devastation of a nuclear war for a principle, and because we were successful in that confrontation, there is a new feeling of security in the Western world today. But perhaps as a direct result of this, some members of the opposition party feel they can devote themselves to petty political attacks on foreign policy.

While we cannot belittle our success of last October, neither can we exaggerate that success. As the President aptly pointed out in his "State of the Union Address," "complacency or self-congratulation can imperil our security as much as the weapons of our adversary. A moment of pause is NOT a promise of peace."

The publicity accorded the debates on the Cuban situation should not distract us from other areas of world tension. Rest assured that the Soviets are not interested only in the Cuban affair, if their past actions are any criteria. There are other areas which should receive our continuing concern.

During the past months we have taken some comfort from an apparent easing of some cold-war tensions. Soviet overtures on a nuclear test ban and the increasing Sino-Soviet split have given us cause for cautious optimism. But we must not deceive ourselves. No nuclear test ban treaty has been negotiated. And while the Chinese-Russian rivalry is becoming more noticeable every day, there is no reason to believe that their rivalry with the West has diminished.

We must remember that the Soviet Union and Red China -- whether acting singly or together -- represent an extremely powerful entity. Together, these two countries occupy more than one-fifth the land mass of this planet. Together, their populations represent almost one-third of the people on this planet. But the Soviet technology by itself is formidable. The Chinese themselves are sacrificing all to similarly advance theirs. It will probably be but a few years until the Chinese will have a nuclear capacity of their own.

While there is every indication that in the future these two power groups will grow further apart, there is also every reason to believe that in the face of a common enemy they will pull together, just as we know that the divisiveness now apparent in the Western ranks would disappear with a new Soviet onslaught.
Finally, it would be well for us to remember that while the Soviets and the Red Chinese disagree violently about the means of destroying capitalism and the West, they are in agreement in their aims. "A dispute over how to bury the West is no grounds for Western rejoicing."

Despite our success of the past, and despite the pause we now enjoy, the need for unity at home is as great today as it was six months ago. The need for self-restraint is equally great. For the Soviets are regrouping their forces, and our relaxation, as well as our disunity, would be an open invitation for them to attempt to regain lost ground.

As I said a moment ago, I am not adverse to criticism, but that criticism must be delivered with the intent to inform the public, rather than to inflame and exhort. It must be delivered with an eye toward what is true, not what is popular or expedient. Those critics who paint the picture of foreign policy in black and white, who oversimplify complex problems -- hiding behind the fact that they do not have the ultimate responsibility -- serve only to obscure the issue and weaken our position.

The fact is that foreign policy problems facing us today never are, and never will be, questions of black and white. Some Republicans who have reduced the Cuban question to: Either we tolerate Communism and Castro forever, or rid ourselves of them today by any means possible -- are living in an age long since passed.

Unpleasant as it may be, we have come to realize that the United States cannot act alone with little or no regard for the many interests which are tied to our own. We have been entrusted with the responsibility of war or peace -- not only for ourselves, but for our many allies around the world. The situation in Cuba is not an isolated one, and any action there must be viewed in relation to other events, other actions and other problems around the globe.

James Reston, one of America's most distinguished newspaper men has written, "The American people don't want to learn to live with their problems or with the Russians, especially in Cuba. They want them to go away, all of them, and immediately, if not sooner." There is little doubt that this is the basic irrationalism to which the Republicans make their emotional appeals.

I am reminded here of an interesting parallel; there comes a time in the life of every child when he must learn that there is ugliness and unhappiness in the world, that there are unpleasant situations with which he must live while seeking to improve them. This is one of the most difficult experiences of childhood, but it is also a necessary step
toward adulthood and maturity. I believe that the American people took this step at the end of World War II. We took this step when we realized that thermonuclear war could no longer be a ready answer to any problem of national policy, and when we abandoned the isolationism and narrow nationalism of a bygone age. This is one of the sources of the greatness of our nation today. But it is often tempting to return to the innocence of childhood, and many of the critics of today would seem to have yielded to that temptation. But childhood tantrums were never the answer to problem-solving.

In view of the pressing and dangerous situations which face us daily and the need for realistic, rather than rash means of dealing with these, in closing I suggest that we be sensible, and that we be unified here at home. Rather than engaging in charges and counter-charges, and rather than trying to find personal political gain at the expense of national unity, I ask our opposition party to join with us in seeking to strengthen our position. This cannot be accomplished by abusive attacks on the Administration in the nation's press, but by presentation and support of positive and responsible proposals in the Congress.

Such proposals need not de-emphasize the very real problem of Castro and Communism in Latin America, but they should also seek to rid Latin America and other underdeveloped areas of the socio-economic conditions which give rise to Castroism. How many of those who cry about Cuba today supported the Alliance for Progress and our Foreign Aid Program yesterday?

In this spirit, let us recognize our responsibility as citizens and lawmakers. If we criticize, let that criticism be based upon fact. If we disapprove, let us offer an alternative. And, most important, if we agree, let us be as quick to announce that agreement as we are to announce our disagreement. Let us not abuse the privilege of internal dissension in order that we may always be able to enjoy it.
It is a privilege to share in your pride and joy at this exciting new stage in the life of your fine young medical school. Today, when so much strife and self-interest divides whole continents, it is gratifying to celebrate an occasion which brings together people dedicated to the health and happiness of humanity everywhere.

This afternoon, the cornerstone ceremonies heralded the near-completion of magnificent new facilities for research and for the care of the sick and disabled. These new hospital and research buildings, as I understand, mark the completion of your College's grand design for a medical city which will rank among the world's truly great centers for human healing.

Eight years ago, John F. Kennedy greeted the opening of Einstein College with the expectation that it would become a monument of hope and pride to the future health and the happiness of all of its citizens. That prophecy has been fulfilled in a remarkably short time and the College is physical proof of the miracle that can be accomplished by men and women of all races and creeds united by a common concern for all.

Just a few hours ago, a "Letter to the Future" was enclosed in the new buildings, bearing the names of the visionary men and women who are determined that generations to come will inherit a world freer of disease and needless suffering than our own. This was a vote of confidence in man's potential to build a more joyous world -- an affirmation that we can harness the positive forces of science for life rather than be helpless pawns in a tragic race for mutual annihilation.

It is only fitting that the school which bears Albert Einstein's name should epitomize the life-giving aspects of science. The College has in its short existence already made an impact that reaches far beyond the confines of its metropolitan home. Conceived in the spirit of equality and freedom, it has become an international focus for the exchange of medical knowledge and training.
It is inspiring to read the list of far-flung states and nations of the world at which your graduate doctors and scientists are now practicing. Australia, Peru, Korea, Israel, Turkey, the Philippines, India, my own State -- Hawaii -- these are only a few of the scores of places across the length and breadth of the globe at which your faculty and student members are serving.

We of Hawaii have first-hand evidence of the skill and humanitarianism of your graduates -- several of whom now serve with distinction in Queen's Hospital of Honolulu.

During the past year alone, the College was home to more than fifty foreign scholars from thirty countries throughout the world. Soon they too will return to their native countries or move on to new posts in foreign lands which desperately need their skills. This is a new kind of international exchange -- not of commodities, or capital -- but of human resources which can be one of the major bridges of understanding between nations of differing beliefs.

We Americans have a long tradition of lending a helping hand to people less fortunate than ourselves. We have, for example, since the end of World War II, given billions of dollars to scores of nations. Such foreign aid is, of course, essential for these newly developed nations. But economic under-development is not the only factor that separates the affluent nations from the poverty-stricken masses of the world.

