

Journal - Office of Legislative Council  
Monday - 30 July 1962

Page 2

6. (Unclassified - OLC) Talked with Jack Leahy, State Department, concerning the status of the reciprocity amendment to the Communications Act. Leahy said that Mr. Borchardt, of the House Commerce Committee, had again asked him if CIA would provide witnesses for the hearings and Leahy again indicated that we would not. Borchardt then asked if an Agency representative would talk with Chairman Harris concerning our interest in the bill, and Leahy again said he thought that we would. I told Leahy I would talk further with Mr. Warner about this.

7. (Unclassified - OLC) Returned to Doris McCracken, House Foreign Affairs Committee staff, the three transcripts of Captive Nations' hearings which we had received on a loan basis from her.

8. (Unclassified - OLC) William Saltonstall, in the office of Senator Everett Saltonstall (R., Mass.), called concerning an appeal from the International Peace Studies Committee for assistance in sending several Afro-Asian and Latin American youths as observers to the Helsinki World Youth Festival and post-Festival tour of the Soviet Bloc. Saltonstall said that the Committee nominees named in the appeal were well known and well thought of by a friend of his in ISIA. However,

STAT

9. (Internal Use - JSW) The Director appeared before the CIA Subcommittee of House Armed Services. See Memorandum for the Record.

10. (Secret - JSW) Firmed up arrangements through William Darden for the Director to appear before the Russell Subcommittee of Senate Armed Services at 10:30 a.m. on 1 August. Mr. Darden stated the Chairman wished to have a record taken of the proceedings and we will furnish the reporter. A sweep will also be made as usual. Mr. Darden also indicated the Chairman had matters which he wished to raise with the Director and indicated these points concerned the negotiations for a nuclear test ban agreement. (The Director was advised of this point.)

cc: Mr. Dir  
DD/S  
Col. Grogan

JOHN S. WARNER  
Legislative Counsel

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7029

ous because our tax laws continue to be heavily weighted in favor of foreign investment, as against increased domestic investment, and world conditions have, in the last 3 or 4 years, changed sufficiently to begin to make this tax favoritism effective in siphoning off capital and increasing the volume of its flow to Europe and other industrially developed areas.

Let me hasten to say that I am not against foreign investment. I am just in favor of taxing its profits. Now every time anyone begins to talk about foreign investment, someone will rush to its defense with the argument that, in the first place, increased foreign investment increases our exports, and in the second place, we get back more in dividends than we send abroad in new money. Let us see about this.

If a company is exporting machinery to Italy, let us say, and it finds that it needs to manufacture spare parts, or make final assembly, or do servicing in Italy, does it need a tax concession to encourage it to set up a small operation in Italy? Will such a company turn its back on this export source of profit because it is required to pay taxes on that part of its profit earned in Italy? I hardly think so. And do we really get back more in dividends than we send abroad in new money? We may if dividends from subsidiaries and profits from branch operations are combined, although even this is doubtful. Branch profits are repatriated because they are taxed currently, although sometimes very lightly. As you know, much of the foreign operations carried on in branch form are in the petroleum and mineral area, and many of the companies concerned, when they combine the foreign tax credit with the depletion allowance, pay practically no U.S. tax whatsoever. Naturally there is no inclination on the part of these companies to try to hide their profits in a subsidiary in Liechtenstein.

What I am really concerned about in this field are subsidiary operations. This is where the big tax avoidance lies. This is where you will find the tax haven abuses. When an American company doing export business in Latin America collapses its Western Hemisphere trade subsidiary in favor of a Swiss subsidiary which, in turn, fronts for a Liechtenstein subsidiary, which, in turn, performs no function whatsoever except to receive a 20-percent commission on all corporate exports—and these exports are actually sold by outside agents—then things have gone too far. This sort of thing is happening daily.

Now, some may say that we should not tax all subsidiaries, but instead we should plug up these various kinds of tax haven loopholes as they are discovered. This is easier said than done. In the first place, it is hard to discover the true facts. Liechtenstein, for example, has such a tight economic espionage law that our Internal Revenue agents working in Europe face the prospect of a long jail term if they go inquiring in Liechtenstein to find to what American-owned subsidiaries are up to. And once a particular type of operation is discovered, it is sometimes difficult to devise specific legislative language to stop it.

Consider the rather limited field of reinsurance. We find at least three variations. In one case, an American operating company will reinsure with a dummy subsidiary in a tax haven, with the reinsurance treaty rigged so as to pull most of the profits into the tax haven. As a variation on this, a foreign company may set up an American operating subsidiary with a reinsurance treaty which pulls the profits of the American company into its parent abroad, or into a tax haven subsidiary of that foreign parent. A third variation is to have an Ameri-

can company set up a subsidiary in a tax haven which, in turn, sets up an operating subsidiary abroad. The reinsurance treaty can be so rigged that the losses of the foreign operating company are paid by the U.S. parent out of funds earned but untaxed in the United States, while the profits of the foreign operating company go into the tax haven subsidiary. The only sure way to cure these abuses is to tax all subsidiaries currently on their profits.

III. RESTRICTED STOCK OPTIONS

As to special means of compensating certain "key" corporation employees, the restricted stock option plan is a favorite. The restricted stock option is a loophole which affects both the corporation and the individual beneficiary. I classify it as a loophole because, as it has been used by many companies and insiders, it amounts only to a scheme for transforming what is in fact ordinary income into a type of income which the tax code recognizes as being entitled to a capital gains tax treatment, if taxed at all.

Here is a case which has been called to my attention. It does not involve a Michigan company, I am glad to say. In this particular company, reportedly almost 5 percent of the shares of stock outstanding were set aside for options. Those insiders who were able to take advantage of the situation have made a profit of about 500 percent on the arrangement. Even worse, when the options were exercised, in at least some cases, the company accepted a note from the officers exercising the options for 95 percent of the purchase price, with a rate of interest so low that the dividends would pay the interest on the loan. What a free ride—500 percent profit without capital, without risk, and with very little tax liability.

But the ordinary stockholder can do nothing. The stock exchanges require fairly full disclosure in proxy statements, but that is, perhaps, all they can do. No Government agency has any authority to review these plans, in most instances.

The root of the trouble lies with the Congress. Because of faulty legislation, this sort of thing has been encouraged until it is now at the point of becoming a national scandal. The only way to put a stop to this sort of thing is to correct the laws. I am trying to accomplish that during this session of Congress.

You know, people have short memories. Just last December the Wall Street Journal ran a wrap-up article on restricted stock options, and the headline, believe it or not, was "Options on the Wane." During the period covered by the SEC March report, officers and directors of the companies listed on the major exchanges reported 358 separate purchases of stock under options, with a market value—based on the closing prices for May 8, 1961—of \$27,144,000. Restricted stock options are anything but "on the wane." Every time the market goes up, both sales and purchases increase.

So far as I am concerned, the restricted stock option is wholly unjustified. I am told that corporate executives need stock options to encourage them to do a conscientious job. I don't believe it. Would you quit your job if the law were changed? If you did, what would you do? Would you be less conscientious in your work if you did not have stock options? Of course not.

I am working for greater tax equity. I would also like to see lower tax rates. But the only way we can have lower rates and more equity is to eliminate special tax favoritism, only a few instances of which I have mentioned tonight. When that is done, we can begin to treat equal incomes, from whatever source, equitably, and with some possible preference to earned income.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,  
August 17, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has come to my attention that you have authored House Resolution 211, a bill asking that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be created.

Congratulations. I sincerely approve of this bill as a means for the American people to receive reliable information systematically and methodically reported concerning peoples of captive nations. Good thinking, Congressman.

A copy of this letter is going out to the Congressman from my county of San Diego, Calif. and as well to the local newspaper.

Again, congratulations and the best of luck to you.

Mrs. TOM LUCAS.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We are writing in regards to your House Resolution 211. We think a Special House Committee on Captive Nations is a wonderful idea.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. PATRICK SEATON.  
LONG BEACH, CALIF.

SAN MARINO, CALIF.,  
August 15, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
Congressman of Pennsylvania, House Office  
Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: You are to be commended  
on House Resolution 211. I hope a Special  
House Committee on Captive Nations will be  
formed at once.

Continue your fine work striving for what  
is right.

Most respectfully,

Mrs. O. L. PUTTLER.

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of the bill you  
authored, House Resolution 211. I would  
let the people in the captive nations  
throughout the world know that the United  
States has not forgotten them and some  
day, God willing, we will free them of their  
atheistic chains.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOAN G. McDONALD.

ENCINITAS, CALIF.

AUGUST 10, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Just a line to  
let you know that I like your House Resolu-  
tion 211 to establish a Special House Com-  
mittee on Captive Nations.

Keep up the good work.

RONALD P. SCHMIDT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily ap-  
prove your bill, House Resolution 211. We  
certainly need this kind of legislation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. E. COX.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.

AUGUST 18, 1961.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your  
House Resolution 211, to provide a special  
House Committee on Captive Nations.

Mrs. LOIS SALMANS.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.

AUGUST 24, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am writing to congratu-  
late you on your fine bill, House Resolution  
211, which would provide a Special House  
Committee on Captive Nations. I'm sure if  
your bill is passed, it would bring hope to  
the millions of enslaved people throughout  
the world. It is very important for these  
people to know the free world has not for-  
gotten them. It would also be a reminder  
to Khrushchev that we have not abandoned  
these people. These people need hope.

I am writing my Congressman about your  
bill, and I certainly wish you success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. S. SAMUELS.

FULLERTON, CALIF.

GRYPHON OIL & GAS CO.,  
Amarillo, Tex., August 19, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: Anticommunistic  
actions speak louder than our foreign-aid  
giveaway. Passage of your House Resolu-  
tion 211 will do far more good to help stop  
the growing tide of communism than all the

millions of dollars the executive branch  
would pour into Communist captive nations.

We must expediently show the Russian  
dictators that we do not now, nor do we ever  
intend to write off the captive nations. We  
must offer the people of these nations new  
hopes for freedom, which the committee un-  
der your resolution would do by letting these  
enslaved people know that we do care, and  
at the same time we will not furnish capital  
to their masters to further the Communist  
criminal conspiracy through foreign aid.

Congratulations for your foresight to pre-  
sent this bill. It will meet with unequivocal  
approval by those who know the real meaning  
of the atheistic international Communist  
conspiracy.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. SHAW.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIEL J. FLOOD: I  
strongly support the proposal to establish a  
Special House Committee on Captive Na-  
tions. We can't forget these nations that  
have been enslaved by the Communist mur-  
derers. It would certainly boost their morale  
to know that the United States has still been  
thinking of their plight.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GRAHAM KRAUS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., August 15, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Could you  
please send me some information on your  
bill, House Resolution 211, to "establish a  
Committee on Captive Nations." This seems  
to me an excellent idea, which will perhaps  
offset some of the odium attaching to our  
foreign relations failures.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BAIN.

AUGUST 22, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I came across this  
item in Elta, the official publication of the  
Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lith-  
uania. Thought you might like to include it  
with other similar "mouthings."

The very idea of Captive Nations or Cap-  
tive Nations Committee has gotten under  
the skin of the Soviets.

My very best to you.

Sincerely,

MARY KISZIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

[From Elta, the official publication of the  
Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lith-  
uania, Aug. 26, 1961]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK ATTACKED BY RADIO  
VILNIUS

The Captive Nations Week 1961 was fiercely  
attacked, as in the previous years, by the  
media in Soviet-occupied Lithuania. Radio  
Vilnius stated on July 20 that the week was  
organized by the most reactionary circles in  
the United States together with the "splin-  
ters of bourgeois nationalists who have fled  
across the ocean." These "splinters," accord-  
ing to radio Vilnius, do not lose hope to  
restore capitalist order in the countries of  
peoples' democracies.

AUGUST 28, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for intro-  
duction of this bill to form a House Commit-  
tee on Captive Nations. This should give  
hope to the millions of Communist-enslaved  
people of the world. I am asking my Con-  
gressman WALT HORAN to give you his support  
on this bill.

Sincerely,

CHARLES UHLEN.

SPOKANE, WASH.

California State Water Plan Is Outgrowth  
of Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a tragic  
drought again is menacing broad ex-  
panses of the West. California is ex-  
periencing its third dry year in succes-  
sion and this is its driest year in the last  
quarter century. In the most populous  
counties no drier year has been recorded  
since statehood, 111 years ago.

Grim disaster is being averted in Cali-  
fornia this summer and fall only by the  
existence of two great reclamation pro-  
jects built by the Federal government,  
and the related aqueducts and local pro-  
jects built by agencies in California. I  
refer to the Boulder Canyon project on  
the Colorado River which regulates that  
stream and supplies water to much of  
southern California and to the Central  
Valley project which serves the great  
Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.  
My State this year would have become  
a major disaster area without these proj-  
ects.

This is recognized in California where,  
under the leadership of Gov. Edmund  
G. "Pat" Brown, new ground is being  
broken in Federal-State cooperation in  
water resources development. The  
voters of California last year approved  
the mammoth California State water  
project which will transfer excess water  
from the Feather River south as far as  
the Mexican border through a great sys-  
tem of reservoirs and aqueducts. The  
job is being undertaken by the Cali-  
fornia Department of Water Resources  
headed by William E. Warne as director.  
Many of you will remember Bill Warne  
as a former Reclamation official and As-  
sistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Warne has written an article, now  
appearing in certain California newspa-  
pers, which emphasizes the value of the  
Central Valley project to the new State  
water plan. It is an expression of the  
cooperation and coordination I have  
noted. I ask unanimous consent that  
the article be printed in the Appendix  
of the Record.

