

private suppliers previously did, you plan to extend power.

In Wisconsin, farmers faced up to a similar decision back in 1937. Eventually 28 local systems joined together in Dairyland Power Cooperative, and it is now the largest cooperatively owned power system in the world. It has proven its worth. It provides the lowest net power costs available to rural systems in the State. It saves these systems millions of dollars annually in power costs from the rates quoted for wholesale supply when it was organized. Total kilowatt-hours to be furnished by Dairyland this year to these systems is expected to reach a billion kilowatt-hours. And the impact of Dairyland as a yardstick of practical rates will become even more important in the years ahead.

Here in Kentucky I am told that you need only look to the success of the East Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative as an example of what can be accomplished through your own generation. I understand East Kentucky fought for 4 long years through the courts to win its right to operate. It now has the lowest wholesale power costs in Kentucky outside the TVA area while its member cooperatives are building a substantial equity in this system.

I understand that your great project already has attracted a major new industry to the area—and that has been the story almost everywhere.

I am informed that the total power input in rural electric systems in Kentucky will double by 1970, and by 1975 the three cooperatives served by your new plant will need almost three times the power you needed in 1961.

Whether rural areas get this power they are demanding—at reasonable rates—will determine whether our country will grow and develop as it should, and whether our country will continue to expand as it must if America is to be strong.

We live in a strange economy today, where employment and unemployment increase at the same time; where many families reach new heights of prosperity and many others slip backward; where automation takes more jobs each day, and where some great areas of our country live in a state of perpetual depression.

We faced up to our problems in the thirties, and the REA was one of the tools we developed to work with. Our problems are just as great today, and they may be even more baffling. We cannot lay down our tools. We have just begun to work.

GEORGE F. KENNAN

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, as both a scholar and practitioner of diplomacy, George F. Kennan has served his country and the free world with rare distinction. His resignation as Ambassador to Yugoslavia, where he has served with high competence, is a major loss to American diplomacy. With his return to the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton, we can expect further important contributions to contemporary scholarship in international relations.

Over the past 20 years, George Kennan has pursued two separate careers with equal distinction. As Ambassador to the Soviet Union in the early postwar years and as Ambassador to Yugoslavia in the last 2 years, he has brought unique qualities of wisdom, perception, and judgment to challenging assignments. Between these ambassadorial posts, he wrote "Russia Leaves the War," the Decision to Intervene, and "Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin," establishing himself as a major contemporary his-

torian. Mr. Kennan is an outstanding example of the dedicated and effective career Foreign Service officer.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point two editorials regarding Mr. Kennan, one from the Washington Post, the other from the Washington Star, for July 31.

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

KENNAN ON CAMPUS

U.S. Ambassador George F. Kennan has left his post in Yugoslavia to return once again to the private life of a scholar. He merits the thanks and best wishes of his countrymen for all that he has done in the Foreign Service. Certainly he has been a hard and brilliant worker in diplomacy's sometimes sterile vineyards.

All told, Mr. Kennan has spent 29 years of his life in those vineyards. Back in 1953 he retired from them, but President Kennedy, almost a decade later, persuaded him to get back in harness for the important Belgrade assignment. The Ambassador performed as usual. That is to say, he performed with high competency, so much so that Marshal Tito and the Yugoslav people have made clear even amid the disaster of Skopje, that his successor will have big shoes to fill.

Mr. Kennan has been one of our country's best and most articulate experts on the meanings and intentions of Red totalitarianism. As the famous Mr. X—a chief architect of the containment policy against the U.S.S.R.—he has shown over the years a perceptiveness that stands by itself. It has been a thing of incalculable value to the United States in the never-ending effort to beat back the menace that emanates everlastingly from Peking and Moscow, even though both are at odds at the moment.

Few members of our Foreign Service have had a career as distinguished as Mr. Kennan's. Wholly apart from his ambassadorship to Moscow under Stalin, he has made impressive contributions to the cause of peace in an exceedingly dangerous world. As the State Department's first chief of policy planning, he deserves special applause for having played a vital role in preventing the U.S.S.R. from gobbling up what remains of free Europe.

Mr. Kennan returns now to the campus in his enviable academic role at Princeton's Institute of Advanced Studies. But this is not a retreat from reality. On the contrary, in some respects, the Institute is closely related to the cold war, or a possible hot one. And so also is Professor Kennan.