Less apparent to Americans perhaps are the woeful medical inadequacies which are the daily lot of billions. So long as this terrible imbalance of health exists -- so long as men, women and children are deprived of the most elementary health standards -- so long will the smoldering flames of conflict remain to be fanned into active antagonism in a world divided.

Here, for example, are some of the appalling statistics of the gap in health standards that separates the more fortunate parts of the world from its less fortunate neighbors:

1. While the life expectancy of the average American is 67 years, a newborn Asian can look forward to a life expectancy of less than 40.

2. While we in the United States have for the most part brought infectious diseases under control, millions in Asia and Africa suffer and die each year from dysentery, influenza, sleeping sickness, yellow fever, and typhoid.
3. Two-thirds of the world's 2.7 billion people are still without the most rudimentary health services such as clear water, plumbing, sewage, vaccination, etc.

4. In the underdeveloped areas, virtually whole populations suffer from childhood endemic diseases like cholera, leprosy, and smallpox which in our land have been relegated to the status of "textbook cases."

5. We in America can boast of one bed for every 100 persons. Yet in India, there is a hospital ratio of one bed for every 3,500 people.

This gap, as we see, is truly staggering. In this age of medical miracles millions die from diseases which long have been mastered in the laboratory.

At a time, when a revolution in the biological sciences offers unprecedented opportunities for longer life, millions of people still believe that sickness and early death are immutable fates. You here who have visited Africa, Asia or the Middle East, have seen for yourself these appalling statistics translated into terms of human suffering. Paradoxically, however, this contrast between medical promise and the world's actualities suggest an area of agreement between opposing camps that could well show the way to peaceful solutions. Indeed unless and until, our war-driven world is able to find common ground for the positive use of the astonishing discoveries of science, we stand every chance of seeing science mobilized for the future extinction of life itself.

We know that the Constitution of the World Health Organization of the United Nations guarantees "the health of all people as fundamental to the attainment of peace and security." Each of you here, through your association with Einstein College, has given evidence of your belief that every man has the inalienable right to freedom from disease, as he has to the other freedoms guaranteed in the Charter of the United Nations and our own Constitution.

The example of medical institutions, such as yours -- in acting as an international training ground for health practitioners -- points to the way in which the advanced nations have begun to meet their responsibility to the entire world.

Many other medical schools, private institutions, government agencies, and United Nations groups are currently engaged in serving the world's health needs on a relatively large scale. But we are still merely
scratching the surface of the world’s health problems. We can no longer afford the luxury of piecemeal efforts or mere guerilla warfare against disease. The time is ripe for a massive retaliation of all nations against disease and needless suffering. Programs of such scope and significance are expensive — indeed running into millions or billions of dollars — and we understand full well the difficulties that stand in the way of organizing and administrating a global war against disease.

Nevertheless, our nation can act as a catalyst in speeding such world-wide health efforts, much as our Peace Corps is doing its fine job of hastening the industrial and educational progress of under-developed nations throughout the world.

I therefore want to put forward the following proposals by which our nation can help to equalize the world’s health imbalance:

1. I propose that our nation’s medical universities, along with our private philanthropic institutes — and in cooperation with the government health agencies, should call a conference for the purpose of setting up a Health Corps along the lines of our existing Peace Corps.

2. The purpose of the Health Corps would be to send teams of scientists, physicians, and nurses and medical administrators to those nations of the world which would request our help.

3. Once established in a specific area, these Health Teams, in collaboration with that nation’s own health authorities, would lay plans for short and long-range programs, for the construction of vitally needed training and research and hospital resources.

4. These Health Teams would be drawn from private doctors and scientists in the United States and from undergraduate and graduate personnel of the nation’s medical schools, who would volunteer to spend their period of elective study, their internships, or residencies in the foreign nations involved.

5. The United States Health Corps should, of course, act in conjunction with the World Health Organization of the United Nations. It might invite the participation of
of health teams from other nations, so that ultimately the Health Corps would become an international agency for promoting health throughout the world.

6. The Health Corps would be in a sense self-liquidating. That is, it would aim at eventually bringing the health standards of each of the member nations up to the point where they would be capable of meeting their own basic health needs.

7. The Health Corps should seek the advice, aid and experience of the World Health Organization so that the efforts of both would be pooled in solving the complex problems that exist.

This proposal is only one of the ways in which our nation's unlimited potential for saving and prolonging life could be extended to other areas of the world. It would, in my opinion, also serve as a vital link in binding together the people of the world in a crusade that would transcend any and all dividing interests which now exists at the level of narrow nationalism.

Your presence here, as friends and Founders of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, attests to the deep concern which you have for a better and happier physical life on this earth. Your "Letter to the Future" is written not merely in words but in your generous support of the splendid new halls of healing and research in which that letter is forever enclosed.

In the future, I am certain those of the forthcoming generations who will have benefited from your courage and concern will read in it a testament of man's humanity to all of the members of the human race.
TONITE'S GATHERING HAS A DUAL PURPOSE. FIRST, WE GATHER AS CITIZENS OF HAWAII TO OBSERVE THE 4TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE OF THE HAWAII STATEHOOD ACT; AND, SECOND, AS DEMOCRATS TO TAKE PART IN A NATIONWIDE DEMOCRATIC OBSERVANCE OF JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY.

I BELIEVE THAT IT IS MOST APPROPRIATE THAT WE HAVE COMBINED THESE TWO GREAT EVENTS, BECAUSE STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII IN MANY WAYS HERALDED THE COMING OF AGE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF HAWAII.

TODAY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF HAWAII IS TRULY THE MAJORITY PARTY OF OUR STATE - THE PARTY CHOSEN BY OUR PEOPLE TO GUIDE THE DESTINY OF OUR ISLANDS. AS A DEMOCRAT, I AM PLEASED AND PROUD TO NOTE THE MANY BOUQUETS OF PRAISE BEING ACCORDED THE NEW DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION LEAD BY GOVERNOR JOHN A. BURNS. DURING MY SHORT RETURN TO HAWAII I'VE HAD COUNTLESS NUMBERS OF PEOPLE TELL "JACK'S DOING A GOOD JOB" OR "I'M A REPUBLICAN, BUT I MUST ADMIT THAT BURNS IS AN EXCELLENT GOVERNOR" OR "I WAS NOT QUITE CONVINCED WHEN I VOTED FOR JACK BURNS, BUT NOW I KNOW I DID THE RIGHT THING WHEN I VOTED FOR JACK."

Our press
OUR PRESS WHICH DID NOT ENDORSE OUR JACK IS NOW FULL OF PRAISE FOR OUR NEW GOVERNOR. GOVERNOR BURNS, I BELIEVE I SPEAK FOR ALL DEMOCRATS WHEN I SAY "WE'RE PROUD OF YOU AND MAHALO FOR YOUR FINE LEADERSHIP."

OUR DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATURE IS CONDUCTING ITSELF WITH DISPATCH AND DIGNITY. WE HAVE BEEN IMPRESSED BY YOUR 16-HOUR WORK DAY. YOU HAVE KEPT FAITH WITH OUR PEOPLE, AND HAVE PROVEN TO ALL THAT OUR PLATFORM IS NOT JUST A PIECE OF PAPER - BUT A SOLEMN CONTRACT WITH OUR PEOPLE. WE DEMOCRATS THANK ALL DEMOCRATIC SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES FOR THEIR UNSELFISH SERVICE TO OUR STATE. WE ARE PROUD OF YOU.