There being no objection, the article  
was ordered to be printed in the Record,  
as follows:

THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

(By William E. Warne, director, Department  
of Water Resources, Sacramento, Calif.)

The Central Valley project of the U.S.  
Bureau of Reclamation in California is  
known worldwide, and well it might be, since  
it is outstanding among its kind.

Originally conceived by the State of Cali-  
fornia, the Central Valley project was taken  
over for construction by the Federal Gov-  
ernment on a finding of feasibility by Interior  
Secretary Harold L. Ickes which was approved  
by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on Decem-  
ber 2, 1935. At the start, the project was

*Captive Nations*  
September 5

Soviet Union have been increasingly intense. Since the spring of 1951 vast purges of the proportions of 1935-38 had taken place in Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan, and the most intensive campaign at Russification is under way. Reliable reports filter through almost daily on this score. In Uzbekistan, the poet Zulfia is condemned for her work "My Uzbekistan," admiring its national traits; in Azerbaijan, writers like Shirvan and Akhundia are upbraided for their nationalism; the histories of the Azerbaijanis, Uzbeks, and Kirghizes are distorted to dim the memories of their past independence; in Turkmenistan, writers are severely reproved for writing in the spirit of its national heroes: in Ukraine, a simple poem entitled "Love Ukraine" and written by V. Sosyurs in 1944 suddenly comes under heavy censure, and Pravda, on November 25, 1951, sweepingly attacks Ukrainian writers for the use of nationalist words and their attempt to wrench the already mutilated Ukrainian language from the Russian language. Similar tragedies have now befallen the non-Russian peoples of the so-called satellite area of the Soviet Empire. For the occupied non-Russian countries of the Soviet Union they measure the ever burning passion of just nationalism without which any nation could not endure, without which the unity of its history, its traditions, its freedom would perish. The entire decade is filled with such repressions.

MEANS AND ENDS IN AMERICAN NATIONAL STRATEGY TOWARD THE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN U.S.S.R.

The concrete means and ends in an intelligent and winning American psychological strategy toward the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. must be realistically adapted to the persistent historical forces and political actualities that prevail in the areas from the Baltic to the Black and Caspian Seas over to the Pacific. The keynote for the formation of these means and ends has already been sounded in the prophetic words of Mr. Acheson that the Soviet Empire "cannot escape the difficulties that, history teaches us, befall all empires." And, as the evidence shows, its foremost difficulty is the long attempted extinction of the will of the non-Russian peoples for a free and independent national existence. Here is the powder keg at the very doorstep of the Kremlin that can serve as one of the strongest deterrents against the outbreak of a hot war and, in the tragic event of one, can serve as the most potent means to victory with the least possible cost in American lives. As so often in the past, so in the future, these non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. will fight in their tradition of freedom.

The means to concretize the unique identity of interest that exists between America and these peoples are many. Here I would urge that full support be given to House Resolution 211 which seeks to assist in an objective and scholarly manner the national liberation movements of these non-Russian peoples. Second, every pressure should be brought to bear for an effective implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, through the Voice of America, through the United Nations, through diplomatic and other means. Third, with over 60 free nations having already ratified it, it is high time that we give full expression to our moral leadership in the world by ratifying the genocide convention and indicting the Soviet Government for the perpetration of genocide in the non-Russian areas of its empire.

Fourth, an "American Committee for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Peoples in the Soviet Union" should be formed to assist materially and with intelligent understanding the heavily organized anti-Communist unity of non-Russian groups in Western

Europe and in Ankara. Another vitally needed means is the creation of a fully independent psychological strategy agency in our Government, responsible on the Executive level only to the President and efficiently equipped with functional control over the Voice of America and other necessary instruments devised to capitalize on the major weaknesses of the illusory Soviet monolith.

But far more important are the ends toward which these and other instrumental means are applied. To simply situate ourselves on an endless defensive with the sure prospect of impairing seriously our own free institutions or to merely "coexist with Khrushchev" betrays not only a callous indifference to universal moral values but also an intellectual myopia as to the realities of history. Our future will indeed prove insecure on a mere biologic version of self-preservation and practical expediency. The hour urgently calls for a powerful reassertion of those principles and values treasured in our Declaration of Independence and nurtured in the great American tradition. Not only for our survival, but for the freedom of others. The histories of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are in essence a heroic struggle of a substantial segment of humanity seeking the realization of these selfsame rights of national freedom, self-government, and responsible independence. As before, so now, they look hopefully to the living expression of these principles, the "Land of Washington."

SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. BARRY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] in urging that the House Rules Committee take affirmative action on the resolution to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations, so that we can organize this vitally important committee prior to the adjournment of the Congress. So much has been said, with proper statistics and documentation added, that it is my opinion the issue is thoroughly familiar to the Members of the House, and it has been under consideration by the majority party leaders in consultation with the State Department and the White House. It seems obvious to me that a policy decision on this subject has been reached. I am most hopeful that it is, as I have indicated, affirmative support for the creation of this Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I wish to insert an article that appeared in the summer 1961 edition of the Ukrainian Quarterly, by the distinguished American scholar and chairman of the National Captive Nations Week Committee, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. The article is entitled "The Viennese Dance and the Cold War":

THE VIENNESE DANCE AND THE COLD WAR  
(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The summit meeting of President Kennedy and Khrushchev in Vienna will very likely go down in history as the Viennese dance of the cold war. In short time there was much movement of bodies and tongues, some of it polite and graceful and even colorful, but after the swift rendition of culturalistic

pomp and palaver there was really nothing to record but the motion itself. What was well known prior to the meeting was in no way altered or supplemented by the diplomatic dance. From a propaganda and cold war viewpoint the gain, as usual, was Moscow's, not ours.

For what reason did the President accommodate the head of the greatest empire in the world with this meeting? Following the Cuban fiasco, the Lao retreat, and the lowering of U.S. prestige to the lowest level yet, the timing of this fruitless meeting was the worst conceivable. Moreover, many Americans have not forgotten the words of candidate Kennedy last October 21 when he boldly stated, "I believe we should not go to the summit until there is some reason to believe that a meeting of minds can be obtained on either Berlin, outer space, or general disarmament—including nuclear testing." On empirical grounds alone the value of this campaign statement is obvious. Indeed, as will be shown below, the increasing marked discrepancies between overflowing words and expected deeds by this administration are causing grave concern in many quarters of this Nation with regard to the matter of sheer integrity of the word, not to mention competence in cold war conduct and activity.

MOSCOW PROPAGANDA GAIN

Many observers, including this writer, anticipated that Moscow would gain in terms of propaganda from this inconsequential conference. On the very eve of the meeting the propaganda drums of Moscow and its puppets began beating the familiar tunes. Radio Sofia in Bulgaria let it be known to the captive peoples that "President Kennedy knows from his own experience—exactly 100 days after his inauguration—whose actions from a position of strength may lead." Sarcastically, it had in mind Cuba and Laos.

This theme of Kennedy being compelled to shift from a position of strength policy to one of peaceful coexistence—and all that this implies from the Red totalitarian viewpoint—was repeated throughout the Red radio and press networks. For example, the Czech newspaper Rude Pravo wrote, "The time has come for Washington to realize that things do not work out with the present kind of policy." The net effect of this kind of propaganda on the audience within the captive world and also in several areas of the free world should not be difficult to perceive. The image cast is one of increasing weakness in the position of the United States and thus, relatively, one of enhanced strength in that of the Russian totalitarian empire. With this and the platform provided by the meeting itself, Khrushchev was afforded a good vantage point from which to launch again his pressing campaign on Berlin.

Under close examination none of the reasons offered for Kennedy's meeting with Khrushchev has any actual validity. One would have to be quite naive to believe that a face-to-face meeting was necessary to impress upon Khrushchev the dangers of miscalculation. In the past as now Russian cold war policy has been firmly based on such an awareness. Logically, the only guarantee against the incurrence of a mistake is the cessation of this policy, but in the nature of things Moscow qua Moscow neither can allow it nor has any intention of changing it. As a matter of fact, since the beginning of the year down to a few weeks prior to the summit meeting when the Russian leader addressed the Georgians in Tiflis, Khrushchev has been predicting victory of what he calls communism. And this, naturally, can only mean the permanent cold war.

The other reasons given, such as personally sizing up his opponent and reaffirming our positions on a variety of subjects, are equally specious. If the President by now



hasn't had a working knowledge and understanding of Khrushchev, his background, ways, and motives, then surely a brief meeting was inadequate to meet this deficiency. Transient impressions acquired in such a situation, no matter how informal, are hardly the basis of knowing the policies and aims of an adversary. As to reaffirming our positions, Khrushchev can and does read translations of our newspapers and periodicals in which these positions are plainly expostulated. He's far more familiar with them than many seem to realize.

For substantiation of these critical observations one need only turn to the President's report on his trip.<sup>1</sup> A close and careful reading of the report shows nothing more than a repetition of these reasons with the usual and rather overdone stress placed on his "responsibility of the Presidency of the United States." Aside from the ever-present danger of concluding secret agreements which a favorite predecessor of his indulged in, he asserts that "No new aims were stated in private that have not been stated in public on either side." Without revealing anything new we are also told that the Soviets—whoever they are—attach different meanings to the words of war, peace, democracy, and so forth, even intimating in a following paragraph that the rational, thinking processes of the Russian totalitarians are different from ours. The extent to which the President still fails to comprehend the nature and character of the enemy is seen in his references to the U.S.S.R. as a nation and to the myth of the dynamic concept of world communism which he imputes to Khrushchev. Finally, as is becoming more and more appreciated, his pontifical remarks on self-determination and independence await concrete deeds, and the policy of patched-up containment that he advocates in this report scarcely indicates a working comprehension of the nature of the cold war. The continued shell-out of billions for foreign aid is certainly not the answer in this type of war.

#### PROTRACTED CONFUSION

In this report the President makes the point that he "wanted to make certain Mr. Khrushchev knew this country and its policies, that he understood our strength and our determination, and that he knew that we desired peace with all nations of every kind." This obviously is an old record that was played over and over again to justify Khrushchev's visit to this country 2 years ago. In fact, as indicated above, quite a number of old records are being played in the statements and outlooks of the Kennedy administration. What is most disturbing is not only the widening gap between word and deed but also an accented protraction of confusion regarding the cold war, as seen in the President's conception of the enemy and the Soviet Union, his reaffirmation of the containment policy, the lack of a cold war strategy and the absence of a cold war apparatus, and the administration's almost total neglect of support for projects pertaining to the captive nations.

When viewed against the background of confusion and attitudes in this country during the past 2 years and in terms of certain basic essentials of cold war concept, the secular Russian cold war policy, and the Captive Nations Week resolution, the Vienna meeting cannot but be regarded as a puny dance. It symbolizes the quasi-appeasement that continues to afflict us. We are ready to abstain from creating and generating any troubles for Khrushchev in the domain of his imperial realm and wishfully hope that he would abstain likewise in the area of the free world. This is the level of our blissful

naivete, not to say ignorance, of the nature of Russian totalitarianism and its cold war coefficient. This is the protracted state of our confusion and quasi-appeasement.

Let us survey, then, this background of confusion, attitudes, and quasi-appeasement. It can be said quite truthfully that since the Mikoyan visit to this country in 1959 many quasi-appeasement forces have been pressing on with increasing confidence. When one looks back over these months, one finds, for instance, some openly stating that there were no or are no slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; others telling us that Khrushchev was simply appalled by the crimes committed by Stalin, as though Khrushchev had never committed a crime.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time we have numerous other Americans in economics, in science, and in education—who are actually peddling, whether they are aware of it or not, the very things that Moscow seeks to peddle. Many of them are really doing Moscow's propaganda work at no cost to Khrushchev. Khrushchev has so effectively administered tranquilizing cold war pills to major segments of our society that an increasing number of Americans aren't even aware of the great strides made by imperialist Moscow in this perilous phase of the permanent cold war. For instance, the singular victory of exacting an invitation to this country in itself produced confusion and doubt in this country. It entrenched the power of Khrushchev with new airs of respectability and legitimacy while it depressed the freedom of millions of patriots in Moscow's empire. It also impressed the newly independent nations with Moscow's inflated power and at the same time has caused uneasiness among our most loyal allies situated about the periphery of the new Russian Empire.

In this period we also heard a great deal about peace and friendship. One of our officials used it at great length on a tour of the Soviet Union. However, before we uncritically accept this particular slogan, we should look also at its significance, not only at this time but in the course of history. A sober American would say: "Yes, peace and friendship, but first, justice and freedom" The traditional Russian political slogan of peace and friendship has for centuries been used to seduce neighboring non-Russian nations into captivity. It was indicative of our lack of cold war insight and imagination that we failed to turn this slogan to our account in whatever sphere of human existence. Peace and friendship are and can only be the consequence of justice and freedom, not their cause. The harmony implied by peace and friendship is logically predicated on the dictates of justice and freedom. The Russians, with typical deception, put the cart before the horse, and some of us were uncritically amenable to be taken for a ride in the cart. And this wasn't the first time in the course of these past 40 years.

When one looks back at these evidences of error and confusion, he should begin to reflect on certain essential points. The first point is that the cold war is not new. It's not a new institution. It wasn't started in 1947, despite the fact that began then to affect the United States. Actually, it didn't even commence in 1917. Historically and analytically, one could show Russian cold war techniques going as far back as the 16th century. The second point is that the development and refinement of these techniques have been linked with the expansion of an empire. These techniques have a tradition and have served to build an empire, with military power always kept in secondary reserve. The third point is that unless we develop a perspective and an understand-

ing of these techniques, to see the whole background to what we now call protracted conflict or the cold war, we can only hope to make all sorts of transient shift, make-shifts, executed in a haphazard and aimless manner, constantly reacting to the perpetual initiative shown by the enemy. In such a case, we will find much to our surprise and also dismay that military power will virtually be neutralized. Even superior military power, in such a case, could really prove to be of little avail. And in exposing ourselves in this way we truly risk an eventual hot war with greater probability of defeat.

