MR. VOORS: Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Senate, I include the following address of Honorable Joseph M. 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 19, 1955.

It is a privilege to join tonight in this tribute to the great and noble spirit of Abraham Lincoln. It is an essential privilege to do so here in Brooklyn, a community of good will, good people, good homes, good churches — the Daughters. In this great borough of Brooklyn lies a great cross section of families 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 prayers of ordinary people like ourselves in all parts of the world. His uncompromising 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 is still the only party of freedom in these United States. It is still that 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, many of the trend toward a total state, have come to realize more and more that the loss 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 Governor and a Republican President in 1956.

And why shouldn't they? Is there a person within the range of my voice who does not realize deep inside him that something is fundamentally wrong with the heuristic leadership in Washington? Is there anyone within the range of my voice who does not fervently hope that out of the election in 1952 will come an administration possessing the basic characteristics that made Abraham Lincoln great — intelligence of purpose, unification 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 achievement of every understanding is whether it will help perpetuate those in power. You have become the judgment 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 restore the leadership we so desperately need, is by a landslide Republican victory next year.

We welcome Democrat and Independents everywhere to this crusade. Our task far transcends party lines.
The great issues before the world today — in essence as vital that it affects every man, woman, and child on earth — is: Which will triumph, the forces of freedom or those of communism and totalitarianism, or the true principles of liberty and individual dignity of man which our civilization has evolved out of 5,000 years of experience?

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

Shall it be the policies that triumph, or shall political systems that recognize the essential dignity of man which our civilization has evolved out of 5,000 years of experience?

Shall we become the victims of nuclear tests, or shall we make the earth a free zone free from nuclear tests?

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

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

Let us apply ourselves tonight to weighing the situation we are now in. Here briefly in what we see:

Since the end of World War II, due primarily to the use of atomic might on the tactics of infiltration, and due also to the incredible policies which the United States and other free nations have followed, the Soviet Union has managed to extend its domination from 125,000,000 people to 300,000,000 people. In other words, almost without firing a shot, Communist Russia in five revealed peacetime years has increased its directive firepower over home beings and now physically controls half of Europe and half of Asia and threatens the other halves on both continents. That is Fact No. 1.

The free countries, on the other hand, devoid of the galls and irritations which the Communist countries have endured to produce the political weapon necessary to obtain the unprecedented victory of the Soviet Union. True, free has been divided on a woman, and it has had some success, but it has not been enough by my own. Our undermining, a political weapon so effectively used by the Soviet Union, has been lending an entity in total though swiftly short on quality. Our progress of military assistance and capital have been operated in various nations and have not proved too effective. In short, we have permitted ourselves to be completely outmaneuvered in the employment of political weapons. That is Fact No. 2.

Finally, while Russia has spent the last 5 years increasing its armed might, the free countries, particularly the United States, have been basically engaged in reducing their military strength. In our own country, the record and show that the Republican Eighteenth Congress passed laws directing the President of the United States to build the Air Force up to 70 groups, 200 squadrons of fighter aircraft, and 200 groups of bomber fission by the construction of super aircraft carriers. But unfortunately, the administration had other plans. Faced with calls for the armed services to be reduced, and by the President's own directives countermanding the action of the Republican Eighteenth Congress, the Air Force had cut to 15 groups, the Marine Corps was virtually extinguished by recall, and construction of the super aircraft carriers, some $2,000,000,000 already laid down, was ordered halted by the White House in 1961.
The Republican Eightieth Congress, by passage of the
Bolshaya resolution, laid the framework for the military
assistance program, and the Eightieth Congress also voted funds
over administration protests to send aid to the anti-Communist
Chinese Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The
military assistance program was commenced, but unfortunately
the military and that the administration permitted to reach
the anti-Communist Chinese Government of the generalization was
for most of what was needed — in fact, it was pitifully small.
But that is not all. Because we had stabilized,姿态 offi-
cials in our security roles, the United States was able to steal
the secrets of the atom bomb and the hydrogen device. To see up, Russia
and its satellites have spent the last 5 years in an enormous
armament program while the United States and the other free
nations were disarming. That is Fact No. 3.

We now regret the former conflict more than the American
people. But despite its terrible cost, Congress has finally rendered
the world and certainly the United States to the fact that the
Communist conspiracy is essentially a conspiracy employing deception
and crowd noise. So, we are reading — reading at greatly in-
creased cost to the United States and the free nations everywhere.
The air force is at last being built up in groups, and construction
of a supermunitions carrier has finally been started all over again.
The Army is being expanded. The Navaho Corps is coming back into
its own. The Navy is being taken out of the muddle.

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

We now recognize that no Nation can successfully launch
a large procurement program without threatenbng its entire
basis of production because that is a fact, the administration
found it necessary to move, and Congress to waive, the imposition
of various economic controls. So, once more America is plagued
by arbitrary outside administered by political favorites and
Mansdown economic laws. Once more we are burdened with bureau-
cratic red tape, high prices, and shortages.

I think I can be excused for what I am about to say.
But the arguments and policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress
have been followed instead of substitutes, the Korean conflict might never
have happened, war time controls and high prices might not be
with us, and the world crisis which now exists might have been
avoided.

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

We appear to have solidified our position along the
Yalu River in the vicinity of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea.
That border complex approximately 80,000 of our troops with Japan
as a base of operations.