FINALLY, I AM REALLY PLEASED TO REPORT TO YOU THAT THE TEAM OF GILL, MATSUNAGA AND INOYUE IS MOVING FORWARD IN WASHINGTON. CONGRESSMAN GILL AND CONGRESSMAN MATSUNAGA ARE FAVORABLY IMPRESSING THEIR SENIOR COLLEAGUES.

PLEASE BE ASSURED THAT HAWAII IS WELL REPRESENTED IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY TOM GILL AND SPARK MATSUNAGA.

IN A FEW HOURS I WILL BE ON MY WAY BACK TO WASHINGTON. LEAVING HAWAII IS NOT THE MOST PLEASANT EXPERIENCE. HOWEVER, LIKE ALL OF YOU I HAVE MY JOB TO DO. SO UNTIL WE MEET AGAIN, ALOHA.
DURING THE PAST SEVERAL WEEKS WE HAVE NOTED WITH SOME INTEREST THAT OUR LOCAL REPUBLICAN ORATORS, TAKING THE CUE FROM THEIR MAINLAND LEADERS, HAVE BEGUN LEVELLING THEIR POLITICAL GUNS ON ALLEGED FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY ON THE PART OF THE PRESENT DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION. IN SO DOING OUR REPUBLICAN FRIENDS HAVE CONVENIENTLY FORGOTTEN THAT THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION AMASSED A LARGER PEACE TIME NATIONAL DEBT THAN THE DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS OF ROOSEVELT, TRUMAN AND KENNEDY. FURTHERMORE, OUR REPUBLICAN FRIENDS CONVENIENTLY FAILED TO NOTE THAT THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION UNDER PEACE TIME CONDITIONS CREATED A LARGER PUBLIC DEBT THAN THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION THAT WAS FACED WITH POST WAR READJUSTMENT AND THE EXPENSIVE KOREAN CONFLICT. HOWEVER, I HOPE THAT THIS SHORT OPENING STATEMENT WILL NOT IN ANY WAY BE CONSTRUED AS MY APPROVAL OF PERPETUAL DEFICIT SPENDING. I AM CERTAIN MY COLLEAGUES IN CONGRESS JOIN ME IN THE HOPE THAT WE MAY SOMEDAY BE ABLE TO REDUCE GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND ALSO OUR NATIONAL DEBT.

SOME OF YOU MAY BE NOW ASKING YOURSELVES "WHY IS DAN DISCUSSING GOVERNMENT SPENDING?" WELL, I WISH TO SPEND A FEW MOMENTS WITH YOU DISCUSSING THE RELATIONSHIP OF FEDERAL SPENDING AND THE ECONOMY OF HAWAII. ACCORDING TO THE 1962 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BANK OF HAWAII PREPARED BY DR. JAMES SHOEMAKER, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DURING THE PAST YEAR MADE EXPENDITURES IN THE STATE OF HAWAII AMOUNTING TO $530,000,000.00. THIS AMOUNT IS APPROXIMATELY HALF OF ALL THE RECEIPTS OF DOLLARS FROM OUTSIDE SOURCES. IN OTHER WORDS, FEDERAL SPENDING
BROUGHT INTO THE STATE OF HAWAII MORE DOLLARS THAN SUGAR, PINEAPPLE AND TOURISM COMBINED. IN BRIEF, TODAY, WHETHER WE LIKE IT OR NOT, OUR ECONOMY IS HEAVILY DEPENDENT UPON FEDERAL SPENDING. I REPEAT AGAIN, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SPENT $530,000,000.00 IN HAWAII DURING THE PAST YEAR. IN CONTRAST OUR PAYMENTS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING TAXES AND PAYMENTS FOR SERVICES SUCH AS POSTAL SERVICES, AMOUNTED TO $280,000,000.00. SIMPLY THIS MEANS THAT FOR EVERY DOLLAR WE PAID INTO THE FEDERAL TREASURY, WE IN HAWAII RECEIVED IN RETURN TWO DOLLARS. I AM CERTAIN YOU WILL ADMIT THAT THIS IS QUITE A BARGAIN. THEREFORE, TODAY OUR MOST GENEROUS PARTNER IN THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF HAWAII IS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. BUT, CAN WE OR SHOULD WE FOREVER LOOK UPON OUR FEDERAL PARTNER TO CONTINUE BEING SO GENEROUS TO HAWAII'S ECONOMY. MY ANSWER IS A DEFINITE "NO."

I BELIEVE IT WOULD BE DANGEROUSLY UNWISE ON THE PART OF HAWAII'S PLANNERS TO RELY UPON HEAVY FEDERAL SPENDING TO CONTINUE FOREVER BECAUSE OF THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

1. OUR NATION IS MAKING EVERY SINCERE EFFORT TO ACHIEVE WORLD PEACE IN OUR LIFETIME. IF BY THE GRACE OF GOD WE ARE BLESSED WITH THIS ELUSIVE PEACE, THERE WILL OCCUR REDUCTIONS IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING ESPECIALLY IN THE AREA OF DEFENSE. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT APPROXIMATELY 75% OF THE DOLLARS SPENT IN HAWAII BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY RELATED TO DEFENSE ACTIVITIES. FURTHERMORE, WE SHOULD NOTE THAT WE ARE EXPERIENCING THE INTRODUCTION OF SOMETHING NEW IN THE FIELD OF WARFARE ALMOST EVERY MONTH. FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE NOTED THAT IN THE PAST FEW YEARS OUR NAVY HAS DISPLAYED GREATER RELIANCE UPON SUBMARINES TO CARRY OUR ITS DEFENSE MISSIONS. IF FURTHER CHANGES ARE MADE IN DEFENSE TECHNIQUES AND STRATEGY, WE MAY FIND THAT SOME OF THE FACILITIES OF NAVY YARD AT PEARL HARBOR MAY BECOME OBSOLETE WITHIN THIS DECADE. IF THIS IS TRANSLATED
INTO THE JOBS, IT MAY MEAN LESS EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.

2. LIKE PRIVATE INDUSTRY WE FIND THAT THE GOVERNMENT IS BEGINNING TO INSTITUTE MECHANISM AND AUTOMATION IN NEARLY EVERY FEDERAL ACTIVITY. IF THIS IS TRANSLATED INTO JOBS, IT MAY MEAN FURTHER UNEMPLOYMENT.

3. THERE IS A SERIOUS AND RISING CONCERN AMONG THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OVER THE HEAVY SPENDING CARRIED ON BY OUR GOVERNMENT. MANY OF US ARE SENSING THE PRESSURES FROM OUR CONSTITUENT TAXPAYERS WHO FEEL THAT THE TAX BURDEN IS GETTING TOO HEAVY.