#### FIVE DOMINANT U.S. ATTITUDES

In the United States, at this time, there seems to be five dominant attitudes toward the world struggle. These are: (1) Wishful cold war cessationism; (2) accommodationism to Moscow's empire; (3) military hardwarism; (4) evolutionism; and (5) cold war realism.

The first, the wishful cessationists, erroneously believe that understanding and cultural exchange will secure peace.<sup>3</sup> They argue as though the two did not prevail in far greater degree with regard to Nazi Germany prior to World War II. We had cultural exchange and a very close and intimate understanding with the German people prior to World War II, and yet these factors were not sufficient to avert the outbreak of a Second World War. The plain fact is that the cold war is at Moscow's instigation and, contrary to what they now say, it certainly has never been at our instigation. Understanding and people-to-people programs are important, but if you begin to understand that the cultural exchange program in itself continues to be an instrument carefully manipulated and used by Moscow for its own benefits, then this could hardly produce that kind of understanding which presumably will pave the road to permanent peace.

The second group consists of the accommodationists. They never learn from historical experience that this form of appeasement only encourages the enemy to bolder ventures. We have many of them in this country, in official circles and outside. They'll say, "Well, if we can only accommodate them. They've expanded far enough. We could make a deal with them. This is your sphere, and this is ours"—which is, curiously enough, the very thing that Khrushchev has been seeking and demanding for his own advantage.

A third group is made up of the military hardwarists. These hardwarists obtusely ignore the forces of spirit, will, and ruse which, so often in the past, have undermined a mighty fortress. In the Armed Forces there are those, of course, like Admiral Burke, who recognize that actually the decision of tomorrow will not rest in the military, especially in the period of mutual deterrence, but, instead, in the area of the nonmilitary, the psychological, propaganda or what we properly call the cold war.

Then, fourthly, there are the evolutionists. Many, without declaring whether they are random or selective evolutionists, are equally wishful in their desire that history will for some inscrutable reason be on our side. This position certainly stimulates a passivity, a wishful hoping that somehow there'll be a strong liberalizing process at work in the U.S.S.R., either through consumer goods production or education and the rest of it, followed eventually by an institutional blend. This, too, fails to recognize the nature of what we call the protracted conflict and only contributes to what is the protracted confusion.

<sup>1</sup> "Text of President's Report on European Talks," the Washington Post, June 7, 1961.

<sup>2</sup> For these crimes see, Campaigne, Jameson, G., "American Might and Soviet Myth," pp. 143-144.

<sup>3</sup> See the excellent article by Philip E. Mosely, "Soviet Myths and Realities," Foreign Affairs, New York, April 1961.

The fifth, the cold war realists, are guided by the evidence not only of today, of yesterday, or even of 40 years of Russian Communist conquests, but also of centuries of established Russian cold war techniques. The evidence precedes any act of hope.

#### THE COLD WAR CONCEPT

Now, in some circles of our Government and elsewhere there is no firm general grasp of what a cold war means. Lacking a working concept, it is no wonder that there is scarcely any appreciation of its long background of methods and techniques. However, on the other hand, it is plainly comprehensible why we continue to operate in aimless, haphazard, makeshift, and piecemeal fashion, incurring losses as we hobble along. The imposing irony of our current situation is that while Moscow carefully plans its cold war tactics and maneuvers in the broad context of its fixed cold war strategy and objectives—including even the lessening-of-tensions maneuver—we are engaged in no such cold war gaming and don't even possess the apparatus for it. In a hot war we wouldn't think twice about immediately creating such an apparatus.

Yet, definitionally, a cold war is a twilight condition of neither peace nor hot war, where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. A cold war is really the very soul and spirit of a hot war, with the massive body of military conflict in secondary reserve. A cold war entails objectives and the will to realize them. It entails all the techniques of ruse, subversion, infiltration, cunning, treachery, plotting, fraud, bluster, blackmail and indirect aggression. It includes every conceivable thing as an instrument—the psychological, the economic, the ideological, demographic, the political, scientific, education. And it also allows for action on two levels: the level of official pretext, like Khrushchev coming here as head of state and, second, the level of subofficial cold war operation, viz., Khrushchev as the head of a world conspiracy.

Many of us rightly lean on the authority of Clausewitz to gain insight into the nature of the cold war. Lenin studied him closely and quoted him often. And Khrushchev, a professed Leninist, must see himself in the mirror of Clausewitz's words: "A conqueror is always a lover of peace; he would like to make his entry into our state unopposed." But few of us realize that Clausewitz gained his cold war knowledge in Russia's military service. With Russia's military position much weaker than Prussia's at the beginning of the 19th century and, yet, the czar extending his domination over nations, Clausewitz asked himself, "How could this be?" He entered Russia's military service to obtain the answers, in order to save his own Prussia. When he returned in 1814, he rejoined the Prussian Army and in 1818 was already commandant of the General War School in Berlin. Lenin studied him and many of us turn to Clausewitz to gain insights into the nature of the cold war.

#### TRADITIONAL RUSSIAN COLD WAR

In essence, the cold war methods employed by Khrushchev today are no different from those developed by Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Catherine the Great, and other Russian tyrants. In looking at these techniques, one has to bear in mind a traditional and institutional nexus, the nexus between internal, totalitarian tyranny and external, imperialist expansionism. The two have always worked hand-in-hand, one leading upon the other, in the past as well as in the present. Substantially, the techniques have not changed. In content, by virtue of technological changes over the centuries, and especially in the recent period, marked changes have, of course, taken place. But this fact of technologic change shouldn't

blind us, as it appears to do for some,<sup>4</sup> to the basic continuity of cold war policy in imperial Russian politics.

The methods are in substance psychological, propagandistic, political and of numerous other veins. The military, on the other hand, has always been kept in reserve, marching in, if you will, at the climax to a situation. In this respect there is a work by which many of us could profit immensely. We cannot quote too often this work written by a French cultural traveler in the Czarist Empire, the Marquis de Custine. It provides his diary notes on the Russian Empire of 1839. Their timelessness will amaze you. With changes for a few characters, you would believe that he is describing the present Russian situation. He says, for example, in one place: "I try to analyze the moral life of the inhabitants of Russia. The Russian thinks and lives as a soldier \* \* \* a conquering soldier."<sup>5</sup> In another passage, which is very appropriate to the Khrushchev exchange visits and the hospitality involved, he says, "Once again I say, everything is deception in Russia, and the gracious hospitality of the Czar, gathering together in his palace his serfs and the serfs of his courtiers, is only one more mockery."<sup>6</sup>

The cold war methods we want to observe for every century since the 16th—the methods of ruse, subversion, infiltration, indirect aggression, fraud, bluster, blackmail—were adroitly employed to build up an unprecedented empire. The tyrants of the past left a wealthy legacy of cold war techniques for the Red Russian totalitarians, including Nikita the Sanguine. By these methods the contemporary tyrants of Moscow have extended the empire and are now threatening the independence of our own Nation. The spurious ideologies of the Third Rome and Pan-Slavism were used in the same deceptive way that the mythical ideology of communism is manipulated today. It would do well for our people to learn more of the growth of the Russian Empire, both past and present, than to learn the Russian language. Such learning would reveal the secrets of empire-building, which are the cold war techniques. Frontal military aggression was always secondary.

#### RUSSIAN COLD WAR CASES

A full cold war perspective requires an historical appreciation of traditional Russian cold war techniques. Let us just quickly review this, taking one illustrative case for each century. In the case of Basil III and Ivan the Terrible, the groundwork for the swift expansion of Muscovy was laid in the 16th century. The real starting point was 1519; the target and victim was Kazan, the citadel of the great Golden Horde. For 33 years Moscow worked at it in "peaceful coexistence," using infiltration, subversion, and intervening support, as it does now, for a contender (Shah Ali) against the possessor of the throne. Finally, in October 1522, the Muscovite forces simply walked in when Kazan itself was so weak it couldn't even defend itself.

There's a definite similarity here between this technique and the one employed by Khrushchev in connection with the Middle East. Khrushchev first builds up a man—Nasser—and hopes that through Nasser he would be able to neutralize the area and thus exclude the influences of the United States, Britain and others. Then, later, he builds up a contender in the area in order to provide the contention and the clash that

<sup>4</sup>For example, Karpovich, Michael M., "Russian Imperialism or Communist Aggression?" in *Soviet Conduct in World Affairs*, Columbia University, New York, 1960, pp. 186-195.

<sup>5</sup>"Journey for Our Time," *New York Times*, 1951, p. 150.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 5.

would lead to division and chaos. Ultimately, like a ripe apple, the area drops into the laps of Moscow.

Following this first case, 4 years later, in 1556, by the same techniques and support of the contender Derbish Ali, Moscow managed to take over Astrakan. The entire area of Siberia and also the Middle East was at that time opened up to further aggression.

Here is a representative case for the 17th century. This case is very appropriate in view of the fact that 7 years ago in the Soviet Union and throughout Moscow's empire, a whole year of celebration was conducted in observance of the Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654. These were produced, and these had to be taught and learned in cells throughout the Soviet Union and also in the so-called satellite states. These glorified the alleged union of two Slav nations, namely Russia and Ukraine. One not knowing the history of the Pereyaslav Treaty would certainly not be in a position to evaluate the reason why, in 1954, a 300th anniversary of this event was put on. Of what significance, of what value to Moscow was there in putting on such a gala event throughout the empire?

Well, the fact is that Moscow twisted the meaning of the treaty to show today an indissoluble union between these two nations. Yet historical facts show that when the treaty was consummated in 1654, it was only a military alliance, a mutual security pact, between Muscovy and Ukraine against hostile Polish or Turkish forces. In 4 years that pact was violated by Moscow. We speak of treaties being violated by Moscow in our day. When one looks at the history of the growth of this empire, he finds the same gross violations. As a further example in 1559, a war took place—an inevitable war—between Ukraine and Muscovy. Hetman Vyhovskiy, who was the head of the Ukrainian forces, declared: "The treacherous action of Moscow was apparent in preparing for us a slavery primarily by means of instigating a civil war in Ukraine." How many instances do we know of instigated civil wars, many that are currently going on, indirectly if you will, in Laos and numerous other places? Again, a precedent for the present.

Let's now look into the case of Poland in the 18th century. We know of the Polish partitions. But how many of us know, for example, the operation of the Russian "Smiling Mike" of that day. The Russian Ambassador Reppin, in Warsaw, employed the religious issue of orthodoxy to divide the Catholics against the orthodox in Poland until, finally, he managed successfully to bring about the first partition in 1772. Immediately thereafter, his successor, Ambassador Steckelberg, operated just as Vishinsky had in 1940 when he entered Latvia and by ultimatum legalized the situation. Steckelberg had the Polish Sejm legalize the first partition. Then, in 1793, with the second partition, a new issue was infused, 50 years before Marx even made his name. Discord was sown between the social classes of the boyars and the peasants. Obviously these are old techniques, no matter how you attempt to grace them and perhaps seek to change them.

Another interesting case in point of illustration was that preparatory to the conquest of Georgia. From 1768 on Russia was at war with Turkey and allied itself with Georgia. In this case Catherine the Great placed the Russian forces in agreement with the Georgians to thwart the Turks. On the eve of battle, the Russian forces withdrew, leaving the Georgians exposed. Let us recall that a century or more later an agreement between the Polish underground and Moscow's forces was consummated to destroy the Nazis in Warsaw. The agreement designated a certain time of uprising to wage together a war against the common enemy, only to be deceitfully broken by Moscow.

As one goes through these cases, one cannot help but be impressed by the techniques that have been used to build up an empire, least of all that of frontal military assault. Numerous other examples can be given. One is reminded of the case in Persia toward the close of the 19th century because of the operations of Moscow surrounding Iran today. You might have noticed on the economic level where Moscow is offering Iran 85 percent of the oil profits. The highest is about 60 to 65 percent in mutual engagement for oil exploitation in the Middle East. Moscow is even willing to build dams and numerous other things, so long as Iran refuses to set up any missile bases.

In the 1880's, the Russian Ambassador in Persia played a very instrumental role that led to the bombing of the Parliament, to the abdication of the Shah, and the withdrawal of the constitution. The division of the country between the Russians and the British soon followed. A repetition of such division occurred in Iran in the 1940's. The old borderlands policy of using non-Russian peoples within the Russian Empire against adjoining territories is a standard one for Moscow. Just as it is attempting to use the Kurds in Iraq and elsewhere, so with the Azerbaijani Moscow seeks to divide Iran.

Even in this century many of us don't realize what transpired immediately prior to World War I and in that very fateful period of 1917-20. In the postwar period many of the so-called "republics" in the Soviet Union today were independent states. Georgia entered into a mutual security pact with Soviet Russia. Ukraine was promised that its sovereignty would be respected. One by one, through infiltration, subversion, and ideological deception, they were raped and have since been kept in a submerged state within the Soviet Union.