In Formosa to the north, the recognized Government
of the Republic of China, headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek,
still holds out, together with its anti-Communist army of
80,000 troops. Despite the fact that the only Government of
China that we officially recognize is the government's gov-
ernment, the administration in Washington refuses to know
government and his fighting forces. In fact, President Truman
in his official announcement in Korea on June 7, 1951, declared
that we were meeting the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to prevent any
more war and any cooperation by the government's forces against
the Communists, thus incentivizing the 80,000 troops on the
islands.
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 150,000 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, Pakistan, and India.

In Europe the forces of the Soviet Union and its puppet states are comparatively unlimited. However, military capes are generally in agreement that the Soviet Union, with its 220 Red army divisions, would hold all the way to the English Channel on the west and to the Pyrenees on the south unless a simultaneous reinforcement program were undertaken by the five nations of Europe. At the present time, the five 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 Greece maintains a friendly posture at the western powers. Spain, the guardian of the Pyrenees and one of the strongest military powers in Europe today, remains isolated from the five nations, anti-Communist though the Franco regime is.

That briefly is the practical situation. 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 sending 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 can possibly prevent it, to allay the menace and destructive capacity of the five 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 foreign policy -- Asia. And I doubt not that Republicans in countless numbers, myself included, have been pontificating such a policy, such a strategy, for years. Our protest date all the way back to 1938, when the first secret decision was reached by the administration in Washington to give its blessings 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 November 1, 1935, President Roosevelt publicly announced to the world that unless the Republic of China admitted Chinese Reds to its government service aid 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 troops of Commumest China had not stopped their attacks on the Chinese Reds? How many Americans recall the protests against this policy made by such outstanding Americans as General Spaatz, Patrick J. Hurley, and William L. 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 South Korea, and the Reds took over Korea. Are we going to make that same mistake again?

Korea has suffered 60,000 casualties in Korea. Mr. Truman says we are going to stay in Korea.

Are we going to leave 200,000 Korean boys stranded in Korea? Or do we want Chinese forces to take advantage of our absence and then turn and point our guns at us? Are we going to leave our guns so the Communists can have a piece of Europe too?

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 not? If we do not supply the 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa?

There is no question whatever about the desire and the eagerness of the Generalissimo and his forces to join in battle against the Chinese Reds, when the foreign conflict breaks out. The Generalissimo, within a week, ordered to transport immediately 30,000 troops from Formosa to Korea. He turned his back on us.

Why?

Our State Department has said that we did not want to recognize the Chinese Reds and bring them into the conflict.

Well, the Generalissimo's troops are still on Formosa, but our boys are being fighting the Chinese Reds since last November.

The State Department's reasoning is no longer valid today, if it ever was valid. What would be sound logic, both strategically and militarily, than to allow the anti-Communist forces of the Generalissimo on Formosa to participate in the war against the Chinese Reds? Why not let them open a second front in said?

Let us consider the possibilities:

First, there is good reason to believe that the Chinese Reds would not support a new-front war. They have outlined the railroads for the highways for the transportation to supply a force fighting in Korea, and another on the Chinese mainland. Where presumably the troops of the Generalissimo would infiltrate if we gave them the necessary naval aid.

Second, there is excellent reason to believe that if the Generalissimo's 800,000 fighting men reached the mainland of China before, 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 Formosa, would not only take the pressure off our forces in Korea, but would reduce the pressure on the French in Indochina and the Communist threat to Europe, Hangs,
Indonesia, Pakistan, India, and Europe.

Fourth, according to responsible military opinion — yes, right in our own Pentagon — the establishment of a second front on China's mainland by the Chinese Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is not only feasible and practical with aid from us, but it would be the greatest operation that we could promote in 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 mainly in the categories of ammunition, transportation, shoes, tents, 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 commands 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 accumulated significant armament, 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 experts to help train the Generalissimo's officers and men. Sailors of God — a critical idea in Asia — would be a prime necessity.

The kind of logic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea when, by changing the power equation to the Generalissimo, a second front could be opened in China without a single GI being cut down to place a foot on the soil of the Chinese mainland?

Certainly, if the United States can employ its great states to fight its war even against its 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 support 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 that 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 people may ask: If a second front in Asia can be opened at very small cost to ourselves and without employing American troops, why haven't our generals done it?

The answer is that we do have military needs where the employment of the anti-Communist forces of the Republic of China. There is good reason to believe that General Hua Tzu-chou
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 opposed to it, and the same State Department crowed that cut off aid to the government of China back in 1946, 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 tanks?

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

If we want to develop a true global strategy that will win out 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 next so-called police action may occur, 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 they have to do is to read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Daily Worker. William E. Butler, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Worker on December 3, 1945, "The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front."

Killer in Asia Kauff stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation. They knew that Asia was 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.

This 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 bottoms are cut out of Chiang Kai-shek's small army? How long will it be before his guns, tanks, and planes are completely extinguished? How long will it be before the Chinese Reds have perfected their defenses to such an extent as to make a second front impossible?

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

The people of Greece will never forget that the snipe of 50 of our boy's howitzer bombers was their salvation back in 1940. These 50 planes, together with only three American 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 gamble 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 dollars, and thousands of planes. The true measure is how effectively those dollars, those feet, and those planes are employed. Nor is the measure of good government its multitude of controls and edicts, or the enormities and hardships it imposes, or the venomosity of its spending and the harmlessness 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 1862 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 fiber that he embodied, 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.