Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Senate, I include the following address of Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Kings County Republican Committee at Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sunday evening, February 12, 1951:

It is a privilege to join tonight in this tribute to the great and noble spirit of Abraham Lincoln. It is an especial privilege to do so here in Brooklyn, a community of ward still, good people, good homes, good churches—and the Dodgers. In this great borough of Brooklyn lies a great cross section of facades and homes that in themselves are a monument to the freedom and individual dignity for which Lincoln fought and died.

Lincoln breathed the hopes and progress of ordinary people like ourselves in all parts of the world. His unprejudiced opposition to human slavery gave birth to a new political party which has served this nation well through generations of constant development and progress.

Today, after 50 years of political service, the Republican Party still is the only party of freedom in these United States. It is still the only party which steadfastly has refused to accept the alien doctrines of socialism and communism, either in part or in whole.

Across this land of ours, the American people, weary of the trend toward a total state, have come to realize more and more that the loss of cohesion of the basic freedoms that have made America great is the Republican Party. And they are going to translate that belief into action and elect a Republican Senator and a Republican President in 1952.

And why shouldn’t they? Is there a person within the range of my view who does not realize deep inside him that something is fundamentally wrong with the Democratic leadership in Washington? Is there anyone within the range of my view who does not fervently hope that out of the election in 1950 will come an administration possessing the basic characteristics that made Abraham Lincoln great—intelligence of purpose, unfailing devotion to ideals, and, above all else, the courage to carry out what the brain and heart and soul dictate?

It is the great tragedy of our day that in a period of crisis we have an administration in Washington which is so bankrupt in leadership that its first manifestation of every understanding is whether it will help perpetuate those in power. Vows have become the jurisdiction of their policies.

This is not the true spirit nor the vision of our fine American heritage. And I am proud to stand here and tell you tonight that there are patriotic Democrats in and out of Congress, in and out of government, who tell me with the deepest sincerity that the only way to save America, the only way to utilize the leadership we so desperately need, is by an immediate Republican victory next year.

We welcome Democrats and Independents everywhere to this crusade. Our task is transcends party lines.
The great issues before the world today — as issues so vital that it affects every man, woman, and child on earth — is:

Which is the force that will triumph, the forces of freedom embodied in Communism and despotism, or the force propelled by liberty and individual dignity of the millions our civilization has evolved out of 3,000 years of experience?

Shall it be the godless materialism of Marx, or the idealism instilled in us by the religious teachings of all faiths?

Shall it be the police state that triumphs, or shall political systems that recognize the essential dignity of man emerge victorious?

Shall we become the victims of secret police, or shall we make the earth a free home facing no one but God?

Shall our homes and our churches be liquidated, or shall the morality of the family and the basic religious teachings survive, greater than ever?

These are the questions. To meet them we must not only assess the finest qualities of spirit and the sum of wisdom, but we must be able to translate these qualifications into practical action.

Let us apply ourselves tonight to seeing the situation as we see it now. More briefly in what we saw:

Since the end of World War II, due primarily to the use of scared might, and the strategy of infiltration, and mixed up to the incredible policies which the United States and other free nations have followed, the Soviet Union has managed to expand its domination from 150,000,000 people to 500,000,000 people.

In other words, almost without firing a shot, Communist Russia in five revealed postwar years has increased its domination fivefold over those beings who are physically controls half of Europe and half of Asia and threatens the other 50 per cent on both continents. This in fact No. 1.

The free countries, on the other hand, devoid of the gullibility immunity which the Communists provide how failed to produce the political response necessary to meet the unprecedented tactics of the Soviet Union. True, IFR has been divided as a million, and it has had some success, but it has not been enough by any means. Our multiyear programs, a political weapon so effectively used by the Soviet Union, has been held by quantity and militarily short on quality. Our progress in economic assistance and capital loans have operated in various fashion and have not proved to be effective. In short, we have permitted ourselves to be completely overpowered in the employment of political weapons. This in fact No. 2.