#### KHRUSHCHEV AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution in July, 1959, disclosed two indisputable facts: one, the sensitivity of Moscow about the weakest and most vital nerve in its empire and, two, the lack of understanding in many sections of our Nation with regard to the significance and content of this resolution. Khrushchev's rantings against the resolution and in his foreign affairs article released in August 1959, and once again, at the end of October before the Supreme Soviet, clearly demonstrated how deeply the resolution penetrated Moscow's cold war armor. Khrushchev fears this resolution more than anything else. And the reason for this is that the resolution is fraught with enormous and even decisive cold war possibilities, particularly on the colonialist issue.<sup>7</sup>

For the first time, our Government took official cognizance of the majority of captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself. Without the captive Baltic nations, Ukraine, the Caucasian nations, Turkestan, and others mentioned in the resolution, Russia, with its 100 million population and its own resources, could hardly be called—as the Moscow propaganda machine now does—the greatest power in the world. It would be no more comparable in power to the United States than a reunited Germany would be. A cold war development of this crucial weakness in the synthetic state known as the Soviet Union would seriously deflate all the bluster, bluff, and sham of Moscow's economic prowess, military might, scientific achievements, and cultural attainments. Parasitic growth on the basis of captive resources is not exactly alluring

<sup>7</sup> See "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire," Neue Zuercher Zeitung, Switzerland, Nov. 20, 1960.

in propaganda or otherwise. Khrushchev has the vision to see this and thus continues to bellow against this resolution. Unfortunately, the possibilities inherent in the resolution escape most of us.

The low level of our understanding about the Soviet Union and its ersatz political character was shown at the time of the resolution's passage. Many reporters and writers inquired to know where Turkestan or White Ruthenia are located. Some wrote as though the minority captive nations in Central Europe were the only nations listed in the resolution. What can one expect when on the highest levels of our Government, the U.S.S.R. is referred to as the Soviet nation and the different nations within the Soviet Union are arbitrarily and somewhat insularly called the Soviet people or the Soviets. Aside from the historical and demographic untruths of these usages, the suggestion of a united, integrated, and monolithic power in the U.S.S.R. is not even intelligent from a cold war point of view.<sup>8</sup> Our many economic, military, scientific, and other comparisons between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America are drawn on false premises. The U.S.S.R., in essence an empire within an empire, is not at all qualitatively comparable to the United States which is a nation-state.

In short, if you don't know the nature of your opponent, how could you expect to convert his weaknesses into real vulnerabilities? We are like the fighter entering the ring with an obscurantist disregard of the information given him that his opponent has several loosely patched-up broken ribs. More, like him, we even refuse to test it. Khrushchev fears such a test and virtually paralyzes some of us with his coexistence or codestruction propaganda, while at the same time his cold war activities continue undiminished in every quarter of the globe. And these activities include every conceivable instrument—political, diplomatic, psychological, demographic, economic, cultural, scientific, military. Certain recent developments show conclusively how the Russians can be easily thrown on the defensive.<sup>9</sup>

If we are not to be cornered into a hot war we must face up to the realities of the cold war. An unparalleled empire was built up over 500 years by cold war techniques. With modern technology and communications, it could expand in short time. A sound basis for necessary cold war-gaming is provided in the Captive Nations Week Resolution. With an indispensable apparatus, such as a Freedom Commission, the possibilities suggested by the resolution could be developed peaceably and victoriously in the name of justice and freedom first.<sup>10</sup> The captive nations throughout the totalitarian Russian empire, and particularly in the Soviet Union, constitute our most powerful weapon in this period of mutual deterrence.

#### AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY, 1960-76

We are really on the eve of an important decade and a half. Last year, 1960, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of the presidency of the Great Emancipator. As he stated, no nation can be half slave and half free. With the global international significance of our daily doings today, we can paraphrase that and say the world certainly can't be half free and half slave. But we must also look to 1976, the period of the 200th anniversary of our own Declaration of

<sup>8</sup> An example of this is "Russia," Charles W. Thayer, Life World Library, New York, 1960.

<sup>9</sup> Parkhomenko, M., "Taras Shevchenko and Champions of the Cold War," Soviet-skaya Kultura, Moscow, Dec. 24, 1960.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., Gill, William, "Dead Poet Becomes Live Issue," Pittsburgh Family magazine, May 7, 1961, pp. 4-5.

Independence. It seems that in these 16 years we should face a period of moral and political rededication to show the tremendous will and the stubborn patriotism of the American people, not the old age that Khrushchev ascribes to us now. It is a period for us to prepare for the many challenges that will certainly present themselves.

In terms of our own moral and political principles, as enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights—not to speak of the importance of preserving our own national independence—we have a global field for the most successful endeavor, provided we are able to express these principles adroitly, skillfully, and in a peaceful manner. The entire Red Empire, including even the Russian people, is ripe for the spirited drive of independence. For the Russians, independence from centuries of tyranny, oppression, and slavery—for the non-Russian nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, national independence and freedom. These objectives constitute a tremendous opportunity for America, and with the proper kind of rededication, we can then begin to implement the means whereby we can seize this opportunity. No team, on any football field, has ever won a game playing on its own side of the 50-yard line. We've been doing that now for over a decade. It is not a winning proposition; and there are many avenues—many feasible avenues—for this kind of pressure for freedom.<sup>11</sup> As it was once said, si vis pacem para bellum—if you wish peace, prepare for war. And the war we have to prepare for in the case of Russia is primarily a cold war. The Vienna meeting, in the light of all this, was simply a Viennese dance.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dobriansky in his remarks points out very effectively pertinent issues which have been discussed from time to time in the discussion of the Captive Nations Committee. To speak as plainly as possible on this subject, may I sum up the entire issue by stating that a special House Committee on Captive Nations would produce a progressive, practical, tremendously effective service; would strengthen our foreign policy position; would point out the basic weaknesses in the Soviet Union; would provide material for our United Nations staff, and could only result in a direct vital contribution to our freedom and help achieve the freedom of peoples behind the Iron Curtain of which they are now deprived.

#### AFL-CIO PARADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, one of the most colorful parades in Gotham's history marched down Fifth Avenue. Over 200,000 working men and women, all members of the AFL-CIO, proudly stepped out in a dedicated, enthusiastic demonstration of a wonderful, meaningful old custom. Hundreds of bands and colorful floats marked what unquestionably was one of the Nation's most impressive demonstrations of solidarity and pride in achievement.

<sup>11</sup> "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961, pp. 3286-3311.

While parades and demonstrations signified this great day in many other sections of the United States as well, the spectacular display in New York was the largest of its kind ever held and it is interesting to note that this symbolic tradition was resumed in New York only 2 years ago after a lapse of 20 years. The last such parade was held in 1939 until this demonstration was renewed in 1959. The fact that the participants have doubled in 2 years is heartening. The intervention of the war years and the gradual drifting away from the custom were responsible for the abandonment of the parade in the city.

With the lapse of the parade, and with similar waivering of overt demonstrations in other cities and towns, Labor Day was beginning to lose its true significance. It was a day that America began taking for granted. For too many Americans the day had come to mean little more than a day off, the last fling to mark the end of summer, the time when families trek back from vacation, the beginning of a new school year.

But going back to first principles, Harry Van Arsdale, president of the New York City Central Labor Council, remembered the spirit in which the day was founded.

Thanks to him and to the New York City Central Labor Council the parade was returned in 1959 to New York City. Now organized labor of this great city is given the opportunity once again to display its dedication to the theme of this historic day—a theme which Mr. Van Arsdale so aptly applied to the parade—"A strong, free labor movement means a strong free America."

It is a theme that over 200,000 men and women joined in yesterday. They represented the unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations ranging in skills from acting to welding.

This was truly a dedication of labor unity and pride in its role in the Nation's economic and social life. It was echoed in cities, in towns, in villages throughout the breadth of our land in many forms—parades, meetings, services, statements, articles, and other means of public expression.

Let us hope in the years to come, more observance, more dedication, more respect for this day will be realized.

It follows the true spirit of the man who is recognized as the founder of Labor Day—Peter J. McGuire—whose inspiration gave rise to the observance of this day. He wrote:

Pagan feasts and Christian observances have come down to us through the long ages. But it was reserved for the American people to give birth to Labor Day. In this they honor the toilers of the earth, and pay homage to those who from rude nature have delved and carved all the comfort and grandeur we behold.

More than all, the thought, the conception, yes the very inspiration of this holiday came from men in the ranks of the working people—men active in uplifting their fellows, and leading them to better conditions.

Today marks the 79th anniversary of the first Labor Day. Labor truly has great reason for pride in accomplishment. It is not only the solid better-

ment in living conditions for so many Americans which labor has helped to achieve, but the strengthening of our democracy and the giving of deeper meaning to our incomparable individual rights—national acceptance of the belief that every man has the right to earn a living and provide for his loved ones under decent conditions—to receive a remuneration worthy of his efforts. These are rights of modern American men and labor's role in attaining them has been a magnificent one.

Our American civilization—for that matter, all civilization—has never seen an equal throughout all of history. The individual has been afforded greater significance and greater protection than in any other society. Labor has helped to make this possible. That was the real meaning of its march up Fifth Avenue, its parade on Main Street, its meetings and its tributes.

Because it has so great an importance for all Americans—and to the world—I want to join in this tribute to those who initiated the idea of Labor Day so many years ago, and to those who have contributed so much through the years and to those who are now doing so much to transform the American dream into reality.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN (at the request of Mr. YATES), on account of death in the family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland (at the request of Mr. FALLON), indefinitely on account of death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. ALBERT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BARRY), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, September 7, 1961.

Mr. WILLIS, for 15 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ULLMAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include a newsletter.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LAIRD and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$189.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. RAY in three instances.

Mr. JONAS.

Mr. HOSMER in three instances.

Mr. ROBISON in five instances.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. KEITH in two instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in two instances.

Mr. HESTAND in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. HORAN.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. MATHIAS in two instances.

Mr. BROMWELL.

Mr. MACGREGOR in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. FULTON in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. CAREY.

Mr. HECHLER.

Mr. ALFORD.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in four instances.

Mr. TUCK.

#### SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 486. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 557. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 560. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 563. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1037. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, relating to practices in the

*Coolidge*  
*77 August 31*

information to make an investigation but it was 4 years before any action was taken. Even then "both Regional Director Atwood and Ambassador Achilles (Theodore C.) persisted in impressing on the Board their beliefs that Neale was simply a victim of spite. Neither appeared to have any knowledge of the actual facts.

"There were no end use checks made of the drought program. ICA/W on the basis of information from various sources, could have taken action to correct this situation." Special audits finally came when Congress began its investigation.

"USOM/Peru Deputy Director Coon tried for over a year to get action from responsible ICA officials on his charges of Neale's maladministration in Peru, only to get rebuffs from ICA Director Smith (James H. Jr.) and Regional Director Atwood. It was not until it became known that he was to appear before a congressional committee, that P.S. & I. (ICA Office of Personnel Security) was finally directed to investigate Coon's charges.

"After failing for over a year and a half to make any substantial inquiry into the charges that a USOM employee (a Peruvian national) had improperly profited from the sale of some \$42,000 in surplus grain stocks, OIGC finally reopened the case, 1 day after this subcommittee had expressed interest in the case."

Now this is an example of what Regional Director Atwood called a foreign aid program "perhaps better than any other program that we have in Latin America." We wonder what the worse programs are like. Atwood also called Neale a man who "made perhaps the greatest contribution to the entire technical cooperation in Latin America \* \* \*" and one of the "most outstanding technicians we have in the field." If this is so, those not so outstanding must be awful.

Nothing in the new Kennedy program would correct the kind of situation described in Peru. It would only make it more permanent and worse. At the same time, if ICA officials think the program in Peru is so great, it seems only logical to suppose that there are scores of other cases—as already shown up in Laos and Vietnam—all over the world, of mismanagement, conflict of interest, stupidity, poor planning, waste and entrenched bureaucracy.

American taxpayers who support the foreign aid program should send for the committee report "U.S. Aid Operations in Peru" from Porter Hardy Jr. of Virginia who headed the investigation. Address, House Office Building, Washington. People who oppose the foreign aid program should write their Congressmen, same address, and tell them to read the report before they vote for more foreign aid.

#### LABOR DAY

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute all our working men and women, past and present, whom we honor on Labor Day.

From the first unofficial observance of this day in New York City in 1882 has evolved nationwide recognition of the importance in setting aside a day to honor all laborers. Labor Day has been observed for 79 years, not through congressional action, but primarily as a result of action taken by State legislatures and local government officials.

This is a day on which we should pause to assess our many gains, our

growth, and our achievements wrought by the labor of so many dedicated individuals. Our progress in all areas of endeavor has been phenomenal even though we are as yet a young nation in comparison with so many others around the world. We could not have prospered and widened our sphere of influence without the honest and sincere efforts expended by our working men and women.

I truly recognize the importance of our working men and women, now and more especially for the future. Without their continued devotion to our form of government and our way of life, we should surely have collapsed as a nation before now. We have gone through several periods of extreme stress and strain as a nation, always with the full support and cooperative dedication of our working people.

It is, then, with gratitude and admiration that I join with so many others in taking my hat off in acknowledgment of the importance of America's working men and women. May your contributions to our future progress be adequately recognized and appreciated by us all.

#### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and I have repeatedly called the attention of the Members of the House to the urgent need for the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations.

At the present time, the resolution creating this committee remains bottled up in the House Rules Committee due to the objections of the State Department, as voiced by the Speaker's spokesman in the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. I need not dwell on the fact that the deliberate suppression of this and other resolutions is certainly contrary to the statements made on the floor of the House by many Members during the debate which "liberalized" the Rules Committee.

However, the issue before us is the value and accomplishments that could come from a special House Committee on Captive Nations. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] called to your attention yesterday the statements made by the President and other key officials, indicating support of the principles involved in this committee. Certainly, there can be no basic objection to the statement that the Soviet Union is at the present time the only colonial and imperialistic power in the world, and this fact could be thoroughly exposed for proper world understanding and judgment by this House committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to place into the RECORD at this time an editorial that appeared in the Ukrainian Quarterly,

summer of 1961, entitled "The World, the President, and Captive Nations Week, 1961."