ON "LIBERALISM" AND "COEXISTENCE"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, it is a welcome relief, during these muggy, sticky, frustrating summer days, to be diverted even momentarily from the serious problems of Government and public policy. We are indebted to the junior Senator from Arizona for providing us with such a diversion in his recent remarks to the Human Events Conference here in Washington.

I read the Senator's speech with interest and enjoyment. It is indeed a remarkable speech. At no point does it burden the reader with the complexities of current foreign and domestic problems.

The Senator has a rare gift of clarity. So lucid is his discourse that he makes

us wonder what all the fuss has been over nuclear weapons and international tensions and unemployment and all the other stubborn problems that perplex the American people. In the Senator's penetrating analysis, all these problems can be made to evaporate if we will only declare a "bold" and "courageous" policy abroad and return to "fundamentals" at home. It is regrettable that, for whatever excellent reasons, the Senator did not see fit to elaborate on his noble sentiments or to spell out how and where and by what means he proposes to take "bold" action abroad or to explain to us which precise "fundamentals" he would have us return to in our domestic life.

Undoubtedly, the Senator from Arizona intends to do these things in some future pronouncement. I think it only proper to assume that he will and, as a Democrat, I think I can assure the Senator that we on the majority side are prepared to wait patiently for the time when he will see fit to translate his brave theories into prescriptions for public policy. It would indeed be rude and ungrateful for a Democrat to join in the intemperate criticisms that have been directed at the Senator from Arizona by prominent members of his own party.

We owe the Senator this forbearance because of his own gracious and generous attitude toward the Democratic Party. In his speech the Senator unequivocally expressed his opinion that Democrats are not Communists and that the Communist Party has not captured control of the Democratic Party—even though, in the view of the Senator from Arizona, the program of the Democratic administration is viewed with favor by the Communists.

I thank the Senator for his generous—I hesitate to say liberal—view of the Democratic Party. In return, I am prepared to state my own unequivocal opinion that the Senator from Arizona is not a Communist either—despite the similarity of some of his views to those of the rulers of Communist China. I am sure this is purely coincidental.

The Senator from Arizona is opposed to coexistence; so are the Chinese Communists. The Senator is opposed to the nuclear test ban treaty; so are the Chinese Communists. The Senator thinks it is cowardly to try to avoid nuclear war; so do the Chinese Communists.

I am confident that no fairminded American will misinterpret the interesting parallel between the Senator's views on these matters and those of the Chinese Communists. The Senator, without doubt, is a loyal and patriotic American.

I was particularly interested in two themes that run through the Senator's remarks: his views on liberalism and on coexistence.

The Senator is foursquare in his opposition to liberalism, which he regards as feeble and exhausted and at the same time—somehow—dangerously aggressive and predatory. Liberalism, in the Senator's view, represents a whole category of evils that the Democratic administrations of the last 30 years have invented to destroy the freedom of the American people. Liberalism stands for such wickedness as social security, which

has destroyed the freedom of the aged to be destitute or dependent; rural electrification and farm price supports, which have destroyed the freedom of the farmer to live in poverty and deprivation—by candlelight; public housing and urban renewal, which have destroyed the freedom of many of our people to live in rural shacks and urban slums; public works and Government fiscal policy, which have destroyed the freedom of most—but not all—of our people to be blissfully unemployed; and Federal aid to education—the most diabolical plot of all—which threatens to destroy our freedom to be ignorant and unemployable.

The Senator from Arizona is opposed to all these incursions on the "freedom" of the American people. He opposes them for many reasons, but most of all because they violate certain unspecified ethical "fundamentals." No doubt, in the fullness of time, the Senator will spell out these "fundamentals." The Senator has been unjustly belabored by prominent members of his own party who have failed to understand that he has been far too busy with his chronicle of things that he opposes to have had time to explain his own distinct philosophy of "illiberalism."

I, for one, am prepared to wait. It is rumored that the Senator from Arizona may be prevailed upon to seek higher office. Should that prove to be the case, he will undoubtedly spell out a dynamic program of national action under some stirring title like "the Fundamentals of Illiberalism" or "Let's Get the Government Out of the Business of Government."

As intriguing as the Senator's opinion of "liberalism" are his views on "coexistence." "To coexist," according to Webster, is "to exist together or at the same time." The Senator, as we all know, is unalterably opposed to such an arrangement between the Communist countries and the free world. It would seem to follow that the Senator considers it essential for one side or the other—presumably the Communist side—to stop existing at once.