Finally, while Russia has spent the last 5 years increasing its armed might, the free countries, and particularly the United States, have been busy engaged in reducing their military strength. In one area, the record will show that the Republican Eightieth Congress worked long directing the President of the United States to build the Air Force up to 70 groups, to strengthen the strategic air, and to reduce armed forces by the construction of a large aircraft carrier. But unfortunately, the administration had other plans. These plans called for the armed services to be reduced, and by the President's own directive envisaging the action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Air Force was cut to 16 groups, the Navy Corps was virtually reduced to 250,000, and construction of the heavy aircraft carrier, which was 80,000,000 already and been built, was canceled by the White House in 1957.
The Republican Eightieth Congress, by passage of the
Brannen legislation, laid the groundwork for the military
assistance program, and the Eightieth Congress also voted funds
over administration protests to send arms to the anti-communist
Chinese Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The
military assistance program was controversial, but unfortunately
the military and the administration permitted to reach
the anti-communist Chinese Government of the generalissimo was
for short of what was needed — in fact, it was pitifully small.
But that is not all. Because we had so-called "peace officials"
in our security setup, the United States was able to steal the
secrets of the atomic bomb from the Japanese. To save up, Russia
and the United States have spent the last 5 years in an enormous
arms race while the United States and the other free
nations were disarming. That is fact No. 3.

We may regret the agony inflicted more than the American
people. But despite its terrific cost, arms has finally enabled
the world and certainly the United States to be the fact that the
Communist conspiracy is essentially a conspiracy employing deception
and subterfuge. So, we are regaining — regaining at a cost increasingly
cost to be the United States and the free nations everywhere.
The U.S. Army is so deep into the armament program, and construction
of a superarmament carrier has finally been started all over again.
The Army is being strengthened. The 20,000 troops can come back into
its own. The Army is being taken out of the mudhalls.

I ask you — could it be that the Republican Eightieth
Congress was right after all?

We now know that the Chinese Government were
regained through military assistance. The Chinese were
by our military assistance

I think I can be more particular, for I am about to say.
I think I can be more particular. The Chinese Government
been followed instead of subverted, the Chinese conflict might have
never happened, wartime controls might have been

Now, let us examine what we are doing today from a
practical standpoint.

We appear to have solidified our position along the
Korean Peninsula in the vicinity of the thirty-sixth parallel in Korea.
This border accounts approximately 300,000 of our troops, with Japan
as a base of operations.

In Formosa to the south, the Nationalist Government
of the Republic of China, headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek,
still holds out, together with its anti-communist army of
20,000 troops. Despite the fact that the only Nationalist
Government is being recognized by the Chinese Government's
government, the administration in Washington refuses to recognize
the Nationalist Government. In fact, President Truman in
his official announcement in Korea on June 30, 1951, declared
that we were meeting the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to prevent any
more aid and arms assistance by the Chinese Government's
troops against the Nationalist Reds, thus intensifying the 300,000 troops
of the

In the Chinese mainland, anti-Communist guerrilla bands continue to make raids on the Chinese Reds. Approximately 1,500,000 anti-Communist Chinese guerrillas are engaged in these activities.

In French Indochina, a so-called volunteer Communist army, composed substantially of Chinese Reds, engages a French force. The French have approximately 125,000 fighting men operating in that area.

In the balance of Asia, the operations of the Chinese Reds are a constant threat to the security of Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Netherlands, Pakistan, and India.

In Europe the forces of the Soviet Union and its puppet states are comparatively small. However, the military men are generally in agreement that the Soviet Union, with its 220 Red army divisions, would win all the way to the English Channel on the west end to the Pyrenees on the south unless a simultaneous reinforcement program were undertaken by the Free nations of Europe. At the present time, the Free nations of the world combined could not muster more than 30 divisions to stop a Soviet advance in continental Europe.

Two nations in Europe are on the outside looking in. Yugoslavia, a former satellite, has broken with the Soviet Union, and this casts an ominous friendly glance at the western powers. Spain, the guardian of the Pyrenees and one of the strongest military powers in Europe today, remains isolated from the Free nations, anti-Communist though the Franco regime is.

That briefly is the practical situation. Just where do we go from here?

Apparently it is the aim of the administration in Washington, as it has been for the past 5 years, to put our eggs in the European basket. We are told that American troops should be put on the continent of Europe. We are at this moment needing more and more military supplies to the members of the North Atlantic community. We are sending food to them. We are in consultation with the governments of Western Europe and their military leaders.

Everyone knows that we must have an effective aid program for Europe. Everyone knows that we must act, if we are possibly prevent it, allow the repressive and productive capacity of the Free European nations to fall into Communist control. It is essential to have a program that meets this problem.