#### THE WORLD, THE PRESIDENT, AND CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1961

The observance of Captive Nations Week in 1961 was more successful than that of 1960 or 1959. This is as it should be. With more experience, a background of planning, and more efficient coordination by the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, citizen committees in various sections of the country have come to organize the festivities of the week with increased skill and performance. One of the highlights of the week was, of course, the proclamation issued by President Kennedy.

It serves no useful purpose to compare the contents of Kennedy's proclamation with those of Eisenhower's in the 2 preceding years. Comparisons along this line are, nevertheless, already underway. For example, under the caption "Captive Nations Week—An Unfortunate Symptom" a statement of Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, of Ohio, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27 contends that the President "issued a halfhearted proclamation which never once mentioned the Communists." Others point to the pithy character of this third proclamation. These strictures may be correct. On the other hand, however, the Kennedy proclamation eliminates the misleading term "Soviet-dominated nations" which appeared in the Eisenhower proclamations. Contrary to the wording of the Captive Nations Week resolution, this term caused people to assume that the nations referred to are those under the domination of the Soviet Union rather than all of the captive nations under the foreign heel of Soviet Russia. Moreover, the resolved part of the present proclamation stresses explicitly "the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom." This does not appear in either of the Eisenhower proclamations.

The fact is that President Kennedy did issue a proclamation which, it is reported, he himself prepared. In certain fundamental respects, as indicated above, it improves upon the previous proclamations. In other respects, also as shown above, it could have been more substantial in the "whereas clauses" and more decisive in spotlighting the myth of Communist ideology. It is hoped that in future proclamations there will be absolutely no grounds for complaint and criticism. And there is every reason to be confident of this. These proclamations are read widely and carefully, behind the Iron Curtain as well as in the free world. They reflect the foreign policy thinking of our Government at given times. With the state of the world today, whether one looks at Berlin, Cuba, Laos, Turkestan or East Germany, our displayed interest in the captive nations always bears important relevancy. Words, the cloak of our ideas, are profoundly consequential.

#### THE POWER OF THE PRESIDENT'S WORDS

It should be quite evident, therefore, that the words, declarations and proclamations of the President of the United States command and convey tremendous power. They create impressions, they affect minds and thoughts, and they influence, for better or for worse, the actions and activities of groups and individuals. What is not said in particular situations is just as consequential as what is said.

In the past 7 months there has been increasing doubt about the proper and judicious use of this power in the White House. This does not mean the President alone but also those about him. Many statements are prepared for the President and although the responsibility for checking on them rests with him, oftentimes circumstances prevent



1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16745

the giving of the most careful attention to them. As concerns the captive nations, the record of this first phase of the new administration is a checkered and unstable one. It reflects uncertainty of thought and conviction regarding the captive nations, the world, and our security.

Here is the record. In contrast to Eisenhower's first inaugural address, President Kennedy's made no mention whatsoever of the captive nations. The New Frontier, which the President defined in these terms—"if freedom is to survive and prosper, it will require the sacrifice, the effort and the thoughtful attention of every citizen. It is this effort and concern which makes up the New Frontier"—obviously did not include the captive nations. Then, in his state of the Union message, the President inserted one weak, sentimental sentence: "We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples."

The Cuban fiasco changed this trend radically. Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April, the President asked some to recall "the long rollcall of refugees who cannot now go back—to Hungary, or to North Korea, or to North Viet Nam, or to East Germany, or to Poland, or to any of the other lands from which a steady stream of refugees pours forth, in eloquent testimony to the cruel oppression now holding sway in their homelands." In the same address he emphasized what many have been declaring for a decade: "The evidence is clear—and the hour is late. We and our friends will have to face the fact that we cannot postpone any longer the real issue of survival itself." One may ask whether the peoples of the non-Russian captive nations are regarded as "our friends" and, if so, what preparations are being made to enlist them in the war of survival?

At this time the reply of the President to Khrushchev reached a high point that months ago should have been a starting point: "The people of the United States believe that the right of self-determination is fundamental and should apply throughout the world. We reject the right of any narrow political grouping or any country to arrogate to itself the power to determine the 'real will of the people.'" Nothing explicit about the captive nations which Khrushchev does not like to hear but, nonetheless, the meaning is clear.

In June, the President's report on his European talks is now marked by confusion as well as omission. He affirms again our belief "in a system of national freedom and independence" and "that liberty and independence and self-determination, not communism, is the future of man," but with regard to Khrushchev's basic empire, the U.S.S.R., he speaks of that "nation's achievements in space" (the U.S.S.R. a nation!) and also of the different meanings given by "the Soviets" to the "same words—war, peace, democracy, and popular will." The Soviets, or councils of workers and peasants, can scarcely express themselves, and the colonial Russian totalitarians who alone can assign their meanings to words, obviously do not have different brain structures from ours and impute meanings they want for purposes of confusion, deception, and division. It is surprising that the President was pulled in by this.

Concerning all of this and more, it is no wonder that toward the close of June the London Times depicted the administration in a state of "political disarray." With this situation prevailing, many began to wonder whether the President would proclaim Captive Nations Week the following month. There can be no doubt of the fact that the Khrushchev message to Kennedy on our Independence Day was designed to influence

the President from issuing the proclamation. Moscow and its colonial puppets would then have a propaganda heyday. The issuance of the proclamation on our own Independence Day would have had a compounded effect. But the President chose to release solely his statement on "The Meaning of Liberty" in which he says, "What matters is the concrete meaning that our words gives our lives. We make the revolution of liberty, not by what we exhort others to do, but what we do ourselves."

The proclamation was issued on July 14, 2 days before the Captive Nations Week commenced. But a week after the period, in an otherwise excellent address to the Nation on the Berlin crisis, the President made a fantastic statement which again suggests a lack of understanding and a deep uncertainty with regard to East European history, the captive nations, and their strategic relationship to us. It is hard to believe but he did say: "We recognize the Soviet Union's historical concerns about their security in central and eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions—and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet those concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area." One finds it difficult to conceive a more logically confused and mixed-up statement than this. Also, as Senator KEATING, of New York, rightly pointed out in the Senate, "The President seemed to be stressing the rights of the Soviet Union to security rather than the rights of the people there to self-determination not only for East Berlin, but also for East Germany, and all of east and central Europe."

As to the fantastic statement itself, first it is evident that a state which has been in existence for less than 40 years could scarcely have developed "historical concerns" in this short period. Second, if the President doesn't as yet know, this empire-state was created and built by the destruction of numerous independent non-Russian nations and states which are enumerated in the Captive Nations Week resolution. Third, if the "security" of the present Red Russian Empire and that of the previous White Russian Empire is an object of our concern, we are desperately in need of historical training to see in what direction the "series of ravaging invasions" took place. According to this statement, the invaded have now become the invaders. Only the Russians have had the reputation of distorting and rewriting history. It appears someone in the administration has chosen to compete with them. And fourth, the statement is almost sublimely self-contradictory. Concern for the security of an empire mixes with freedom as oil with water.

FROM THE WEEK TO A COMMITTEE

The above facts, more than anything else, explain why a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is a patent necessity. During the observance of the 1961 Captive Nations Week the theme of creating such a committee was sounded over and over again. Throughout the country countless Americans recognized the urgent need for such a committee to serve not only Congress and the represented American citizenry but, also—quite necessarily—our executive branch of the National Government. The July 24 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD gives an impressive account of the activities, festivities and expressed thoughts of groups and individuals who observed Captive Nations Week.

In addition to this theme there were, of course, other ideas furthered by observers of the week. These included a firm stand without any compromise on West Berlin, a determined opposition to the admission of Red China to the U.N., the establishment

of a Freedom Academy, the activation of the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act with reference to Cuba, the expansion and improvement of the "Voice of America" broadcasts to the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., and the restoration and extension of the "Champion of Liberty" stamp series. However, the theme which attracted most attention was the passage of House Resolution 211. The resolution was sponsored originally by the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania and calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The argumentation in favor of this and similar resolutions has been set forth in detail since March 8 when the original resolution was submitted. The addresses of Congressmen FLOOD, DERWINSKI, SCRANTON, HALPERN and some four dozen other legislators spell out all the compelling reasons why such a committee is a "must." The reader can profit immensely from reading the RECORD issues of March 8, March 27, May 10, June 20, 24, and August 3. No direct refutations have been given to the dozen and more reasons cited for the necessary formation of the committee. There is no question but that once the measure is reported out by the Rules Committee, it will pass overwhelmingly in the House.

Thus in this project alone one can see how the world, the President, and Captive Nations Week observances are tied together. Through its investigations, studies, hearings and reports a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would fix the the attention of world opinion on the only real threat to the nontotalitarian free world, namely Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. It would thereby put to account statements made by leaders in the free world, as, for example, President Sukarno's statement in June that it is nonsense to accuse Moscow and Peiping of carrying out imperialist policies. Furthermore, the work of such a committee would give the constant lie to the so-called 20-year plan launched by Moscow, particularly by its disclosures of the rampant colonialism and imperialism within the Soviet Union.

In serving our Government and the American people this committee would be the prime vehicle of public information and enlightenment concerning all of the captive nations. It would be performing an indispensable job that no agency, public or private, is doing. And the salutary results of the committee's work and findings would help to prevent the incurrence of grandiose statements on the Soviet Union, and on the captive nations within and outside it, at any high level of our Government. Twisted conceptions about the enemy and his victims are not exactly solid grounds for meeting the tasks of a war of survival.

Finally, the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would represent the first concrete implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution. It would also be the fitting response of Congress to the 1961 Captive Nations Week, to the urgings of millions of Americans who see in it a powerful means to ultimately defeat Moscow in the cold war.

ON ACCEPTANCE OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON FOREIGN AID BILL

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of accepting the conference report on S. 983, the foreign aid



authorizations bill, because I believe that it will achieve substantially all of the objectives which I, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which considered and reported the legislation, sought.

During my entire service in Congress, I have supported the successive Foreign Aid programs. I am in favor of long-range planning with annual appropriation and review by the Congress, not only in this instance but in all Government activities where it will promote economy and efficiency. In the bill as agreed upon between the House and Senate conferees, this is achieved in an effective manner.

Although the bill does not provide the authority for borrowing from the Treasury which the President once said was essential to the success of his program, he has stated that the bill in the form in which it is now before us is "wholly satisfactory." Certainly, it will provide him with full authority to carry out in the most effective manner the international development projects in which our Government is to assist, and which in the 5 years ahead will be so important a part of our foreign relations.

The bill authorizes the appropriation for international development in this fiscal year of \$1.2 billion, and \$1.5 billion for each of the next 4 fiscal years, which funds shall remain available until expended, thus providing full opportunity for such commitments as the administration deems prudent in long-range planning. It should be noted that any unappropriated portion of the amount authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated in any subsequent fiscal year in addition to the amount otherwise authorized, so that if Congress should appropriate in any 1 year less than the amount authorized, the authorization would be cumulative in the succeeding years.

The authority of the President to enter into agreements committing funds authorized in this bill is clearly stated, and it is to be subject only to the annual appropriation of the funds authorized. The President very properly is required to notify the Senate and the House of all agreements entered into under the authority of this act, and the amounts of funds involved.

Thus, under this bill, the people of the United States are entering into an investment in good neighborliness which between now and fiscal 1967 will involve grants and loans which will aggregate more than \$11.9 billion. We hope and expect to get back the portions which are in the form of loans. If the program is well administered, the return on the investment in the form of good will and mutual security should be many times the outlay.

#### PRESIDENT ENDORSES TEMPORARY CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDERS FOR THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 President John F. Kennedy sent a letter to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, strongly endorsing pending legislation introduced by Hon. TOM STEED, myself, and a number of our colleagues, to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders against unfair practices while cases concerned with permanent relief are pending before the agency. I should like here to introduce the President's letter into the RECORD.

AUGUST 28, 1961.

HON. OREN HARRIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: I want to express my strong support for pending legislation to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders against the continuance of unfair practices while cases concerned with permanent relief from such practices are pending before that agency. I understand measures to accomplish that purpose are now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: H.R. 1233 and H.R. 1817, introduced by Congressmen STEED and PATMAN.

Effective law enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission has long been hampered by delays in litigation and an increasing backlog of cases. Despite a concerted effort to decrease these delays through recent revision of the Commission's organization and procedures, the basic difficulty requires additional remedies. At present, the Commission is powerless to halt allegedly illegal practices until the termination of frequently protracted proceedings. As a consequence, small businessmen who are so often the target of discriminatory and monopolistic activities are often irreparably injured or destroyed long before the lengthy process of adjudication has been completed. The proposed legislation will provide means to prevent such injury during that interim period. It will thus provide important protection for the small business community and, indeed, all those who are confronted by violations of the laws which seek to sustain our competitive economy. Such orders should, of course, be subject to the protection of appropriate due process, including the safeguards of judicial review.

The White House Committee on Small Business which I established in April and which includes representatives of the major Government agencies, has studied the proposed legislation and recommended its approval.

I have concluded that such legislation will provide essential protection for small businessmen and thus strengthen competition throughout the Nation's economy. I am hopeful that congressional action on behalf of the objectives of this legislation will be both expeditious and favorable.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

As the President so clearly sees, long delays in litigation and the increasing backlog of cases have seriously hampered the Commission in its efforts to achieve effective law enforcement.

As the President states:

Small businessmen who are so often the target of discriminatory and monopolistic activities are often irreparably injured or destroyed long before the lengthy process of adjudication has been completed.