The problem of course—which the Senator has not yet seen fit to comment on—is precisely how the Communists can be persuaded or coerced to terminate their existence. It seems reasonable to suppose that they will not do so voluntarily, so the problem is really one of compulsion. It is precisely at this interesting point that the Senator leaves us in suspense.

He is absolutely clear, however, in his conviction that "coexistence" is craven, cowardly and un-American. It is, in fact, a Communist idea, based on Khrushchev's apparent confidence that if the two sides engage in peaceful competition for the allegiance of mankind, his side will win. For an American to favor coexistence, he would have to believe that democracy is far stronger than communism, that a free society can create a far better life for the individual than a totalitarian society, that freedom has a magnetism and promise for mankind that communism can never hope to match.

Of this heresy no one can accuse the junior Senator from Arizona. He has stated unequivocally that he favors "boldness and courage and determination" over craven "coexistence." These words, of course, are a bit vague and the Senator has not yet seen fit to translate them into specific proposals for a "bold" and "courageous" foreign policy.

But perhaps we can speculate. Both the United States and the Soviet Union possess hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles with which to destroy each other's societies. Neither has the means of preventing the other from doing so. Under these circumstances the only alternative to "coexistence" is mutual destruction. This, perhaps, is the key to the foreign policy favored by the Senator from Arizona—a "bold," "courageous," and "determined" policy of "coannihilation."

This, of course, is speculation because the Senator has not yet chosen to reveal his foreign policy proposals. It may be some time before he does so. In the meantime, there is nothing for us to do but restrain our eagerness and contemplate the delay with equanimity.

Madam President, I notified the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] that I would comment on his speech. I understand he is out of the city. Unfortunately, I shall have to leave the city this evening, and I thought I could not wait until his return.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the remarks of the Senator from Arizona, delivered before the Human Events Conference on Friday, July 12, 1963, to which my comments are directed.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE HUMAN EVENTS CONFERENCE, JULY 12, 1963

Speaking a short time ago to a Young Republican Convention in San Francisco, I examined at some length the complete bankruptcy of the liberal position in American political life. And today, I should like to extend that discussion and deal with what I believe are some of the root causes of the decline and fall of American liberalism. Basically, I believe it is important to understand that the liberal approach to the problems that beset us both at home and abroad has been given every conceivable chance. It has been tried, and tried and tried—over and over and over again. And it has never worked. We saw the whole rigamarole in the 1930's when this Nation was caught in a deep depression. We were told then that the answer to all of our problems was the massive intervention of the Federal Government. We were told that the answer rested in Government spending—bigger and bigger Government spending accompanied, of course, by higher and higher taxes. We were told that the pump needed priming; that leaves needed raking; that we were all children under the paternalistic fatherhood of the Federal Government.

We were told many things in those dark and desperate days—at a time when this Nation was prepared to try almost anything to overcome the ravages of hunger and unemployment and economic stagnation. Well, we took what we were told to heart. The Nation and the Congress went along with

the whole bag of tricks. A great profusion of new laws was passed. Heavy new appropriations were provided. Taxes soared. But it still took World War II to get this country out of the depression. And we were almost last among the nations of the world to emerge from that depression.

Now today we find the American liberals offering the same old tricks in an effort to lower unemployment, accelerate business activity and—if you'll pardon the expression—"get the Nation moving." What do we have today in the way of proposals from the administration that differ, except in size, from what the New Deal offered 30 years ago? We have nothing different. We have public works projects, a new version of the old CCC camps, more unemployment compensation, area redevelopment, and so on and on. The only difference, I suggest, is that today the liberal has progressed to the stage where he no longer makes any pretense of supporting fiscal responsibility. You know, we used to be told that recurring emergency and constant crisis were the only things that prevented New Dealers and Fair Dealers from striving toward the goal of a balanced budget. In the craziest days of New Deal and Fair Deal innovation, at the very peak of the drive for more and greater social engineering and tampering with the lives of the American people, none of the liberals ever attempted to sell us the idea that deficits were desirable. In this respect, at least, they were hewing to the line of intellectual honesty.

But what do we find today? We find that anyone who retains a belief in fundamentals, anyone who feels that there should be a relationship between Government income and Government spending; anyone who fears that we are mortgaging the lives of our children and our grandchildren with exorbitant and unnecessary Government spending; any such person is suffering from a new disease called the Puritan ethic. Today, if we are to believe the New Frontiersmen, there is something dishonorable about being either a Puritan or retaining some ethics in the field of fiscal affairs. We are actually told that deficits are not only necessary but imperative to the well-being of the American society. We are led to believe that anything which calls for further Government spending, regardless of whether such spending is needed, is a blessing in disguise because it might spur business activity.

