MR. FOSTER. 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 12, 1951:

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—and the Dodgers. In this great borough of Brooklyn live 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 bequeathed 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 as a 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 freedom of the basic freedoms that have made America great is in 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, unlimited 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 measure of every undertaking is whether it will help perpetuate those in power. You now have the jurisdiction of their policies.

This is not the true spirit nor the wisdom 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 hold as the deepest sincerity that the only way to save America, the only way to salvage 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 is to transcend party lines.
The great issues before the world today — or, rather, so vital that it affects every man, woman, and child on earth — is: Which will triumph, the forces of freedom or emboldened communism and totalitarianism, or the free principles of liberty and individual dignity of man 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 that recognize the essential dignity of man emerge victorious?

Shall we become the victims of secret policy, or shall we win the earth as free men fighting on one but cause?

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

These are the questions. To meet them we must not only possess 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 as we see it. Here briefly is what we see:

Since the end of World War II, the question finally to the use of armed might out the tactics of infiltration, and due also to the incredible victory which the United States and other free nations have achieved, the Soviet Union has managed to extend its domination from 175,000,000 people to 300,000,000 people.

In other words, almost without firing a shot, Communion has in five years more than it did five years ago, and yet physically controls half of Europe and half of Asia, and threatens the other half to both continents. That is Fact No. 1.

The free countries, on the other hand, devoid of the giant and immensity which the Communists previously have failed to produce the political response necessary to attain the unimposed tactics of the Soviet Union. Free man has been divided on a woman, and it has had some success, but it has not been enough by my view. Our machinery, as a political weapon, is most used by the Soviet Union, has been used on quantity and qualitatively short on quality. Our progress in technical assistance and capital have been offset by the Soviet Union and have not proved too effective. In short, we have attempted 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 busy engaged in reducing their military strength. In our own country, the record and show the Republican Eightieth Congress passed laws directing the President of the United States to build the Air Force up to 76 groups, to strengthen the atomic force, to put atomic arms on everything by the construction of a super aircraft carrier. But unfortunately, the administration has slow plus. We were also called for the atomic research to be reduced, and by the President’s own directive encompassing the action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, the Air Force was held to 56 groups, the Marine Corps was virtually canceled in 1961, and construction of the four aircraft carrier, so we had 2,000,000 already had been down, and ordered halted by the White House in 1961.
The Republican Eightieth Congress, by passage of the Eisenhower resolution, laid the preconditions 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 commenced, but unfortunately the military aid that the administration promised to reach the anti-Communist Chinese government of the generalissimo was for months of what was needed — in fact, it was pitifully small. But that is not all. Because we had字样-кенг, the Chinese officials in the Chinese military were able to steal the secrets of the atom bomb. To make up, Russia and its satellites have spent the last 5 years in an enormous arms race while the United States and the other free nations were dismissing. That is Fact No. 3.

So one regret the Soviet conflict more than the American people. But despite its terrific costs, forces has finally reached the threshold that enabled the United States to the fact that the Communist expansion is essentially a conspiracy employing deception, subversion, and armed force. So we are reaching — reaching at a greatly increased cost to the United States and the free nations everywhere. The air force is at last being built to its greatest strength, and construction of a comparable air carrier has been set as the top priority. The Army is being strengthened. The Navy is being taken out of the mudballs.

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

We long ago learned that no nation can successfully launch a major military program without threatening its entire economy badly out of joint. Because this is a fact, the administration found it necessary to seek, and Congress to give, the imposition of various economic controls. So, once more America is plagued by arbitrary controls administered by political forces and with more confusion than those we have been accustomed with bureaucratic red tape, high prices, and shortages.

I think I can be pursuaded for what I am about to say, that the administrations and policies of the Republican Eightieth Congress has been followed instead of subversion, the Korean conflict might never have happened, war might have avoided, and high costs may 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 38th Meridian in the vicinity of the thirty-sixth parallel in Korea. That sector consists approximately 30,000 of our troops with Japan as a base of operations.