NOW, THEREFORE, IF WE ARE TO CONCLUDE THAT THE ABOVE PROPOSITIONS ARE REASONABLE AND REALISTIC THEN WE IN HAWAII MUST IMMEDIATELY BEGIN REVISING OUR ECONOMIC PLANNING. WE MAY FIND THAT OUR FEDERAL PARTNERS MAY NOT BE TOO GENEROUS IN THE FUTURE. AND IN FACING THE FACTS SQUARELY WE MUST BEGIN LOOKING FOR OTHER STABLE SOURCES OF DOLLARS -- DOLLARS THAT WILL MEAN JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR THIS GENERATION AND THE FOLLOWING. OUR NEXT LOGICAL QUESTION SHOULD BE, "WHAT CAN OR SHOULD WE DO." THERE ARE SEVERAL RATHER OBVIOUS STEPS THAT MUST BE TAKEN. FIRST, WE SHOULD MAKE EVERY SINCERE EFFORT TO SUPPORT AND STRENGTHEN OUR AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISES. CONTRARY TO SOME OF OUR PEDDLERS OF ECONOMIC GLOOM I HAVE FAITH IN THE FUTURE OF SUGAR, PINEAPPLE AND DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURE. RECENTLY, WE PASSED A SUGAR BILL THAT IS MOST FAVORABLE TO OUR INDUSTRY. I AM CERTAIN UNDER THIS LEGISLATIVE STRUCTURE OUR INDUSTRY WILL FLOURISH. AGAIN, RECENTLY, OUR ADMINISTRATION ANNOUNCED ITS DECISION TO PURCHASE HAWAIIAN PINEAPPLE FOR USE IN OUR SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. AGAIN, WE FIND THAT WE HAVE BEEN EXCEEDINGLY FORTUNATE IN THE CONGRESS TO RECEIVE APPROVAL FOR VARIOUS PROJECTS GEARED TOWARD THE ENHANCEMENT OF OUR ECONOMY -- PROJECTS SUCH AS NAVIGATIONAL AND TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS AT KWAIHAE, KAULUI, KAUNAKAKAI, PORT ALLEN, HONOLULU AND BARBERS POINT. AGAIN, WE FIND THAT THE CONGRESS WAS EXCEEDINGLY GENEROUS IN
APPROVING AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS SUCH AS THE WATERSHED PROJECTS IN WAIANAЕ NUI, WAIANAЕ IKI, PUUKAPU AND THE MOLOKAI IRRIGATION PROJECT. AGAIN, WE FIND THAT THE CONGRESS HAS BEEN EXCEEDINGLY GENEROUS IN PROVIDING FOR IMPROVED FACILITIES AT THE HILO AIRPORT, KAHULUI AIRPORT AND HONOLULU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT. THERE WERE MANY OTHER PROJECTS THAT WERE APPROVED BY CONGRESS. HOWEVER, I POINT THESE OUT TO INDICATE THE TYPE OF PROJECTS THAT OUR CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION SHOULD SEEK. AS YOU CAN SEE, THESE PROJECTS WORK INTO THE LONG RANGE PLANNING OF HAWAII'S ECONOMY. THESE PROJECTS WILL MEAN BETTER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES WHICH MAY IN TURN RESULT IN EASIER ACCESSIBILITY TO MARKETS AND POSSIBLY A REDUCTION IN TRANSPORTATION RATES. THE AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS WILL MEAN THE OPENING UP OF VAST ARID LANDS TO PRODUCE OUR MUCH NEEDED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FOR USE HERE AND ABROAD. THESE PROJECTS IF TRANSLATED INTO JOBS WILL UNDOUBTEDLY MEAN GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT FOR THIS GENERATION AND THE FOLLOWING. IT WILL MEAN MORE DOLLARS INTO OUR STATE TREASURY WHICH IN TURN WILL MEAN BETTER SERVICES SUCH AS EDUCATION AND HEALTH FOR OUR PEOPLE.

DURING MY LAST VISIT IN THIS COUNTY, I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY OF SITTING WITH SEVERAL SMALL BUSINESSMEN TO DISCUSS THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF HAWAII. AFTER MY PRESENTATION, A LOCAL SMALL BUSINESSMAN, OPERATING A GROCERY STORE, MADE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT. "I AM SATISFIED THAT YOU HAVE DONE YOUR BEST TO HELP OUR SUGAR AND PINEAPPLE INDUSTRIES AND HAVE PROVIDED FOR IMPROVED TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES BUT WHAT HAVE YOU DONE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES." I REPLIED THAT IT IS TRUE VERY LITTLE HAS BEEN SPECIFICALLY DONE FOR SMALL BUSINESSES. BUT I POINTED OUT THAT IN ALL OF MY ACTIVITIES MY PRIME CONCERN WAS FOR THE SMALL FREE ENTERPRISER AND OUR MANY JOB HOLDERS. THIS BUSINESSMAN HAPPENED TO OPERATE HIS GROCERY STORE IN ONE OF OUR MANY SMALL PLANTATION TOWNS. I POINTED OUT THAT IF OUR AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY FAILED, IT WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY MEAN THE FAILURE OF HIS BUSINESS. IF ONE OF OUR MAJOR PLANTATIONS CEASED OPERATIONS AND LAID OFF ALL
OF THE WORKERS IT WOULD MEAN NOT ONLY THE LOSS OF JOBS FOR THE EMPLOYEES BUT
IT WOULD ALSO MEAN THE CLOSING UP OF THE GROCERY STORE, THE DRUG STORE, THE POOL-
SMALL BUSINESSES. THE SURVIVAL OF OUR SMALL BUSINESSES DEPEND UPON THE PURCHASING
POWER OF PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY. THEREFORE, I POINTED OUT THAT IN SUPPORTING
OUR BASIC AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES AND BY SEEKING THE IMPROVEMENT OF OUR TRANSP-
ORTATION SERVICES WE HAVE IN TURN STRENGTHENED THE SMALL BUSINESS POTENTIAL.

THE SECOND PROPOSITION OUR PLANNERS SHOULD CONSIDER IS AN INTERESTING
ONE. A FEW DAYS AGO, I HAD A MOST INTERESTING DISCUSSION WITH MR. GEORGE CHAPLIN
OF THE ADVERTISER DISCUSSING THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF HAWAII. DURING THIS
DISCUSSION GEORGE MENTIONED THAT WE HAVE CONVINCED OUR NEIGHBORS ON THE MAINLAND
THAT WE HAVE THE ALMOST PERFECT CLIMATE FOR VISITORS. OUR TOURIST FACILITIES
ARE EXCELLENT, OUR PEOPLE ARE FRIENDLY. HOWEVER, WE WONDERED WHETHER THE ECONOMIC
CLIMATE AND CONDITIONS WERE SUCH TO ATTRACT MAINLAND CAPITAL. I HAVE NOTED THAT
OUR PLANNERS HAVE DONE A LOT TO CONVINCE OUR MAINLAND NEIGHBORS OF OUR MANY
FACILITIES AND SUPPOSEDLY FAVORABLE CONDITIONS, BUT, AS MR. CHAPLIN POINTED OUT,
HAVE WE EVER INQUIRED OF OUR MAINLAND NEIGHBORS AS TO WHAT ECONOMIC CLIMATE AND
CONDITIONS THEY WOULD REQUIRE BEFORE THEY DECIDE TO POUR IN THEIR DOLLARS INTO
HAWAII. I CONCURRED WITH GEORGE IN THAT OUR PLANNERS SHOULD LOOK INTO THIS
POSSIBLE CHANGE AND APPROACH. BY THIS METHOD, WE MAY FIND WHETHER OUR ECONOMIC
CLIMATE IS OR IS NOT CONDUCIVE TO THE INVESTMENT OF DOLLARS IN HAWAII. I AM
CERTAIN ALL OF YOU REALIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NEW INDUSTRIES IN HAWAII.
IT IS TRUE THAT WE HAVE DONE A LOT IN THIS AREA. TODAY, THE DIVERSIFIED
MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IS FACT BECOMING ONE OF OUR MAJOR SOURCES OF INCOME AND
EMPLOYMENT. HOWEVER, WE MUST FURTHER DEVELOP THIS SELDOM PUBLICIZED SEGMENT
OF OUR ECONOMY. AS I POINTED OUT EARLIER, IF WE SENSE THE POSSIBILITY OF LESS
FEDERAL SPENDING IN HAWAII, WE MUST SERIOUSLY LOOK INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SOURCES OF EMPLOYMENT FOR OUR PEOPLE. I AM CERTAIN ALL OF YOU IN THE PAST DECADE HAVE WITNESSSED THE DEPARTURE OF ONE OF YOUR FAMILY OR POSSIBLY OF YOUR NEIGHBOR TO THE MAINLAND BECAUSE OF THE POSSIBLE GREATER JOB OPPORTUNITIES THERE. HARDLY A WEEK GOES BY IN MY OFFICE WHERE I MEET A YOUNG BRIGHT STUDENT FROM HAWAII WHO TELLS ME THAT HE INTENDS TO REMAIN ON THE MAINLAND TO LIVE OUT HIS LIFE. IF WE FAIL TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR OUR AMBITIOUS YOUNG PEOPLE IT WOULD RESULT IN OUR GREATEST LOSS. HAWAII'S GREATEST RESOURCE IS THE PEOPLE. WE CANNOT AFFORD TO LOSE THEM.