In effect, we are being told that things are not as they seem, not as they actually are, but only as the New Frontier says they are. We are asked in every area of Government policy to base our judgment, not on achievement but on Presidential rhetoric. We are supposed to overlook the unsolved problems, the looming threats, the lack of decision and abject failures and devote our time instead to marveling at sweet-sounding verbal assessments emanating from the White House.

This is particularly true in the field of foreign affairs. We are to "ask not" why it was necessary for the President of the United States to travel over Europe promising that the United States would honor its commitment to defend Western Europe in the event of a Communist attack. Our task is to take our cue from cheering thousands in Europe and join the chorus. We are not supposed to ask why other American Presidents never had to give such resounding personal assurances. We are not supposed to see that personal assurances were all the President had to give because the record of his administration does nothing—let me repeat, does nothing—to reassure the people of Western Europe that we would react strongly and affirmatively to a Communist attack. How can we expect Western Europe to take us at the President's word when they have only to look at Cuba to realize that we haven't reacted strongly enough to meet a Communist threat on our own doorstep?

I suggest that those Europeans who had read the President's speech at American University must have wondered at his promises that the United States would not hesitate to defend Europe from Communist attack. In that speech, you may remember, the President credited the Soviet Union with having a deep interest in "a just and genuine peace." He urged the American people to reexamine their attitude toward the Soviet Union and pointed out that our two nations had never waged war against each other. He drew attention to Soviet losses in World War II—as though this had some special bearing—and urged an effort to "make the world safe for diversity."

Now that last—make the world safe for diversity—is a nicely turned phrase. It has a statesmanlike ring to it. It is the kind of rhetorical expression we have learned to expect from the President. But what does it mean? I would suggest that you think long and hard on that phrase—make the world safe for diversity. For diversity, as practiced by the Soviet Union, means many things. It means slavery and oppression and tyranny and bigotry. It means Godlessness, a lack of honor, the degrading of human dignity, a national policy of falsehood. It means pogroms and purges and concentration camps. It means mass murder and aggression. Why, in the name of everything that is honorable, should the United States strive to make the world safe for that kind of diversity?

I suggest that the President's plea is just another way of saying that the New Frontier is determined to coexist with international communism wherever it thrives—even in the Western Hemisphere. This is merely an extension of the liberal fallacy which can never seem to realize that there can be a serious threat to the security of the United States and the freedom of the world coming from the left of the political spectrum. Apologists for the Communist way and Communist objectives continue to abound in the liberal circles of America despite the years of experience we have had with Soviet duplicity. I suggest that there is something wrong—something radically wrong—with the liberal orientation for the cold war. And I am beginning to despair of its ever being able to overcome what amounts to a deep-seated prejudice in favor of far leftists' objectives.

In this connection let me draw your attention to the fact that the Moscow-trained secretary general of the American Communist Party is urging the defeat of all Republicans in 1964. Gus Hall, in a 10,000-word statement in the Sunday Worker of June 23, laid down the marching orders for American Communists. He found much that was praiseworthy, in his view, with the approach of the New Frontier.

Hall served notice that the Communist Party of the United States would not put up candidates of its own in the 1964 elections and that it will not support any movement for a new political party. His rationale and blueprint for Communist action on the domestic front found that both of America's major political parties are tools of capitalism. But he said that although President Kennedy had engaged in "imperialist adventures" such as the blockade of Cuba last October, he had nevertheless kept the "lines of communication open" with Russia and atoned for the blockade by quarantining the Cuban exiles, banning raids, bombing and the invasion of Cuba.

The Communist leader seemed particularly interested in what he called "the broad movement which has relationships with the administration." He said the broad movement included labor organizations, peace movements and youth and civil rights groups which are engaged in "ever more militant mass actions" and which keep a "constant line of contact with administration forces."

According to Hall—and mark this—almost all "peoples political movements" are operating within the orbit of the Democratic Party and must be supported by what he termed "the serious left." Of course, in the Communist verbiage a "peoples political movement" is one which is oriented to far-leftist Communist objectives.