In Formosa to the north, the recognized government of the Republic of Chinese, 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 of the Communists, the administration in Washington refuses to recognize the governments and its fighting forces. In fact, President Truman in his official announcement on Formosa on June 7, 1953, declared that we were sending the Seventh Fleet to Formosa to prevent any more raids and sea operations by the government's forces against the Nationalists, thus intensifying the 80,000 troops on the island.
On 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, Nepal, Indonesia, Pakistan, 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 fight all the way to the English Channel on the west and to the Pyrenees on the south unless a simultaneous rearrangement 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 90 divisions to stop a Soviet advance in continental Europe.

Two nations in Europe are on the outside looking in. Bulgaria, a former satellite, has broken with the Soviet Union, and this sets an uncomfortable friendly ghost 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 not prepared to send more and more military supplies to the members of the North Atlantic Community. We are sending food to them. So 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 cannot possibly prevent it, allow the resurgence and productivity capacity of the Free European nations to fall into Communist control, it is essential to have a program that meets this problem.

But I proceed with every reserve as my mind the formulation of any overall strategy which virtually ignores the focal point of our national being—Asia. And I might say that the Republicans in Congress and myself, myself included, have been advocating such a policy, such a strategy, for years. Our protests date all the way back to 1952, 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 abandoned Chinese Reds to its government inducements and 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 this policy made by such outstanding Americans as General Ridgway, 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.

We abandoned the anti-Communist forces of South Korea, and the Reds took over Korea. Are we going to make that same mistake twice?

North Vietnam has suffered 30,000 casualties in Korea.

Mr. Kennan says we are going to stay in Korea.

Are we going to leave 60,000 American boys stranded in Korea? Do we want another Pearl Harbor the second one be taken off them by deploying other hundreds of thousands of American boys to the scene 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 troop surge across Europe, why not, if we can't justify the 800,000 anti-Communist Chinese troops on Formosa?

There is no question whatsoever about the desire and the expertise of the generals and his forces to join in battle against the Chinese Reds, when the Korean conflict breaks out; the generals, within a week, ordered to transport immediately 30,000 troops from Formosa to Korea. So turned him down cold.

Why?

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

Well, the generals' 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 was ever valid.

What could be sounder logic, both strategically and militarily, then to allow the anti-Communist forces of the 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 would not support a second front now. They have outlined the railroads and highways for the transportation to supply a force fighting in Korea, and neither on the Chinese mainland, where presumably the troops of the generals would infiltrate if we gave them the necessary support.

Second, there is excellent reason to believe that if the generals' 300,000 fighting men reached the mainland of China, however, 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 Formosa, Taiwan,
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 armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kaishek 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 solely in the categories of ammunition, transportation, planes, tanks, and food.

The Generalissimo has planes and tanks, but we 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 by a second crossing of the Yangtze, and whether it would be built up by a series of advance raids or air-borne landings would depend on the number and strength of the Chinese Red forces in that area. For such purposes the Generalissimo abroad has never been conspicuous greedy, 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 offensive and rear services — a critical need in Asia — would be a prime necessity.

Right kind of holistic is it that lets our soldiers die in Korea, while by championing the power doctrine to the Generalissimo, a second front would be opened in China without a single GI being forced to place a foot 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 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.

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 people who favor the employment of the anti-communist forces of the Republic of China. There is good reason to believe that General Kaishek
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 tanks?

But the State Department, as now constituted, is never going to permit a single soldier from Korea 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 out on 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 we have had to do is to read the writings of Lenin, Stalin, or the Daily Worker. William E. Borton, the head of the Communist Party in the United States, wrote in the Daily Worker on December 5, 1945, "The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front."

Khitro in New York stated emphatically that Asia was the key to the world situation. Does he know 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.

Time is running out in Asia. How long do you think 1,392,000 anti-Communist guerrillas can hold out against superior forces? How long will it be before the bottoms run out of Chiang Kai-shek’s small army? How long will it be before his guns, trucks, and planes are completely exhausted? How long will it be before the Chinese Reds have perfected their defenses to such an extent as to make a second front impossible?

No time is on our side. If we permit the State Department’s bankrupt 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 envoys of our Korean killers bumbled their election book in 1966. These 39 places, together with only three hundred military men to train Greek fliers, 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 go broke 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 under, or thousands of planes. The true measure of effective leaders is the measure of good government. The multitude of controls and the size of the government teams must be measured by the effectiveness of their spending and the fairness of their taxes.

Do 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 be in the best interest 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 vision, his simple principles and his humanity. Let us remember that it was the clear, high-minded vision 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 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.