THIRD, THIS MAY SOUND LIKE A BROKEN RECORD TO YOU BUT I THINK THE TIME HAS COME WHEN OUR PLANNERS MUST SERIOUSLY THINK OF DEVELOPING OUR NEIGHBOR ISLANDS. TODAY, 80% OF THE POPULATION OF THE STATE IS CONCENTRATED ON THE ISLAND OF OAHU. OUR CITIZENS ARE NATURALLY ATTRACTED TO HONOLULU BECAUSE OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES. HOWEVER, THIS ATTRACTION HAS RESULTED IN CONGESTED AND CROWDED LIVING CONDITIONS AND THE EVER-INCREASING BURDEN ON OUR HONOLULU COUNTY GOVERNMENT. I AM CERTAIN I NEED NOT POINT OUT TO YOU SOME OF THE NATURAL EFFECTS OF OVER-CROWDED CONDITIONS. OUR NEWSPAPERS HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB POINTING THIS OUT TO YOU. THEREFORE, IT IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE HONOLULU PLANNERS TO HELP BUILD OUR NEIGHBOR ISLANDS. WE IN CONGRESS HAVE DONE OUR BEST TO BRING THIS ABOUT. I AM CERTAIN YOU HAVE NOTED THAT MOST OF OUR PROJECTS ARE GEARED TOWARDS DEVELOPMENT OF OUR NEIGHBOR ISLANDS. MOST OF OUR AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS ARE ON OUR NEIGHBOR ISLANDS.

PLEASE DO NOT CONSTRUE MY SUGGESTIONS AS BEING ALL ENCOMPASSING. I AM CERTAIN OUR PLANNERS AND ECONOMISTS HAVE MANY AND POSSIBLY BETTER IDEAS.

YOUR NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION HAS DONE A LOT TO DEVELOP A BETTER ECONOMIC CLIMATE FOR HAWAII. WE HAVE TALKED A LOT BUT WE HAVE ALSO ACTED.
I have noted with some concern that our state administration has done a lot of talking and has conducted many, many studies and surveys but I am certain the people of Hawaii will be asking this fall what has the Republican state administration done. This to me is a reasonable question to ask. I am certain that a change is needed in Iolani Palace. I am certain the people of Hawaii will support the party of deeds and action -- the Democratic Party of Hawaii.
Some of you here tonight may consider it a little out-
landish for a Senator from Hawaii to be speaking to Democrats
in the state of Utah.

But let me assure you that I feel very much at home in
your state which rivals mine for beauty, cleanliness and the
hospitality of its people.

I feel at home for these reasons and for the added reason
that I am speaking in the shadow of a magnificent Latter Day
Saints temple which also rivals the L.D.S. Temple in Hawaii.

When my good friend Ted Moss asked me to come to Utah to
speak at this dinner, I was most happy to do so. Senator Moss
and I see alike on many issues. For example, I am one of his
strongest supporters on his Senate resolution to raise the
colors over the U.S.S. UTAH in which 54 officers and men lie
entombed at Pearl Harbor. Few measures have been introduced
this session which have wider support than the Moss Resolution.

As a Democrat and a friend, therefore, I take a great
deal of pleasure speaking here in Utah.

I believe that the Democratic Party finds its strongest
fortress in the West.

Adhering to the traditions of the Western frontier, the
Democratic Party is the party at the frontiers of American
Government -- the party with its gunsights on tomorrow even
while its trigger finger is on the problems of today. It is
the party which considers our human resources our greatest
capital assets but seeks to create, to develop and to shape
the natural resources around us into the instruments that
mean greater prosperity for men everywhere.

-more-
Furthermore, the Democratic Party is the party of the whole country -- the party which recognizes that every group of Americans is entitled to a voice in the affairs of our land but that no one group is entitled to dominate all the country. That is why we are a national party that knows the East, the West, the North, and the South -- knows all of them as part of a united whole -- the United States of America.

But let me emphasize the role of the Western States tonight. The West is not only the developing area of America; it is also the area in which the statement that men and women are to be judged upon their merits and capabilities is not only given lip service but is a daily axiom.

It is the area where rigid social and economic divisions of the past give way before the pressures generated in a dynamic, fluid, and constantly changing society.

The Democratic Party recognizes this inherently progressive spirit which permeates the Western States. Thus it is that the Democratic Party gives the greatest recognition in the councils of government to the leaders of these states -- in the Majority Leader of the Senate, Mike Mansfield of Montana; the Chairman of the all important Senate Commerce Committee, Senator Magnuson of Washington; the Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and powerful member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Jackson of Washington; that voice of conscience from Oregon, Wayne Morse; and a long list of distinguished legislators, governors, and industrialists. I need not call the roll. It is called and not found wanting in the Nation's Capitol almost every day.

Your own Senator Moss has recently been added to the list of Western Senators with special power and influence in Washington.

He is now Chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee. This is the powerhouse of the Interior Committee -- and the Interior Committee is the most important committee of the Senate to the West.
Irrigation and Reclamation is the subcommittee which will hold hearings on the Dixie Reclamation Project, which means so much to Washington County, and on the Bear River Project, which will help the people in Cache, and Box Elder, and even Weber counties. It is the subcommittee which will do the spade work on Senator Moss' bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act so Utah can have even more water projects like Settlement Canyon in Tooele Country and Haight Creek in Davis County. Since all of these projects harness and put to best use Utah's precious water resources, I am sure I don't need to emphasize their significance to you.

When the ultimate phase of the Central Utah Project is ready for authorization -- along about 1966 or 1967, it will be very much to Utah's best interests to have their own Ted Moss sitting in the Chairman's seat of that subcommittee -- this alone should be enough to send Ted Moss to Washington in 1964 with the blessings of the entire state. I searched the records of Congress carefully, and I could find no evidence that any other Utah man has ever held such an important position in water development either in the House or the Senate.

Senator Moss should get considerable satisfaction out of the fact that it was his closest Senate colleagues -- men he had worked with most closely for the past four years -- who voted to give him this choice assignment, usually reserved for the Chairman or the ranking majority member of the committee. It comes usually with seniority -- in Ted Moss' case, it came because of a reputation earned in day after day contact with the members of the committee. It was something like winning your own precinct by beating out the votes yourself.

As a Senator, I am happy to represent a geographically small but intellectually able partner -- Hawaii -- in your ranks.