The President also states that this legislation "will provide essential protection for small businessmen and thus

strengthen competition throughout the Nation's economy."

IMMEDIATE PASSAGE A MUST

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill at this session of Congress is an absolute must if we are to halt the destruction of small business in this country.

This bill has strong bipartisan support. Similar bills have been introduced by Mr. EVINS, Mr. ROOSEVELT, and Mr. MULTER, all members of the Small Business Committee. Similar bills have been introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] and a number of other Members of the House. As the President states, the White House Committee on Small Business, including representatives of the major Government agencies, have studied the proposed legislation and recommended its approval.

This bill will correct the inordinate delay which has characterized procedures during the past several years before the Federal Trade Commission. It will give to the Federal Trade Commission power to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders, certainly a modest addition to the Commission's powers, since the Congress long, long ago gave the Commission the power to issue permanent injunctions against objectionable practices.

BILL WILL REDUCE BACKLOG AND DELAYS

The crux of the matter is that this bill will cut through the legal entanglements that have hamstrung the Commission in achieving effective relief for small businessmen being pressed to the wall by predatory practices and all manner of unfair competition. With this power, the Commission can step in before the damage is done—before the legal experts employed by big business defendants can start spinning their legal web.

In my testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of this legislation, I cited a report which the Federal Trade Commission made to me on March 21, 1961, showing how serious this problem has become with that agency. I placed that statement in the RECORD on March 22 at pages 4338-4339. That report showed the large number of cases of vital interest to small business which have been pending, without decision, at the FTC for periods ranging from 6 to 10 years.

Although the Commission has endeavored to expedite proceedings within the framework of its statutory powers, it has never been able to provide small business complainants with the immediate relief which is necessary to stop the practices which are destroying them while the litigation is pending. The Commission also has been powerless to forestall consummation of objectionable mergers threatening to destroy competition.

LONG DELAY IN PILLSBURY CASE

Let me give a brief chronology of the notorious delay involved in the famous Pillsbury merger case.

On June 12, 1951, more than 10 years ago, Pillsbury Co. acquired Ballard & Ballard Co. On March 7, 1952, Pillsbury acquired the Duff Baking Mix Division of American Home Foods, Inc. The Federal Trade Commission issued a complaint against these acquisitions in July

*Captive nations*

1961.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16495

munity might meet the needs of the mentally ill.

I have long had an interest in the problems of the mentally ill, Mr. Speaker. As a State senator in New York I sponsored the law establishing the New York Mental Health Commission and the one authorizing the current \$350 million mental hospital expansion program. I am a director of the Queens County Mental Health Society. These years of study in the field have forcibly demonstrated to me the great need for a national, coordinated attack on the problem.

In the words of one of the experienced experts in the field, Dr. Paul Sivadon, "Mental diseases are the most curable and the most hopeless of all illnesses. The most curable because, if detected early, modern treatment will effect a cure."

Herein lies the basis for an understanding of the need for a nationwide program. Intensive treatment of patients requires more of everything—research, personnel, facilities, and understanding. But it means earlier return of the mentally ill to normal, productive lives with a consequent real dollar saving to the taxpayer.

Progress has been substantial. But much, much, more has to be done. Mental illness is still a danger to society, but mainly to its pocketbook. Frugal authorities have come to understand that curing patients is the cheapest way of having none. Healthier citizens are a national asset of immeasurable value.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to consider fully the incalculable benefits in terms of human and material resources which can flow from a national conference which will provide the focal point for an assault on the illness which levies the heaviest toll on our country.

**U.S. GOVERNMENT POLICY AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in numerous previous addresses I have stated the reasons and arguments justifying the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Many Members have urged on a bipartisan basis that immediate action be taken by the Rules Committee on this vital proposal. Recently, however, a new development emerged, involving the attitude of the State Department toward such a committee. Because this development has unnecessarily clouded the situation somewhat I should like to read the following communication I sent to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee. The contents of this letter should be sufficient to clarify the situation surrounding the resolutions calling for a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I feel certain that my distinguished colleagues will profit from them, and I also hope that these points will serve to overcome what ap-

pears to be a delaying action on these resolutions. The contents of this communication go a long way, I believe, to dissipate false notions and rumors that a special committee would run counter to U.S. Government policy.

The aforementioned letter to Chairman SMITH follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1961.

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH,  
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Two weeks ago I was informed that the Rules Committee requested the appearance of a State Department representative to discuss the desirability of establishing a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. In order to be given the possible opportunity of rebutting the representative I asked Mr. Carruthers to notify me and others sponsoring the resolutions of the time of this appearance. Now I am given to understand that no such appearance will take place and that, instead, the Department has expressed in general and unexplained terms a negative position on the proposal, along with an insinuation that the White House supports this position.

It appears to me, as I am sure it does to you, that this kind of response to your request is grossly unsatisfactory. A mere expression of attitude in vague terms and without justifying reasons is scarcely a foundation for serious consideration of this very important and most essential proposal. Worse still is the misleading implication that the creation of this committee would run counter to State Department policy. I am advised that this is the impression conveyed.

Aside from the considerations of the appropriate weight to be given to an executive opinion in a matter that is exclusively legislative and also of the curious unwillingness of the Department to send someone in person before your committee so that the opportunity for incisive questioning may be available to you, I should like simply to dispel the impression that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations would not be in accord with the policy of our Government. In fact, in the light of all the documented evidence furnished in my addresses on this subject since last March 8, I am astonished to learn that this is the inference drawn from a patently inconsistent position expressed by some group in the Department. Anyone clinging to this inference simply has not familiarized himself with the facts.

The facts are as follows:

(1) In my address on August 10, 1961 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 14314-22) I offered 15 solid reasons justifying the necessary formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations, reasons ranging from the principle of national self-determination to legislative intent. My colleagues and I still have to hear convincing counterarguments to any of these detailed reasons. But I emphasize that my first reason is the guiding principle of national self-determination;

(2) As to the policy of our Government, it is interesting to note that on April 23, 1961 the Department of State, in a reply to Khrushchev's stand on Cuba, declared the following: "The people of the United States believe that the right of self-determination is fundamental and should apply throughout the world. We reject the right of any narrow political grouping or any country to arrogate to itself the power to determine the real will of the people." A careful reading of the resolutions would readily show that a special committee would be in full and complete accord with this policy position and also in its fact-finding and scientific

investigations would continuously mirror the "real will of the people" of the two dozen captive nations;

(3) Again as to the policy of our Government, only last month in his July 17 Captive Nations Week Proclamation, President Kennedy stressed that "it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in the freedom of other nations" and "I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom." What better way can we manifest this interest and recommit ourselves, especially in the present crisis, than by way of this people's committee to study continuously, persistently, methodically and objectively the plight of all the captive nations;

(4) Once more on policy, in his state of the Union message the President declared: "We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples." Again, what better way is open to the Chamber of the American people's will, this House of Representatives, to give living and consistent expression to these hopes than by way of the proposed special committee;

(5) The statements of the President always impinge on policy and on April 20, 1961 before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, he said: "It is clearer than ever that we face a relentless struggle in every corner of the globe that goes far beyond the clash of armies or even nuclear armaments. We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it." Indeed, we dare not. And from what better source can our people learn all this than from the captive nations to which a special committee will be especially devoted;

(6) Recognizing the basic continuity of the policy of our Government, we should also observe that President Eisenhower on two occasions called upon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations" and the then Under Secretary Douglas Dillon expressed the same viewpoint for the Department of State in an address I used for documentary proof (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961, pp. 4295-4297); and

(7) Not to needlessly extend this further, let us recall the statement of President Kennedy which seeks to implement the policy directions given above: "The captive nations should be studied intensively. If a Joint Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations is the best way to insure such popular study, I would naturally not be opposed to it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961, p. 3292). Not to incur other known difficulties, many Members and I feel strongly that the best way is the creation of the Special Committee of the House on Captive Nations, one to which I feel sure the President would naturally not be opposed.

In the light of all this and more one cannot but be amazed by the position taken by the State Department. Since a special committee by its concentrated study of the captive nations would work in behalf of our people and our executive organs, one cannot but wonder who in the State Department determined this position and, actually, for what concrete reasons and with what motivation. I seriously doubt that the leadership of our Government shares this unjustified position. The facts overwhelmingly point in the other direction.

Within our own legislative precincts let us be guided by these facts. Let us also be guided by the fact that approximately 40 resolutions have been submitted by our Members in favor of a special committee. And let us be guided by the popular support

for this proposal. In almost every legislative week since March sample letters of this support have been printed in the RECORD. I have no doubt whatsoever that the House would overwhelmingly vote for this proposal.

With the Berlin crisis staring us in the face it is time now to report out favorably this proposal for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Our Members and I seek your immediate action on this. It is now almost 4 months since the first hearing was held on this vital proposal.

In gratitude for your studied consideration of this and your favorable action, I am

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
Member of Congress.

GROWING POPULAR INTEREST IN STUDY OF  
CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. Speaker, as has been my habit throughout these discussions, I should like to offer additional evidence of growing popular interest in the study of the captive nations. Many Members will find much of this evidence of the greatest interest. It is drawn not only from domestic sources but also from foreign areas. And some of it, as, for example, the two recent scientific Ukrainian defections to the free world, would be of enormous value to the studies of a Special Committee on Captive Nations from its chief viewpoint of Moscow's imperialism and colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union.

I therefore request, Mr. Speaker, that the following items be printed at this point in the RECORD:

First. The observance of Captive Nations Week in the Free Republic of China;

Second. The observance of the week in Bremerton, Wash.

Third. An excellent analysis of two UNESCO publications by Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Marquette University, dealing with cultural colonialism in the U.S.S.R.;

Fourth. The resolutions and letter of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations pertaining to the captive nations; and

Fifth. The New York Times editorial and report on the two defections, along with the account in the Telegram of Toronto, Canada:

[From the China Post, July 48, 1961]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MARKED HERE—DECLARATION OF FREEDOM RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

Since the end of World War II, over 800 million people of the world have been shut behind the Iron Curtain. To strive for their freedom and survival, an overwhelming majority of them have been carrying on their fight against Communist tyranny. In fact, the heavier the oppression, the more violent is their resistance. The demonstrations by workers in East Germany in 1953, the uprising by the Polish people in 1956, the Hungarian revolution in October of the same year, the anti-Communist revolution by the Tibetan people in 1959, and the anti-Communist movements by the people under Communist domination in various parts of the Chinese mainland in the past years are examples in point.

As an expression of their sympathetic support to the captive nations and their peoples in the struggle for national independence and freedom, the American Government and people have designated the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, which

was passed by both the House of Representatives and Senate, and formally proclaimed by former President Eisenhower on July 17, 1959. As from that year, the people in all parts of the United States hold various kinds of ceremonies and activities within that week each year. And the commemoration of this week will continue to be observed as long as the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain have not regained their freedom.

RIGHTEOUS MOVE

This great and righteous move on the part of the U.S. Government and people deserves high respect of the countries and peoples of the whole free world. Particularly at the time when contradictions within the ranks of the Communist Parties have been deepening, peoples behind the Iron Curtain have been fighting relentlessly against the tyrannical Communist rule, famine on the Chinese mainland has been aggravating to most alarming proportions and struggle against communism has been gaining in vigor and effectiveness, this righteous move by the American Government and people not only is an indication of its deep sympathy to the unhappy lot of the peoples of the captive nations and of its opposition against communism, but also gives great encouragement to the enslaved peoples in their will and determination to strive for freedom.

However, we have to point out that the Communist bloc, to divert the attention of the enslaved peoples in their fight against Communist tyrannical rule, and to achieve its end of world domination, has been playing on the fear of war on the part of the free world. Thus, it harps on the slogan of peaceful coexistence with a view to dividing the free nations on the one hand and launches an overall offensive against the free world in the form of threats, deceit, inducements, infiltration, subversion, and even armed aggression on the other. In the face of this formidable antagonist, it is a great pity that there are still certain countries in the democratic camp, either for selfish reasons or out of a sense of self-complacency, adopt a policy of appeasement in the vain hope of existing peacefully side by side with the Communist bloc. While holding a mass rally in support of the enslaved countries and peoples to strive for their freedom here at Taipei today, we feel compelled to call upon the United States and other democratic countries and their peoples to maintain their high degree of vigilance toward this adverse undercurrent in the world and to save on time the danger with which the free world is confronted.

SUGGESTIONS OFFERED

On behalf of the people from all walks of life of the Republic of China, we wish to offer the following suggestions:

1. It is our belief that solidarity of the free world is the only way open in the cold war in which it is engaged against the Communist bloc. For this reason, we urge all democratic countries to step up their anti-Communist cooperation, to stand pat on their policy to defend Berlin, to maintain independence, freedom and unification of Laos and the Congo, and to give support to the freedom fighters of Cuba in their struggle for national recovery, so as not to let the Communists seize a single inch of free territory.

2. It is our conviction that any attempt to appease or compromise with the Communists will not only give encouragement to the aggressor but also dampen the ardor of the enslaved peoples in their will and determination to strive for freedom. For this reason, we are strongly opposed to the admission of the puppet regime of Outer Mongolia into the United Nations. We hope also that the United States will stop her talks with it for the establishment of diplomatic relations right away.

3. We believe that the only effective way in coping with Communist infiltration and subversive activities is to broaden the scope of the freedom movement in support of the enslaved peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain in their struggle for freedom and to step up the support to them and to encourage them to rise in revolt against their Communist oppressors. Only thus will the tyrannical Communist regimes be overthrown from behind the Iron Curtain, and in unison with the anti-Communist forces outside of it, thoroughly tear down the Iron Curtain.

