MR. WHITUS. 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 for me to do so here in Brooklyn, a community of good will, good people, good homes, good churches—and the Dodgers. 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.

In Lincoln breathed the hopes and progress 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 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 freedom 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 Congress and a Republican President in 1952.

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 Democratic 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, unflinching devotion to ideals, and, above all, 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 an bankrupt in leadership. It is the first condition of every understanding in whether it will help perpetuate those in power, those laws 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 unify the leadership we so desperately need, is by a landslide Republican victory next year.

We welcome Democrats and Independents everywhere to this crusade. Our task far transcends party lines.
The great issues before the world today — or seem so vital that it affects every man, woman, and child on earth — are: Which will triumph, the forces of freedom re-emboldened in communism and socialism, or the free principles of liberty and individual dignity of the west which 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 based upon the essentials of dignity of man which our civilization has evolved out of 3,000 years of experience? Shall we become the victims of secret policies, or shall we make the earth a free zone forever so one but one? Shall our homes and our churches be liquidated, or shall the morality of the family and the base religious teachings survive, stronger than ever? Those are the questions. To meet them we must not only assume the finest qualities of spirit and the maximum of vision, but we must be able to translate these qualities into practical action.

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

Since the end of World War II, due primarily to the size of armed might and the politics of infiltration, we have also 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 295,000,000 people. In other words, almost without firing a shot, Communist Russia in five relatively peaceful years has increased its domination fivefold over more 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, despite of the giants and immensity which the Communist propaganda never failed to produce the political response necessary to attract the unimpressed nations of the Soviet Union. True, this has been devised as a weapon, and it has had some success, but it has not been enough by any means. Our undermanned, a political weapon so effectively used by the Soviet Union, has been long on money and militarily short on quality. Our program of technical assistance and capital loans have operated in serious fashion 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, and particularly the United States, have been heavily engaged in reducing their military strength. In our own country, the record must show that the Republican Eighty-first Congress passed time directing the President of the United States to build the Air Force up to 70 groups, to strengthen the fighter corps, and to broaden area control by the construction of a super aircraft carrier. But unfortunately, the administration had other plans. Those plans called for the armed services to be reduced, and by the President's own directive accompanying the action of the Republican Eighty-first Congress, the Air Force was held to 85 groups, the Marine Corps was virtually reduced to 10 groups, and construction of the super aircraft carrier, no within $3,000,000 already had been begun, was ordered halted by the White House in 1957.
The Republican Eightieth Congress, by passage of the
Nikitaevsky resolution, 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 continued, but unfortunately
the military aid that the administration promised to reach
the anti-Communist Chinese government of the generalissimo was
far short of what was needed — in fact, it was pitifully small.
But that is not all. Because we hadfang-styled, false offi-
cials in our security setup, the Soviet Union was able to steal
the secrets of the atom and the hydrogen bombs. To use up, Russia
and its satellites have spent the last 5 years in an enormous
ammunition program while the United States and the other free
nations were dissuading. That is fact No. 3.

So one regrets the forces called more than the American
people. But despite its terrible cost, forces have finally
ensued the world and certainly the United States to the fact
that the Communist conspiracy is essentially a conspiracy
employing deception and fraud. So, we are regaining — regaining at a
considerable cost to the United States and the free nations everywhere.
The Air Force is at last being called to its rightful role, a in
construction of a supersonic carrier that finally was started all over again.
The Army is being strengthened. The Strategic Air Command
is coming into being.

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

We long ago learned that no nation can weakly launch
a huge procurement program without threatening its entire
economy badly out of joint. Because that is a fact, the administration
founs it necessary to seek, and Congress to vote, the imposition
of various economic controls. So, the same forces are plaguing
us in a way that is being administered by political favoritism and
black marketeering. Once more we are burdened with bureau-
cratic red tape, high prices, and shortages.

I think I can be pardoned for what I am about to say.
But the discrepancies and policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress
have failed instead of advancing. The Korean conflict might never
have occurred, wartime controls and steep-high taxes 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 sector is occupied by approximately 60,000 of our troops, with
Japan as a base of operations.

In Formosa to the north, the reorganized government of
the Republic of China, headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek,
held out, together with its anti-Communist army of
65,000 troops. Despite the fact that the only government of
China that we officially recognize is the communist's gov-
ernment, the administration in Washington refuses to back the
government and its fighting forces. In fact, President Truman
in his official announcement on Korea on June 7, 1952, declared
that we were sending the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to prevent any
more aid and any supplies by the government's forces against
the Chinese Reds, thus inconveniencing the 60,000 troops on the
island.
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, Indonesia, and India.