There is for our country a lesson in the political horizons which the Democratic Party has opened up in the West. It is that our own interests are best served by supporting the party which promises to serve all regardless of regional interests.
Does anyone here seriously believe that the great power projects of the Pacific Northwest; the great irrigation projects of the Rocky Mountain States; the great transportation systems that blanket your whole area would even have been built without the contributions of the Democratic Party? The question is rhetorical, at least to us Democrats. To the opposition still groping in the nineteenth century, it seems like a current issue.

But, I am not going to lambast the Republican Party or the Republicans tonight. I am not going to challenge their motives, their patriotism or their integrity. However, I may indicate, from time to time, that they seem possessed by somewhat misguided souls. But I know of no statutes, Federal, State or local, which make a felony out of being misguided.

In fact, in Hawaii we like Republicans. We like Republicans so well that in our last election we voted Democratic. For the first time in the history of Hawaii, we elected a Democratic Governor, a Democratic Senate and House, Democratic Representatives and a Democratic Senator.

But great people though the Republicans may be, I do not think that anyone will say that the Republican Party is the friend of the West. I say this even though some of my best friends are Republicans.

If we read western history with care, we will find individual Republicans who sincerely tried to do something for the great area we represent. I can recall for instance, a good conservationist, Theodore Roosevelt. He loved the West and was part of the West. And he had such a great hold on the imagination of the American people that the Republican Party was forced to put up with him for nearly two whole terms.

It was a little bit too much for the Republican Party. As soon as the administration was over, they quickly returned to the age of McKinley, high-button shoes and low-cut political tactics. They went back to the old game of trying to win an election by the only strategy they knew -- sow the seeds of dissension and reap the bitter fruit of temporary victory.

The Republicans traditionally have a sentimental remembrance of things past. And in line with that sentimental attachment they have learned full well their history -- the history of the Roman Empire, that is. There is a reason for this. The Roman Empire and the Republican Party bear marked similarities. Their economic and social values run parallel. Rome as a nation was small but overbearing just as is the Republican Party. Both were based on the principle of rule by elites. And both realized that their victory could come only by creating internal dissension in the country.
At the crucial moment, the Roman legions would march in and conquer the country. And at the crucial moment, the Republicans also believe they can walk in and take over the polls when Democrats have been cleverly manipulated to engage in intra-party harangues.

I have been talking in the tense of the historical past. Let us hope that this is not only a grammatical expediency, but a political fact.

I do not, under any circumstances, believe in suppressing differences in the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is the party of the people and like most of our people we don't mind hanging our wash out on the line. Furthermore, I think we actually gain strength by testing our ideas in the marketplace of free discussion so that when we do go to the people, we are not just approaching them with unproven theories.

But the strength of the Democratic Party lies not only in its diverse views but in its ability to unite in periods of crisis.

In the West, I believe we can be one of the most potent factors in maintaining unity of the national Democratic Party too. We understand the problems of the agricultural South. We understand the problems of the industrial North, and we constantly try to understand the complexities of a financial East. But we do recognize the absolute necessity of men of all regions working together if freedom is to survive in this age of anxiety.

We are only a little more than a year away from a campaign that is crucial to the West. In the Senate races alone, some of our more important Democratic leaders must face the political gauntlet. Let me call the roll of just a few:

Senator Henry Jackson of Washington
Senator Howard Cannon of Nevada
Senator Howard Edmondson of Oklahoma
Senator Clair Engle of California
Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana
Senator Gale McGee of Wyoming

and, of course, your own

Senator Ted Moss of Utah.

-more-
At the top of the ticket in every state flinging the gauntlet back will be the leaders of the New Frontier -- John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

You will be told in many different words and many different phrases about the issues in the campaign. You will hear "choke and stagger" stories about Cuba told by the eloquent Republicans; about foreign policy; about budget-balancing. But do not make any mistake. As far as I am concerned, this is a question of the West voting confidence in the only leaders who, because they seek to represent the whole country, will give the West its rightful due. Let us be with them on the political ramparts in 1964.

From a domestic standpoint, the issues will include the development of power; development of resources; development of agriculture; development of the great industries like the Utah missile industries, which have been ushered in by the Space Age. I do not think that we of the West are going to repudiate the leadership which has done so much for us. I know that everyone here tonight feels that same way.

Furthermore, I do not think that you of the West are the anxious children of fear. The campaign that is now being mounted against the Democratic Party is to a great extent a campaign of propagating fear -- an invitation to the American people to be afraid of themselves.

Furthermore, the campaign against the Democratic Party is going to be based on the concept of our limitations rather than our potential. The Republican Party reminds me very much of the old definition of a pessimist -- the man who looks at the hole instead of the doughnut.

We will be told we cannot afford our great irrigation projects.

We will be told that we cannot afford our great water purification projects.

We will be told we cannot afford our Space Age programs.

We will be told we cannot afford our power projects.

-more-
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We will be told to cancel out the advances of the Twentieth Century and move back to an age where our problems were easier.

I do not believe in spending our government into bankruptcy and neither does the Democratic Party. But I do believe in trying to find out what we can do and then going ahead and doing it, rather than a constant wringing of the hands over that which cannot be done.

The Democratic Party is a "can do" party and the West is a "can do" region. Based upon this alliance, there is nothing to stop us from being a "will do" government that will always seek to advance the interests of all regions of the country.

###
WINNING THE COUNTRY WITH THE WEST

As a Democrat, I take a great deal of pleasure speaking here in Washington.

I believe that the Democratic Party finds its strongest fortress in the West.

Adhering to the traditions of the Western Frontier, the Democratic Party is the Party at the frontiers of American Government--the party with its gunsights on tomorrow even while its trigger finger is on the problems of today. It is the party which considers our human resources our greatest capital assets but seeks to create, to develop and to shape the natural resources around us into the instruments that mean greater prosperity for men everywhere.

Furthermore, the Democratic Party is the party of the whole country--the party which recognizes that every group of Americans is entitled to a voice in the affairs of our land but that no one group is entitled to dominate all the country. That is why we are a national party that knows the East, the West, the North and the South-- knows all of them as part of a united whole--the United States of America.

But let me emphasize the role of the Western States tonight. The West is not only the developing area of America; it is also the area in which the statement that men and women are to be judged upon their merits and capabilities is not only given lip service but is a daily axiom.

It is the area where rigid social and economic divisions of the past give way before the pressures generated in a dynamic, fluid, and constantly changing society.

The Democratic Party recognizes this inherently progressive spirit which permeates the Western States. Thus it is that the Democratic Party gives the greatest recognition in the councils of government to the leaders of these states-- in the Majority Leader of the Senate, Mike Mansfield of Montana; the Chairman of the all important Senate Commerce Committee, your own Senator Magnuson; the Chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and powerful member of the Senate Armed Services
Committee, your own Senator Jackson; that voice of conscience from your neighboring State of Oregon, Wayne Morse; and a long list of distinguished legislators, governors and industrialists. I need not call the roll. It is called and not found wanting in the Nation's Capitol almost every day.

As a Senator, I am happy to represent a geographically small but intellectually able partner -- Hawaii -- in your ranks.

There is for our country a lesson in the political horizons which the Democratic Party has opened up in the West. It is that our own interests are best served by supporting the party which promises to serve all regardless of regional interests.

Does anyone here seriously believe that the great power projects of the Pacific Northwest; the great irrigation projects of the Rocky Mountain States; the great transportation systems that blanket your whole area would even have been built without the contributions of the Democratic Party? The question is rhetorical, at least to us Democrats. To the opposition still groping in the Nineteenth Century, it seems like a current issue.