Finally, we, the people from various walks of life of the Republic of China, wish to convey to the American Government and people our sincere support to the Captive Nations Week and hope that the freedom-loving peoples of the United States and the world will dedicate themselves to the common struggle for the regaining of freedom for over 800 million peoples in Europe and Asia at any early date.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLES OF THE  
CAPTIVE NATIONS

DEAR FRIENDS: Hitlerite nazism was uprooted as the result of World War II. It has been replaced by Communist imperialism, far more totalitarian and oppressive. Its first victims were the countries in east and central Europe. Their national independence has been surrendered under Communist iron heels and the freedom of their peoples has been deprived of. Later, its aggressive tentacles extended from the Chinese mainland to North Korea and North Vietnam in Asia. Now almost 1 billion peoples have been enslaved and persecuted, leading a life even more miserable than that of beasts of burden. Particularly on the Chinese mainland, Communist tyranny has brought about a catastrophic famine. The Communists, instead of giving relief to the afflicting masses, have cut down their rations and left them to eat grass roots and wild plants for subsistence. No one knows how many people have died of sickness and hunger. Indeed, tyrannical rule such as this has been never heard of in the annals of mankind.

To pursue freedom and to resist slavery are the inalienable rights of mankind. Historical facts have shown once and again that no country and people can be permanently enslaved. Nor can any tyrannical rule last. Caesar and Hitler, powerful as they were, were all overthrown under the impact of the human desire for freedom and national independence. Such being the case, can Soviet imperialism negate this law of historical development and be free from the doom of final collapse?

To show their sympathetic support to the captive nations in their struggle for independence and their people for freedom, the American Government and people have, since 1959, started a "Captive Nations Week" movement. It goes without saying that it will go a long way in enhancing immeasurably your confidence in the fight for freedom and against slavery. To unite the just force of all freedom-loving peoples in the United States and the whole world, the people of the Republic of China, as from this year, give their wholehearted endorsement to this movement with a view to giving their support to the struggle for freedom by the enslaved peoples under Communist domination. We shall exert our utmost to push forward this movement, so as to give you practical and effective help and to unite all anti-Communist forces on both sides of the Iron Curtain for tearing down the Iron Curtains in Asia and Europe and to reestablish your national independence and freedom.

Dear friends, darkness will leave you very soon; and light is ahead of you. Let us hope that you will unite yourselves and step up

1961

your struggle in your common effort to search for light and strive for freedom.

## CABLE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: In warm response to the Captive Nations Week which has been initiated by your country, we are holding a rally at Taipei today as an expression of our deep sympathy to those captive nations and their peoples. On behalf of people of all walks of life of the Republic of China, we wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to convey to you our respect for the righteous act on the part of your Government which has given great encouragement to the enslaved peoples in their struggle for freedom.

At the time when over 800 million peoples shut behind the Iron Curtains in Europe and Asia are engaged in their life-and-death struggle for freedom and survival, we hope that you will take firmer stand and provide stronger leadership to the whole free world by pushing forward in every possible way the freedom movement and giving effective support to the peoples groaning under the yoke of Communist tyranny in their fight for freedom and exert your influence to stop talks with the puppet regime of Outer Mongolia for the establishment of diplomatic relations with it, the thought of admitting the Peiping regime into the United Nations, preposterous "two Chinas" concept and any attempt to exist peacefully with the Communist bloc born of a sense of complacency and in utter disregard to the principle of international justice, so as to realize your hope that the cause of freedom will spread all over the areas behind the Iron Curtain from Peiping to Warsaw and from Budapest to Havana. Indeed, nothing can possibly give the enslaved peoples greater encouragement. And only thus can the tyrannical communism be uprooted and the peoples under its domination regain their freedom again.

With highest regards,

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman, Committee of Civic Organization of Republic of China in Support of Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain.

## WEEKLONG PROGRAM IN RESPONSE TO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

## SUNDAY, JULY 16

Mr. Tsiang Chang-lin, an anti-Communist escapee recently fleeing to Taiwan for freedom, meets the press to give a report on real conditions on the Chinese mainland. Special broadcasts to people at home and abroad as well as areas behind the Iron Curtain by all local broadcasting stations.

## Youth forum.

Catholics in Taipei holding Mass for the people of the captive nations.

Prayers by all Christian churches.

Slide show of slogans in various cinemas for 1 week beginning from July 16 and observance of 1 minute of silence in memory of victims under Communist enslavement and persecution.

Postmarks bearing slogans on all mails for 1 week beginning July 16.

Publishing bulletins by various public service centers throughout Taiwan.

## MONDAY, JULY 17

Rally at the Armed Forces Officers' Club in Taipei at 10 a.m.

Activities on Kinmen.

Special broadcasts.

Catholics in Hsingchu holding Mass.

## TUESDAY, JULY 18

Forum held by Chinese women at Ru Mo Hall at 3 p.m. in Taipei.

Activities on Matsuo.

Catholics in Taichung holding Mass.

Special broadcasts.

## WEDNESDAY, JULY 19

Forum sponsored by labor unions at the auditorium of the Highway Bureau, at 9 a.m.

Activities in Taichung.

Special broadcasts.

Catholics in Chiayi holding Mass.

Buddhist temples saying prayers for those who died under Communist slavery and persecution.

## THURSDAY, JULY 20

Forum sponsored by intellectuals.

Rally held in Tainan.

Catholics in Tainan holding Mass.

Special broadcasts.

## FRIDAY, JULY 21

Forum sponsored by the commercial and industrial circle in Taiwan, at Taipei City Hall at 4 p.m.

Special broadcasts.

Rally held in Kaohsiung.

Mosques conducting religious services.

Catholics in Kaohsiung holding Mass.

## SATURDAY, JULY 22

Rally held in Keelung.

Catholics in Haulien holding Mass.

Special broadcasts.

Evening party at Taipei Park.

Forum held by anti-Communist ex-POW's of the Korean war.

## KU PREDICTS COLLAPSE OF RED TYRANNY IN RALLY TO MARK CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the Committee of Civic Organizations of the Republic of China in Support of the Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain, yesterday predicted that Communist tyranny which enslaves people will finally be washed away by the surging tide of struggle by the enslaved peoples for freedom.

Presiding over a freedom rally held at 10 o'clock yesterday morning at the Armed Forces Officers' Club, Ku said that the Russian people have been enslaved under the iron heels of communism since 1917. "Following the close of World War II, 14 countries in Europe and Asia became victims of Communist aggression. Some of them have lost their national independence, while others have been left divided," he pointed out.

"The number of people shut behind the Iron Curtain including the Russians totals around 1 billion," Ku declared.

However, Ku said, these peoples are strongly against Communist tyranny. "During all these years," he pointed out, "anti-Communist movements have followed in rapid succession one after another." The strikes by workers in East Germany in 1953, the riots by the Polish people in 1956, the anti-Communist uprising by the Hungarians in 1956, the revolution by the Tibetan people in 1959, and anti-Communist movements both in the slave camps of the Soviet Union and on the Chinese mainland are just some examples in point, he added.

## STRIVE FOR FREEDOM

"These facts show on the one hand that communism is deeply detested by all the peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain and on the other that the peoples under the Communist domination are putting up positive fight to strive for their freedom," Ku declared.

Archbishop Paul Yupin spoke after Ku. He said that the free world is supporting the efforts made by the captive nations to regain freedom out of humanitarian and religious considerations.

Richard M. McCarthy, Director of the U.S. Information Service, declared at the meeting that Communist tyranny on the Chinese mainland is aimed at destroying the ancient tradition of respect for the in-

dividual, the strength of family ties and any independence of thought or expression.

## FAILURE OF COMMUNES

"It has also imposed upon the Chinese people the inhuman regimentation of the 'people's communes.' From the communes the Communists expected to harvest more grain and extract more work out of the mainland," the USIS Director said.

McCarthy said that these efforts made by the Chinese Communists are in vain. "Instead," he added, "they have reaped only hardship, misery, and famine."

"If we are going to preserve freedom for ourselves and others," McCarthy pointed out, "we must remember, we must not only maintain our strength but increase it."

Chiang Chang-lin, exofficial of the Communist Ministry of Geology, also delivered a speech concerning conditions on the Chinese mainland. He said that the people on the Chinese mainland are living under the worst tyranny. "They have not enough to eat and are being forced to work as long as possible," he declared.

The 28-year-old native of Antung Province also told of how he fled the Communist-controlled mainland for freedom. He crossed the Yunnan-Thailand border to flee for freedom a couple of months ago. He arrived here on July 1.

## ANTI-RED UPRISING

Yeh Hsiang-chih, Director of the Intelligence Bureau of the Ministry of National Defense, also gave a lecture at the meeting. He declared that the people on the Chinese mainland are rising against the puppet regime in Peiping.

The MND Intelligence Chief said that the Republic of China must cooperate closely with other free nations in helping the people shut behind the Iron Curtain to regain freedom.

"Above all," Yeh said, "we must do everything within our power to help our compatriots on the mainland to regain their freedom. He added that only through coordinated efforts by people on both sides of the Iron Curtain can Communist tyranny be crushed and mankind saved from calamity.

## PROGRAM FOR THE RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM, SPONSORED BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Beginning of the program.

Chairman assuming chairmanship.

Audience standing up.

Band playing.

National anthem.

Salute national flag and the portrait of national founder, the late Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

One minute of silence in memory of victims under Communist enslavement and persecution.

Report by Mr. Ku Cheng-kang, Chairman of the Committee of Civic Organizations of Republic of China in Support of Struggle for Freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

Read messages from the president of the Republic of China.

Speeches by: Archbishop Paul Yupin; Mr. Richard M. McCarthy, director of USIS, Taipei office; Mr. Tsiang Chang-lin, an anti-Communist escapee recently fleeing to Taiwan for freedom.

Special lecture: Mr. Yeh Hsiang-tze, an expert on Chinese Communist affairs.

Adoption of declaration and statement of the rally.

Shouting slogans.

Band playing.

End of the program.

**MESSAGE BY PRESIDENT CHIANG TO THE MASS RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLES OF CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM**

Since the end of World War II, the Soviet imperialists have become more audacious than ever in their persistent scheme to communize the whole world. By either direct or indirect aggression, they have carried out external expansion and pushed hundreds of millions of people in Europe and Asia behind the Iron Curtain. The enslavement and massacre of large numbers of people is a tragedy unprecedented in human history. The Government and people of the United States, in order to express their sympathy with and support to the enslaved peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence, have since 1959 set aside a "Captive Nations Week" each year. This annual event has steadily gained in momentum and grown in impact. Being the voice of righteousness, it has won the praise of all freedom-loving peoples of the world, and given unparalleled encouragement to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain and their resistance to Communist tyranny stiffened.

The fate of Chinese people suffering under the Peiping regime on the mainland is even worse than that of the enslaved peoples in other Iron Curtain countries. It follows that their hostility to communism is the strongest and their yearning for deliverance, the most urgent. Since the autumn of 1960, the Chinese mainland has been visited by a series of natural disasters rendered ever graver by Communist tyranny and maladministration. As a result, discontent has become widespread, and there have been innumerable cases of mass pillagings of granaries and mass killings of Communist cadres. The anti-Communist movement is spreading in scope as well as in seriousness. This proves that no matter how strict is the Communist control, and how cruel are Communist measures of repression, they cannot destroy the determination and the will of our enslaved compatriots to fight for existence and freedom. Once the opportunity ripens, they will surely throw off the shackles on them and free themselves of the present oppression.

Today, as people in the Republic of China gather here in observance of the U.S.-initiated Captive Nations Week, all of us Chinese should further strengthen the unity among ourselves in order to be able to carry out our sacred duty of national recovery. We should also unite with all free and democratic nations and peoples in the world and take positive actions to render effective support to peoples enslaved on the Chinese mainland and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain. Above all, I hope all our compatriots on the mainland will continue to fight against Communist tyranny with an undaunted spirit, and seize every opportunity to deal the enemy a mortal blow. Only through coordinated efforts by peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain can Communist tyranny be crushed and mankind be saved from calamity. May this be a signal for greater dedication on the part of all of us.

**DECLARATION OF THE FREEDOM RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM**

Since the end of World War II, over 800 million people of the world have been shut behind the Iron Curtain. To strive for their freedom and survival, an overwhelming majority of them have been carrying on their fight against Communist tyranny. In fact, the heavier the oppression, the more violent is their resistance. The demonstrations by workers in East Germany in 1953, the uprising by the Polish people in 1956, the Hungarian revolution in October of the same year, the anti-Communist revolution by the Tibetan people in 1959, and the anti-

Communist movements by the people under Communist domination in various parts of the Chinese mainland in the past years are examples in point.

As an expression of their sympathetic support to the captive nations and their peoples in the struggle for national independence and freedom, the American Government and people have designated the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, which was passed by both the House of Representatives and Senate and formally proclaimed by former President Eisenhower on July 17, 1959. As from that year, the people in all parts of the United States hold various kinds of ceremonies and activities within that week each year. And the commemoration of this week will continue to be observed as long as the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain have not regained their freedom.

This great and righteous move on the part of the U.S. Government and people deserves high respect of the countries and peoples of the whole free world. Particularly at the time when contradictions within the ranks of the Communist Parties have been deepening, peoples behind the Iron Curtain have been fighting relentlessly against the tyrannical Communist rule, famine on the Chinese mainland has been aggravating to most alarming proportions, and struggle against communism has been gaining in vigor and effectiveness, this righteous move by the American Government and people not only is an indication of its deep sympathy to the unhappy lot of the peoples of the captive nations and of its opposition against communism but also gives great encouragement to the enslaved peoples in their will and determination to strive for freedom.