In Europe, the forces of the Soviet Union and its puppet states are comparatively small. However, military aid is generally in agreement that the Soviet Union, with its 200 Red army divisions, could roll all the way to the English Channel on the west and to the Pyrenees on the south unless a substantial reinforcement program was undertaken by the free nations of Europe. At the present time, the free nations of the world combined could not muster more than 80 divisions to stop a Soviet advance in mainland Europe.

Two nations in Europe are on the outside looking in. Yugoslavia, a former satellite, has broken with the Soviet Union, and Tito sees an uncertain friendly chance 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 3 years, to put our eggs in the European basket. We are told that American troops should be kept on the continent of Europe. We are to provide new and more modern military supplies to the members of the North Atlantic community. We are sending food to Tito. 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 to prevent it, allow the resurgence and proliferation of the free European nations to fall into Soviet 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. And I might add that Republicans in Congress recently, myself included, have been advocating such a policy, such a strategy, for years. Our protest date all the way back to 1941 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 December 17, 1945, President Truman publicly announced to the world that unless the Republic of China submitted Chinese Reds to its government bertrice 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 Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek stopped their attacks on the Chinese Reds? How many Americans recall the protests against that policy made by such outstanding leaders as General Bedeaux, Patrick J. Hurley, and William J. 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. If we abandoned the anti-Communist forces of South Korea, and the Reds took over China, are we going to have that same mistake happen?

North Korea has suffered 30,000 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? If we do not support them until the pressure can be taken off them by deploying other forces of thousands of American boys to the 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 not, if we cannot supply the 600,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa?

There is no question whatsoever about the desire and the eagerness of the Chinese to help us to fight against the Reds, and the Korean conflict breaks only the general war, within a month, ordered to transport immediately 35,000 troops from Formosa to Korea. Is that too done now?

Wary?

Our State Department claimed that we did not want to engage the Chinese Reds and bring them into the conflict. Well, the generalization's troops are still on Formosa, 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 were valid. What could be sounder logic, both strategical and militarily, than to allow the anti-Communist forces of the generalization on Formosa to participate in the war against the Chinese Reds? Why not let them open a second front in that?

Let us consider the possibilities. First, there is good reason to believe that the Chinese Reds could not support a second front now. They have crushed the railroads and the highways, and transportation to supply a force fighting in Korea, and mobile on the Chinese mainland, where presumably the troops of the generalization would be infiltrating. Why could that not happen?

Second, there is sound reason to believe that if the generalization's 600,000 fighting men are needed to keep the mainland of China together, 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 up 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 Burma, Thailand,
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 forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is not only feasible and practical with aid from us, but it would be the decisive operation that we could promote 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 fail wholly in the categories of ammunition, transportation, planes, tanks, and food. The Generalissimo has plenty 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 speed and strength of the Chinese Red forces in that area. For such purposes the Generalissimo abroad has stationed inseparable forces, 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 imports to help train the Generalissimo’s officers and men. Shrewdness of mind — a critical thing in Asia — would be a prime necessity.

What kind of hope is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea while, by changing the power balance to the Generalissimo, a second front would be opened in China without a single GI being furred to place a foot on the soil of the Chinese mainland?

Certainly, if the Soviet Union can employ its present states to fight its war even against their will, then the United States can call on the 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 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 hundreds of American boys.

Some people say only: 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 means who favor the employment of the anti-communist forces of the Republic of China. There is good reason to believe that General Hsiang
Favors such an operation. There is good reason to believe that there are people in the Pentagon who favor such an operation.

Willy hasn't a second front been opened? The reason is that the State Department is preventing it, the same State Department that cut off aid to the Government of China back in 1960, 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?

Willy, the State Department, as now constituted, is never going to permit a single soldier from foresum 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 turn 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 America like not only in Korea, but wherever the most powerful people within my vision, then I say to you that we must clean out the State Department from top to bottom, starting with Dean Acheson.

The matter planners in the Kremlin have had their eye on Asia for a quarter of a century. All access has to be in to read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Daily Mirror. William E. Paton, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Mirror on December 2, 1965, "The war in China is the key to all the problems of the international front."

Ritter in Kasa Kumpf stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation. Why have we not key to the world situation. Military strategists of many governments have declared the war in Asia again.

Almost everybody knows it except our State Department.

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

No time is not on our side. If we permit the State Department's hulked-out politics 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 air's B-47 bombers was their salvation back in 1965. These 50 planes, together with only three American military men to train Greek fighter, and a mere handful of mechanics to teach the Greeks to operate 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, hundreds of millions of dollars. The true measure of a government's effectiveness is in 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 stringencies and hardships it imposes, or the lassitude 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 1952 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 vision, his single principle, and his fragility. Let us remember that it was the clear, high-principled thinking of Lincoln that saved this Union, and let us realize that without clarity of thought, without action based on fundamental principles, without the moral vision that he envisioned, 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.