But, I am not going to lambast the Republican Party or the Republicans tonight. I am not going to challenge their motives, their patriotism or their integrity. However, I may indicate, from time to time, that they seem possessed by somewhat misguided souls. But I know of no statutes, Federal, State or local, which make a felony out of being misguided.

In fact, in Hawaii we like Republicans. We like Republicans so well that in our last election we voted Democratic. For the first time in the history of Hawaii, we elected a Democratic Governor, a Democratic Senate and House, Democratic Representatives and a Democratic Senator.

But great people though the Republicans may be, I do not think that anyone will say that the Republican Party is the friend of the West. I say this even though some of my best friends are Republicans.

If we read Western history with care, we will find individual Republicans who sincerely tried to do something for the great area we represent. I can recall for instance, a good conservationist, Theodore Roosevelt. He loved the West and was part of the West. And he had such a great hold on the imagination of the American people that the Republican Party was forced to put up with him for nearly two whole terms.
It was a little bit too much for the Republican Party. As soon as the Administration was over, they quickly returned to the age of McKinley, high-button shoes and low-cut political tactics. They went back to the old game of trying to win an election by the only strategy they knew -- sow the seeds of dissension and reap the bitter fruit of temporary victory.

The Republicans traditionally have a sentimental remembrance of things past. And in line with that sentimental attachment they have learned full well their history -- the history of the Roman Empire, that is. There is a reason for this. The Roman Empire and the Republican Party bear marked similarities. Their economic and social values run parallel. Rome as a nation was small but overbearing just as is the Republican Party. Both were based on the principle of rule by elites. And both realized that their victory could come only by creating internal dissension in the country.

At the crucial moment, the Roman legions would march in and conquer the country. And at the crucial moment, the Republicans also believe they can walk in and take over the polls when Democrats have been cleverly manipulated to engage in intra-party harangues.

I have been talking in the tense of the historical past. Let us hope that this is not only a grammatical expediency, but a political fact.

I do not, under any circumstances, believe in suppressing differences in the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is the party of the people and like most of our people we don't mind hanging our wash out on the line. Furthermore, I think we actually gain strength by testing our ideas in the market place of free discussion so that when we do go to the people, we are not just approaching them with unproven theories.

But the strength of the Democratic Party lies not only in its diverse views but in its ability to unite in periods of crisis.

In the West, I believe we can be one of the most potent factors in maintaining unity of the national Democratic Party too. We understand the problems of the agricultural South. We understand the problems of the industrial North, and we constantly try to understand the complexities of a financial East. But we do recognize the absolute necessity of men of all regions working together if freedom is to survive in this age of anxiety.
We are only a little more than a year away from a campaign that is crucial to the West. In the Senate races alone, some of our more important Democratic leaders must face the political gauntlet. Let me call the roll of just a few:

Senator Henry Jackson of Washington

Senator Howard Cannon of Nevada

Senator Howard Edmondson of Oklahoma

Senator Clair Engle of California

Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana

Senator Gale McGee of Wyoming

Senator Frank Moss of Utah

And at least, six important governorships -- headed by your own Albert Rosellini.

At the top of the ticket in every State flinging the gauntlet back will be the leaders of the New Frontier -- John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

You will be told in many different words and many different phrases about the issues in the campaign. You will hear "choke and stagger" stories about Cuba told by the eloquent Republicans; about foreign policy; about budget-balancing. But do not make any mistake. As far as I am concerned, this is a question of the West voting confidence in the only leaders who, because they seek to represent the whole country, will give the West its rightful due. Let us be with them on the political ramparts in 1964.

From a domestic standpoint, the issues will include the development of power; development of resources; development of agriculture; development of the great industries which have been ushered in by the Space Age. I do not think that we of the West are going to repudiate the leadership which has done so much for us. I know that everyone here tonight feels that same way.
Furthermore, I do not think that you of the West are the anxious children of fear. The campaign that is now being mounted against the Democratic Party is to a great extent a campaign of propagating fear -- an invitation to the American people to be afraid of themselves.

Furthermore, the campaign against the Democratic Party is going to be based on the concept of our limitations rather than our potential. The Republican Party reminds me very much of the old definition of a pessimist -- the man who looks at the hole instead of the doughnut.

We will be told we cannot afford our great irrigation projects.

We will be told we cannot afford our great water purification projects.

We will be told we cannot afford our Space Age programs.

We will be told we cannot afford our power projects.

We will be told to cancel out the advances of the 20th Century and move back to an age where our problems were easier.

I do not believe in spending our government into bankruptcy and neither does the Democratic Party. But I do believe in trying to find out what we can do and then going ahead and doing it, rather than a constant wringing of the hands over that which cannot be done.

The Democratic Party is a "can do" Party and the West is a "can do" region. Based upon this alliance, there is nothing to stop us from being a "will do" government that will always seek to advance the interests of all regions of the country.
I doubt if any man can be in politics very long without learning one immutable law -- the voter is unpredictable. For reasons often unknown to us, and, for that matter, not always known to himself, he pulls the lever marked Democratic or Republican on election day. This is repeated by hundreds of thousands of voters across the nation and a new Congress results. We can be sure of only one thing -- whatever peculiar combination of circumstances made him pull that particular lever can never again be repeated.

We have just been through such an election and that new Congress has barely begun its work. The political pros, newspaper columnists, and even reluctant Republicans admit that the results of that election indicate a victory for the Democratic Party. We have an increased majority in the Senate -- and on the Senate committees where it counts -- and had minimal losses for an off-year election in the House. All of this adds up to increased liberal-Democratic strength and optimism for the Administration's program in this Congress.

Yet, even while the returns from one State are not yet official and Minnesotans know not who their Governor is, I am here to tell you, as political representatives of organized labor, to begin work NOW for the 1964 Congressional contest.

Before I am asked, "Where's the fire?" a word of explanation is due. I say work now for 1964 precisely because the voter is unpredictable and because his whim of yesterday may not be his will of the day after. Whatever our gains in the last election -- however well things look right now -- 1964 is bound to be a different story. I am not saying that we are not going to do as well, but I am saying that the reasons for victory in 1962 may not be relevant in 1964, AND LABOR'S STAKE IN THE 1964 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION WILL BE GREATER THAN EVER.
1964 is, of course, a Presidential year. This may be to our advantage. The polls show that the President's popularity is high, and the prospects for his re-election are more than good. But popularity is hard to pin down and we are all aware that any number of things -- a temporary foreign policy reverse, the failure of the economy to respond to the stimulus of the proposed tax cut, and so on -- could change the complexion of the contest overnight.

Even more important, however, the popularity of the President will not assure the success of his party in the Congressional elections. Coattails are out of style. Mr. Eisenhower was one of the most popular Presidents in our history, but he never pulled his party into power behind him. And, in terms of your interests, the Congressional contest is both just as important and involves a fight just as great as the Presidential election. Further, the outlook for the Congressional contest is far less optimistic.

In 1964, twenty-five Democratic Senators face re-election. Only eight Republicans must stand a similar test. Fourteen of these Democrats are from states which President Kennedy did not carry in 1960 -- California, Indiana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Ohio and so on. It is difficult to predict gains in such a heavily-weighted contest.

Among these twenty-five you will find many of labor's staunchest supporters and firmest friends. Philip Hart of Michigan, Clair Engle of California, Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota, Gale McGee of Wyoming, Ralph Yarborough of Texas, Vance Hartke of Indiana and Harrison Williams of New Jersey are but a few. Twenty of these twenty-five voted for the Administration's Medicare program. Nineteen had ratings of more than "80% Right" according to their votes on eleven issues selected by COPE. And, they are almost unanimously in favor of such programs as aid to education, housing, area redevelopment and minimum wage.