Now let me make myself entirely clear. I am not suggesting that Democrats are Communists. And I am not suggesting that the Communist Party has captured control of the Democratic Party. I am not saying that anyone in the New Frontier is a Communist. I am merely giving you the Communist Party's official appraisal of American political parties and its proposals for action in 1964. I think they are of extreme interest to anyone who concerns himself with the American political scene.

Be that as it may, my contention is that today's liberals have taken us too far to the left for the good of the Nation, particularly when we find ourselves in a worldwide struggle with the forces of the extreme left. They have deserted the lessons of history and perverted the real meaning of the word "liberal." A true liberal today should be in the forefront of the fight for individual liberty. He should be opposing, at every turn, the further extension of Federal Government power. He should be battling the corrupt big city machines instead of doing business with them. He should be committed without reservation to the defeat of tyranny and oppression as exemplified by international communism. In other words, if today's liberals were true liberals in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, they would be doing the work that has fallen to the lot of today's conservatives.

Far from being dedicated to the conserving of everything we remember of the past, today's conservative is committed to the conservation of liberty. His devotion is to sound progress, based on proven values—the same kind of progress that permitted this Nation, in the space of only 200 years, to become the most powerful Nation and the most prosperous Nation on the face of the earth.

Today's conservative, I am proud to say, is standing where history once placed the true liberal. He is standing for freedom in its true meaning both at home and abroad. He is standing for individual rights, for justice and order, and honor in a world which the modern day liberal says is changing so fast that we must erase even the virtues and traditions which have withstood the test of many thousands of years.

I believe today's liberal is so frightened of the future that he is incapable of acting in the present. Why else are we confronted today with a virtual paralysis of policy? Why else does Cuba remain a festering, Soviet powerbase on our very doorstep? Why else are we trying to pretend that international communism is mellowing and not out to enslave the entire world? Why else are we pushing, ever more frantically, for an accommodation with the Soviet Union on disarmament and a nuclear test ban?

I say that the cause for our indecision and inaction is a deep-rooted fear on the part of the liberal establishment which forecloses the possibility of any action at all that may contain a slight element of risk. And I don't have to tell you that such craven fear is completely out of character with the American spirit. I have no doubts about the American people. They know that to stand for principle, to oppose oppression, to fight tyranny involves a certain risk. This is nothing new. Think of the risk our revolutionary forefathers ran at Lexington and Concord. I doubt if we will ever see the day when you and I live in a risk-free world, where our every action is guaranteed absolutely safe before we take it. The good things in this life do not come easily and without risk. They require boldness and courage and determination on the part of

those who seek. So it is with the United States of America. To lead the free world, we must measure up to the demands of leadership—yes, even to the taking of risks in the name of freedom and justice.

NOMINATION OF HENRY CABOT LODGE TO BE AMBASSADOR TO THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, the President has appointed Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge to be Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam, and the Senate has confirmed the nomination. Ambassador Lodge will serve in a country that is beset with difficulty and danger. Since its constitution as a sovereign government, South Vietnam has been under constant attack from the North Vietnamese. It is burdened with grave internal problems. I believe it is because of those difficulties that Mr. Lodge has been appointed Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam. His past experience, derived from his service in the Senate and as chief delegate of the United States to the United Nations, his qualities as an administrator, his qualities of mind, and his decisiveness in thought and action, will be needed in his newest appointment.

I know that in these troublous times Ambassador Lodge will faithfully serve the interests of the United States. We who served with him in the Senate remember his qualities as a Member of this body. Since that time, we have observed his career with admiration. We are glad that he has been appointed to this high, though difficult, position. Above all, his service in Vietnam will be of great value to our country.

IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY REGARDING RECOGNITION OF EAST GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, questions have been raised by Members of this body, in the press, and in West Germany as to the implications of the proposed nuclear test-ban treaty for the question of recognition of East Germany.

It is, as the Senate knows, the policy of this Government and our Western European Allies not to extend formal recognition to the East German Government. This does not mean, of course, that there are no contacts with East Germany. West Germans, for example, are in substantial contact with East German officials, largely in connection with the trade between the two zones, which amounts to several hundred million dollars a year, and with travel of Germans between the zones. In the course of this contact, Madam President, countless documents are signed by both West and East Germans, or are stamped by East German officials, although this in no way constitutes recognition by the West German Government of the East German regime. Similarly, Madam President, Americans and Western Europeans have frequent contact with East German officials. Obviously, in this contact, we recognize that these East German officials exist. If we did not, we would bump