But I protest with every resource at my command the formulation of any over-all strategy which virtually ignores the focal point of our national being -- Asia. I suggest that Republicans in Congress should, myself included, have been speaking and promoting such a policy, such a strategy, for years. Our protests date all the way back to 1951 when the first secret decision was reached by the administration in Washington to give its blessing to the Chinese Communists as a political force in the Orient, as opposed to our great ally, the established government of the Republic of China.

How many Americans recall that on December 15, 1955, President Truman publicly announced to the world that unless the Republic of China continued Chinese Reds to its government bitterness and blood would be cut off? How many Americans recall that the aid was cut off and that General Marshall was sent to China to make sure that the forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek stopped their attacks on the Chinese Reds? How many Americans recall the protests against this policy made by such outstanding spokesmen as General Macarrey, Patrick J. Hurley, and William F. Bullitt? How many people recall that General MacArthur
declared that our failure to help the Republic of China may be
"the single greatest blunder in the history of the United States"

Stop and think.

We abandoned the anti-Communist forces of Siam once, and
the Reds took over China. Are we going to make that same mistake
again?

Korea has suffered 50,000 casualties in Korea.
Mr. Truman says we are going to stay in Korea.

Are we going to leave 200,000 American boys stranded
in Korea? Or shall we risk another battle the outcome of
which can be decided off them by deploying other hundreds of
American boys to the same area in Europe?

If we really want to take the pressure off our forces
in Korea, and if we want to diminish the threat of a Soviet
group across Europe, why? If we do not attack the
550,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on our border?

There is no question whatever about the ferocity and
the expertise of the generalissimo's men who have been
trained to keep you and me from ever crossing the
Chinese border. The result of the Korean conflict is to
make the generalissimo, within a week, ordered to transport
immediately 33,000 troops from Manchuria to Korea. He turned
himself in good order.

Why?

Our State Department claims that we did not want to
extricate the Chinese Reds and bring them into the conflict.

Well, the generalissimo's troops are still on our border,
but our boys have been fighting the Chinese Reds since last
November.

The State Department's reasoning is no longer valid
today, if it ever was valid.

What could be sounder logic, both strategically and
militarily, than to allow the anti-Communist forces of the
generalissimo of Manchuria to participate in the war against the
Chinese Reds? Why not let them open a second front in Korea?

Let us consider the possibilities:

First, there is a sound logical reason to believe that the Chinese
Reds could not support a two-front war. They have outlined the
railroads for the supply of the highway transportation to supply a
front fighting in Korea and another on the Chinese mainland, where
presumably the troops of the generalissimo would militarily attack if we
gave them the necessary impetus.

Second, there is sound logical reason to believe that if
the generalissimo's 550,000 fighting men reached the mainland
of China across the peninsula, they would double the size of their army
within six to eight weeks by the addition of anti-Communist
guerrilla forces already fighting the Reds in South China.

Third, the opening of a second front on the
Chinese mainland by the forces of the established government of
China, operating from Manchuria, would not only take the pressure
off our forces in Korea, but would reduce the pressure on the
Front in Indochina and the Communist threat to Korea, Vitalia,
Indonesia, Pakistan, India, and Europe.

Fourth, according to responsible military opinion — yes, right in our own Pentagon — the establishment of a second front in China's mainland by the forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is not only feasible and practical with aid from us, but it would be the cheapest operation that we could prosecute in the terms of dollars and manpower.

The forces of the Generalissimo are mostly battle tested, and they are as well trained as the Chinese Reds. Their needs to make a second-front operation successful fall easily in the categories of ammunition, transportation, planes, arms, and food. The Generalissimo has planes and tanks, but he would need more. The Generalissimo has a navy, but it needs replacement parts and servicing.

Whether the second front would be opened up by an invasion of the mainland or whether it would be built up by a series of commando raids and night landings would depend on the number and strength of the Chinese Red forces in that area. For such purposes the Generalissimo abroad has stationed considerable数额 at sea, but his operations would be much more successful if the United States provided amphibious craft, landing barges, and PT boats.

In addition, it would be desirable to have American exports to help train the Generalissimo's officers and men. Harpoons of gold — a critical area in Asia — would be a prime necessity.

What kind of logic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea when, by changing the overture relative to the Generalissimo, a second front could be opened in China without a single GI being exposed to harm on the soil of the Chinese mainland?