Thus, labor's stakes are high. Many of your friends are on the firing line, and the odds are not in your favor. But in 1964 labor's stakes are higher than even this might indicate. Labor has a real investment in supporting their candidates in 1964, for labor, itself, has been on the firing line of late.
At a time of general prosperity in this nation, when our fears and concerns are centered on foreign rather than domestic problems, public sympathy for labor seems to be on the wane. In the early days of the movement, organized labor was viewed as the underdog fighting for its fair share of the American wealth. Today, with many of its original aims achieved -- with such concepts as collective bargaining and workman's compensation everyday words in the American vocabulary -- the labor movement has lost much of the idealistic impetus upon which it rode.

This is not to say that the programs and principles for which labor fights today are any the less necessary or valid. They are, however, less pressing. The need for medical care for the elderly and aid to education is great indeed, but it is not the urgent and immediate need for compensation of a critically injured worker and his family, nor the need for bread felt by the hungry. And while it is widely recognized that labor can and should ask for its fair share of the profits of prosperity, there is wide disagreement as to what constitutes that fair share, and how it is to be secured. Similarly, while it is widely recognized that labor must look after its own interests, there is wide disagreement as to what those interests are, and how they are to be related to the national interest. Moreover, the sympathy engendered by a fight for survival no longer adds its force to labor's ammunition.

Today, the survival of organized labor is assured. As a power group in American society, the voice of labor is equal to all others, and because it is an organized voice, it is often louder. For these reasons, there is inevitable fear of labor's influence and power. This has been with us for many years. Of late, however, that fear has found an increasingly apparent point of focus.

During the past few years we have had a series of long and laborious strikes, some of which have been considered greatly injurious to the national interest. Among these was the recent dockworker's strike, which, despite the use of the Taft-Hartley injunction could not be settled behind the scenes, and tied up the nation's shipping and commerce for several weeks. Only the intervention of a Presidential Board brought about agreement.

Other strikes, while not involving the national interest, and thus precluding the use of government machinery to speed settlement, have involved direct and personal inconvenience and
injury to individuals and businesses caught in between the labor and management groups involved. The most outstanding example, of course, is the current New York newspaper strike.

I am not about to discuss the issues involved in either strike, or the merits of either position. For however right or wrong labor or management may be in each instance, the fact remains that the public has little sympathy for those who are striking. I do not think I am being unduly dire in predicting that it will take but one more strike of national import to bring public pressure for restrictive legislation, beyond the scope of the Landrum-Griffin Bill, to the point where it is irresistible. And may I remind you that when the Landrum-Griffin Conference Bill was voted upon by the House of Representatives in 1959, only 52 members voted against passage. Over 350 voted for passage. I was one of the lonely 52.

An indication of this growing pressure is already available. One of the nation's leading publications, "Business World," -- not known as a friend of labor, to say the least, put it this way: "... union power remains a potentially explosive issue in Congress where demands continue for anti-strike legislation of some kind ... Kennedy still hopes to keep a lid on new labor legislation this year. But the unions themselves may blow the lid off before summer." There was a time when we could dismiss such warnings as scare-tactics on the part of an unfriendly publication, but today there is more than a measure of truth in this report.

More and more in the corridors of the Capitol one can hear talk of "what can be done about labor." Several Senators have introduced and advocated legislation designed to apply anti-trust laws to labor unions. Even Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor -- who above all is NCT an enemy of labor -- has mentioned the possibility of compulsory arbitration. In a speech last week before the National Academy of Arbitration, the Secretary warned, "... neither the traditional collective bargaining procedures nor the present labor-dispute laws are working to the public's satisfaction ..." He continued, "it doesn't matter anymore, really, how much the hurt has been real, or has been exaggerated. A decision has been made. And that decision is that if collective bargaining can't produce peaceful settlements of these controversies the public will."
In the face of this mounting sentiment, the interest of labor in electing spokesmen who are sympathetic to their views should be apparent. For if the showdown now impending should prove unavoidable, it will not be by a landslide, but by a close and carefully-waged contest that the issue is decided. One or two votes on either side could prove crucial and the deciding votes will be won or lost now.

I believe that this mounting anti-labor sentiment is real and immediate, and that its impact on the Congressional elections of 1966 can be immense. Further, there is another developing disposition on the part of the American public which is similarly acting against your interests. That is an increasingly apparent anti-spending sentiment. As in the case of the public's fear of the power of unions, this anti-spending sentiment is not new to the American scene; however, in a year in which taxes and the economy have been made a major issue by both parties, "spending" as such, is taking its place as a hotly contested factor on both sides.

An indication of the amount of attention which this issue is attracting is afforded by the press. Pick up any major newspaper or magazine in this country, any day of the week, and you are bound to find mention of Federal spending. There will be articles and editorials on -- federal spending and foreign aid; federal spending and education; federal spending as it affects the individual and his freedom; federal spending as it affects a balanced budget, and so on -- until federal spending as it affects every segment of and situation in our society has been carefully scrutinized and often stigmatized.

Again, because of our general prosperity and our increased concern over foreign rather than domestic issues, there seems to be a growing annoyance at greater domestic spending. True, the bulk of our budget is expended for defense and space exploration, and few would advocate reductions here. Thus, the relatively small amounts which go into domestic programs come under exaggerated fire.

Without the immediate and painful reminders of growing unemployment, bank and business failures and falling prices, we find it easy to forget that there are still those who are deprived and denied in this nation. Similarly, while most of us enjoy an unparalleled prosperity, it is easy to forget that the potential of this nation for providing adequate education, housing and medical care for all of its citizens remains unrealized.
Such easy forgetfulness is a ready weapon for the opponents of education, medical care, housing and other programs. While few are reminding us of the reality of these needs, many are warning us of the dangers of deficits and the beauties of a balanced budget. And, as I pointed out a moment ago, this point of view has found many advocates in the nation's press, and has received a great deal of publicity of late. Such a calculated campaign cannot fail to make some impression.

Once again, I am not here discussing these issues, per se. For whether we cut our taxes and initiate reforms or maintain the status quo, whether we balance or unbalance the budget, these domestic needs will remain. And labor will continue to be the group most directly aware of and concerned with these needs.

You have always been the strongest supporters of these domestic programs. But if your efforts of the past are to meet with success -- if programs such as medical care for the aged and aid to education are to be enacted -- your increased efforts in the future, in the face of ever more vocal anti-spending sentiment, will be called for. Here, once again, it is in the Congress that these issues will be decided. Again, a few votes will make the difference. If you are going to have those votes when they are needed, you must seek and secure them now.

The interest of labor in every Congressional election is great, for your members are many and your role in our society is a vital one. But the challenges to your interests are not often as great as they will be in 1964. There is a great deal to lose and it will take some effort to merely hold our own.

I might have spent these few minutes advising you of the merits of Medicare or the advantages of aid to education. But I am not here to sell you a program. Rather, I am here to urge YOU to sell that program, because it is imperative to your interests that you do so. Thus, I can but point out what I believe is the real and immediate importance of early action and the equally real importance of inaction.

If you are going to be successfully able to combat public pressure for anti-labor legislation and decreased domestic spending -- if the twenty-five Democratic Senators who must face the electorate in September of 1964 are to return to the Senate in January of 1965 -- and if labor is going to hold the trump in 1964 in order to take the trick in 1965 -- you must do your bidding now.