Certainly, if the Soviet Union can employ its puppet states to fight its war even against their will, then the United States can call on its friends who are not only willing but begging for the opportunity.

Certainly we want a united and militarily strong Europe. Certainly we are willing to provide equipment and possibly some of the manpower necessary to achieve that goal.

But let us not place all our eggs in the European basket. Let us remember that we have friends in Asia and that we are fighting a war in Asia at this very moment.

If it is right for American boys to fight Chinese Reds in Korea, what can be wrong with American help to the anti-communist Chinese fighting the Reds on their own soil?

What are we in Korea for, to win or to lose?

If we are in Korea to win, then we should do everything possible to bring this victory about. If we are not in Korea to win, then this administration should be indicted for the murder of thousands of American boys.

Some persons may ask: If a second front in Asia can be opened at very small cost to ourselves and without employing American troops, why hasn't our generals done it?

The answer is that we do not have military needs where the employment of the anti-communist forces of the Republic of China. There is good reason to believe that Generalissimo
Favors such an operation. There is good reason to believe that there are people in the Pentagon who favor such an operation.

Why hasn't a second front been opened? The reason is that the State Department is preventing it, the same State Department crowd that cut off aid to the Government of China back in 1963, thus allowing China to fall into Communist hands. Can anyone expect the State Department to admit 5 years too late that it was wrong? Can anyone expect the State Department to accept the blame for the fact that American boys are now being killed by Chinese bullets?

By the State Department, as now constituted, is never going to permit a single soldier from Fort Knox to participate. Why? Because it would mean that the State Department would finally have to admit that we should have supported Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek all along.

If we want to develop a true global strategy that will win the Communist threat of world domination, if we want a strategy that will save Korea and save Asia at the same time, if we want a strategy that will save American lives not only in Korea, but wherever the most goggled police within my view. Then I say to you that we must clean out the State Department from top to bottom, starting with Dean Acheson.

The master planners in the Kremlin have had their eye on Asia for a quarter of a century. All across has to do is to read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Daily Worker. Billie E. Meter, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Weekly Worker on December 5, 1945, "War in China is the key to all problems on the International Front.

Khrushchev has said emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation. The key to the world situation. Military strategists of many governments have declared the same thing time and time again.

Almost everybody knows it except our State Department.

Time is running out in Asia. How long do you think 1,500,000 anti-Communist guerrillas can hold out against superior forces? How long will it be before the bottom fall out of Chiang Kai-shek's small army? How long will it be before his guns, trucks, and planes are completely outdated? How long will it be before the Chinese Reds have perfected their defense to such an extent as to make a second front impossible?

My time is not on our side. If we permit the State Department's bungled policies to prevail, we will have run out completely, while more thousands of American boys die on foreign soil.

The people of Greece will never forget that the support of 50 of our Navy's battleship bombers was their salvation back in 1940. These 50 planes, together with only three hundred military men to train Greek pilots, and a mere handful of mechanics to teach the Greeks to service the planes, turned the tide against the Communist forces in Greece.

Certainly, if we could afford to rendre in Greece and achieve such wonderful results, we can afford to take a chance on Formosa.
A little can go a long way if it is effectively applied. Successful policies are not measured in billions of dollars, millions of feet, billions of acres, thousands of miles or thousands of lives. The true measure is how effectively those dollars, those feet, and those lives are employed. Nor is the measure of good government its multitude of controls and restrictions, or the meekness and servility it imposes, or the lavishness of its spending and the harshness of its taxes.

Don't you think it is about time Washington learned that?

Yes, in this crisis, we need leadership and sound policies as we have never needed them before. As Americans, everyone of us must act in the full meaning of good citizenship. We must look to the year of 1932 for deliverance. It is up to every American to help obtain this leadership by promoting widespread discussion of the issues and the most careful selection of political candidates in both parties. Each of us can help; each of us should participate to the utmost.

as we near the end of this day of tribute to Abraham Lincoln, let us borrow from his wisdom, his simple philosophy and his humility. Let us remember that it was the clear, high-minded thinking of Lincoln that saved this Union, and let us realize that without clarity of thought, without actions based on fundamental principles, without the moral values that he emphasized, we cannot save the world we live in.

We have more than an opportunity. We have a duty. God grant us the wisdom and the strength to perform it.