However, we have to point out that the Communist bloc, to divert the attention of the enslaved peoples in their fight against Communist tyrannical rule and to achieve its end of world domination, has been playing on the fear of war on the part of the free world. Thus, it harps on the slogan of peaceful coexistence with a view to dividing the free nations on the one hand and launches an overall offensive against the free world in the form of threats, deceit, inducements, infiltration, subversion, and even armed aggression on the other. In the face of this formidable antagonist, it is a great pity that there are still certain countries in the democratic camp, either for selfish reasons or out of a sense of self-complacency, adopt a policy of appeasement in the vain hope of existing peacefully side by side with the Communist bloc. While holding a mass rally in support of the enslaved countries and peoples to strive for their freedom here at Taipei today, we feel compelled to call upon the United States and other democratic countries and their peoples to maintain their high degree of vigilance toward this adverse undercurrent in the world and to save on time the danger with which the free world is confronted.

On behalf of the people from all walks of life of the Republic of China, we wish to offer the following suggestions:

1. It is our belief that solidarity of the free world is the only way open in the cold war in which it is engaged against the Communist bloc. For this reason, we urge all democratic countries to step up their anti-Communist cooperation, to stand pat on their policy to defend Berlin, to maintain independence, freedom, and unification of Laos and the Congo, and to give support to the freedom fighters of Cuba in their struggle for national recovery, so as not to let the Communists seize a single inch of free territory.

2. It is our conviction that any attempt to appease or compromise with the Communists will not only give encouragement to the aggressor but also dampen the ardor of the enslaved peoples in their will and determination to strive for freedom. For this

reason, we are strongly opposed to the admission of the puppet regime of Outer Mongolia into the United Nations. We hope also that the United States will stop her talks with it for the establishment of diplomatic relations right away.

3. We believe that the only effective way in coping with Communist infiltration and subversive activities is to broaden the scope of the freedom movement in support of the enslaved peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain in their struggle for freedom and to step up the support to them and to encourage them to rise in revolt against their Communist oppressors. Only thus will the tyrannical Communist regimes be overthrown from behind the Iron Curtain, and in unison with the anti-Communist forces outside of it, thoroughly tear down the Iron Curtain.

Finally, we, the people from various walks of life of the Republic of China, wish to convey to the American Government and people our sincere support to the Captive Nations Week and hope that the freedom-loving peoples of the United States and the world will dedicate themselves to the common struggle for the regaining of freedom for over 800 million peoples in Europe and Asia at an early date.

**CABLE TO MR. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: In warm response to the Captive Nations Week which has been initiated by your country, we are holding a rally at Taipei today as an expression of our deep sympathy to those captive nations and their peoples. On behalf of people of all walks of life of the Republic of China, we wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to convey to you our respect for the righteous act on the part of your Government which has given great encouragement to enslaved peoples in their struggle for freedom.

At the time when over 800 million peoples shut behind the Iron Curtains in Europe and Asia are engaged in their life-and-death struggle for freedom and survival, we hope that you will take firmer stand and provide stronger leadership to the whole free world by pushing forward in every possible way the freedom movement and giving effective support to the peoples groaning under the yoke of Communist tyranny in their fight for freedom and exert your influence to stop talks with the puppet regime of Outer Mongolia for the establishment of diplomatic relations with it, the thought of admitting the Peiping regime into the United Nations, preposterous two Chinas concept and any attempt to exist peacefully with the Communist bloc born of a sense of complacency and in utter disregard to the principle of international justice, so as to realize your hope that the cause of freedom will spread all over the areas behind the Iron Curtain from Peiping to Warsaw and from Budapest to Havana. Indeed, nothing can possibly give the enslaved peoples greater encouragement. And only thus can the tyrannical communism be uprooted and the peoples under its domination regain their freedom again.

With highest regards.

**KU CHENG-KANG,**  
*Chairman, Committee of Civic Organizations of Republic of China in Support of Struggle for Freedom Behind the Iron Curtain.*

**SPEECH BY MR. KU CHENG-KANG, PRESIDENT OF THE CHINA CHAPTER, APAFL AT THE FREEDOM RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS IN THEIR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM**

Today is the third anniversary of the Captive Nations Week which was announced by Mr. Eisenhower, the former President of the United States, in accordance with a joint resolution by the American Congress.



The purpose for this movement is to give support to all enslaved peoples in their struggle for freedom and national independence. That the people of the Republic of China give their warm response to this movement is motivated by a desire to unite all freedom-loving peoples in the United States and other parts of the world in their common support to the captive nations and their peoples, so as to tear down the Iron Curtains in Asia and Europe with their concerted efforts and to bring into consummation the mission of this movement.

Russia fell prey to tyrannical Communist rule in 1917. Since then, the Russian people has been enslaved under the iron heels of communism. Following the end of World War II, 14 countries in Europe and Asia became victims of Communist aggression. Some of them have lost their national independence, while others have been left divided. The number of people shut behind the Iron Curtain including the Russians totals around 1,000 millions.

However, these peoples are strongly against Communist tyranny. During all these years, anti-Communist movements have followed in rapid succession one after another. The strikes by workers in East Germany in 1953, the riots by the Polish people in 1956, the anti-Communist revolution by the Hungarians in 1956, the anti-Communist uprising by the Tibetan people in 1959 and anti-Communist movements both in the slave camps of the Soviet Union and on the Chinese mainland are just some examples in point. These facts show on the one hand that communism is deeply detested by all the peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain, and on the other, that the peoples under the Communist domination are putting up positive fight to strive for their freedom. We are confident that Communist tyranny which enslaves people will finally be washed away by the surging tide of struggle by the enslaved peoples for freedom.

In the fight against the Communist bloc, the great weakness on the part of the free nations is lack of a firm stand, of a spirit of unity, and of a basic policy to tear down the Iron Curtain. Thus, it provides an opportunity to the Communists to divide them and to practice their tactics of infiltration and subversion and brings about a tense world situation with the world security and human freedom seriously threatened. At the time when we are exerting our utmost to extend our support to the enslaved peoples in their struggle for freedom, we wish to call upon all nations of the free world, especially the United States upon whom devolves the responsibility to provide leadership to the whole free world, to make a review of their anti-Communist policy and to lay down a positive and firm policy in the fight against communism so as to meet the requirements of the current world situation and to strive for the victory in the struggle against aggression and for freedom.

First of all, we wish to point out that the free world should give up its policy of appeasement. The Munich Conference sacrificed Czechoslovakia and resulted in the outbreak of World War II. At the Yalta Conference, the interests and rights of China were sacrificed and, finally, it led to the fall of the Chinese mainland. Largely because of this appeasement policy on the part of the free world is it possible for the Communist bloc to expand its influence today. It is our belief that a firm stand is the basic condition and the most effective measure to fight against communism. For this reason, let us hope that anything which may affect the morale of peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain and may give encouragement to the growth of Communist influence should be stopped right away.

Secondly, we wish to point out that the free world should not entertain any illusion toward neutralism. As a matter of fact, neutralism is a Communist tactic for the implementation of the so-called peaceful co-existence. The Communists use peaceful co-existence to create the illusion of neutralism, making those politicians having no independent will and no ability to protect themselves to believe that neutralism is the only way for their own security. The end result is that neutralism has become a Communist trap for them. Right now, the Communist bloc is trying to create a neutralist bloc beside the two existing world opposing camps—democratic and Communist. In fact, this is a means to divide and paralyze the free world and is a sinister plot on the part of the Communists to change the balance of the world today. Particularly at the present moment when the influence of the two world opposing blocs has almost come to a point of equilibrium, the danger of neutralism is especially great. For this reason, we have to call upon the free world to heighten its vigilance.

Finally, we wish also to point out that the free world should adopt a policy of liberation. The policy that is being followed by the free world under the leadership of the United States is a policy of containment, retaliation and deterrence. This policy achieved much success in the past, because it arrested the Communist bloc to launch armed aggression against their weak neighbors. But now the Communist bloc has adopted a strategy of indirect aggression by infiltrating and subverting various areas and democratic countries of the world in political, economic, and cultural fields. This new strategy has helped the Communist influence grow. This fact proves that the policy of containment is not able to contain Communist expansionism any longer. For this reason, we hold that the free world should adopt the policy of liberation as the basic anti-Communist policy. This is to say, the free world should help the growth of free force in Europe and Asia so as to arrest the Communist expansionism on the one hand, and give support to the growth of free force behind the Iron Curtain so as to rock the foundation of Communist rule behind the Iron Curtain on the other. Only by linking up the anti-Communist forces on both sides of the Iron Curtain can Communist aggression be effectively checkmated. Only thus can Communist rule be overthrown and the captive nations regain their independence and the enslaved peoples recover their freedom.

We are confident that, to tear down the Iron Curtain, it calls for the concerted efforts of the free world as well as those of the enslaved peoples. President Chiang Kai-shek has long ago initiated support to the anti-Communist revolutionary movement behind the Iron Curtain, so as to realize the policy of liberation. All people of the Republic of China, in response to this great call, have started the Freedom Day movement in their positive support to the peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain in the struggle for freedom. APACL, in all its annual conferences, passed resolutions to give support to the anti-Communist movement behind the Iron Curtain and to give positive support to it. Today, we give our hearty response to the Captive Nations Week movement. It signifies the union of the anti-Communist forces behind the Iron Curtains both in Europe and Asia. It also means solidarity of the anti-Communist forces both in the East and in the West in their common struggle for the same cause. At the same time, it is an indication that the freedom movement of the world is gaining in momentum. In actuality, growth of the force in support to the enslaved peoples in their struggle for

freedom is the only forcible guarantee to maintain world peace and freedom of mankind. The people of the Republic of China are willing to strive jointly with the peoples of the United States and the world for the realization of this common objective—to regain the freedom of the enslaved peoples.

**BREMERTON CAPTIVE  
NATIONS COUNCIL,  
Bremerton, Wash.**

REPORT: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 16  
THROUGH JULY 22, 1961

Proclamations: Hon. Albert D. Rosellini, Governor, State of Washington; Hon. H. O. Domstad; mayor, city of Bremerton, Wash. Letters in support of Captive Nations Week:

House of Representatives: Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON; Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY; Hon. CATHERINE MAY.

U.S. Senate: Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON; Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

Kitsap County Republican Central Committee, Robert J. Bryan, chairman; Assembly of European Captive Nations, Vaclavas Sidzikauskas, chairman.

KBRO, spot radio announcements through-out Captive Nations Week.

Bremerton Captive Nations Council letters to 37 Kitsap County churches urging special captive nations services. Response continues through newly formed study groups.

Window displays: Bremerton Chamber of Commerce. Full color captive nations maps (four, poster size). Public Law 86-90. Eisenhower's proclamation. City of Bremerton proclamation. Bremerton Captive Nations Council resolution.

First Federal Savings & Loan Association: Special report (14 parts) of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, House Report 2694. City of Bremerton proclamation. Bremerton Captive Nations Council resolution. Full color captive nations maps.

East German photo poster. Shevchenko poster, hand-lettered in Ukrainian and English.

Hard-bound books: "Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover. "The Naked Communist," Skousen.

Booklets: "Ukrainian Quarterly," "Handbook for Summit," "The New Colonialism," "Facts on Communism," vols. I and II; "Hungary Under Soviet Rule."

Information center and window display: medical-dental building, street floor. Open daily 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. (8 p.m. Friday and Saturday).

Partial list of items displayed: "Crimes of Khrushchev" (7 parts); "Soviet Union, Prison House of Nations and Races"; all proclamations, letters, and resolutions; "Soviet World Outlook"; "North Korea—A Study of Communist Takeover"; poster showing Hungarian revolt, pictures from Life magazine, 1956; photoposter of "Lest We Forget." HUAC.

Distribution of 8,200 Government documents and miscellaneous publications relating to Communist totalitarianism at the information center.

Other: Letter to Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD in support of H.R. 211 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 22, 1961).

Bremerton Captive Nations Council resolution and letter printed in central Washington paper.

Assisted large numbers of summer school students in making reports at the request of their instructor.

We express our sincere appreciation to: Assembly of European Captive Nations, National Captive Nations Committee, American Friends of the Captive Nations, Hungarian Committee, American Council of Christian Laymen, and our elected representatives for



their contributions which made the first observance of the Captive Nations Week in the city of Bremerton a memorable occasion.

JAMES K. MORGAN,  
Chairman.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
Olympia, July 12, 1961.

A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR

The Congress of the United States, by public law approved in July of 1959, designated the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week.

All the captive peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, including the Russian and Chinese people themselves, have for long years been enslaved by Communist tyranny. The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, and North Vietnam. The captive peoples of these nations have never ceased to strive for freedom and look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence.

This week has been set aside to keep fresh in the minds of all people the fact that the free world has not forgotten these nations and that they must some day become independent, and that the people of our State share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington, do hereby urge the people of this State to join with the citizens of other States in the observance of Captive Nations Week and further urge the people to remember our promises to the people of the submerged nations and to show that we have not forgotten our silent allies.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,  
Governor.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 16-22, 1961

Many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism. The peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties.

The citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent.

It is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence.

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America by Senate Joint Resolution 111, and House Joint Resolutions 454 and 459, authorize and request the President of the United States to designate the third week of July as Captive Nations Week;

Now, therefore, I, H. O. Domstad, mayor of the city of Bremerton, Wash., do hereby invite our citizens concerned with the freedom and security of our Nation to observe the week of July 16-22, 1961, as Captive Nations Week, and urge you to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit yourselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations. Freedom will be secured only when all men everywhere are free, and peace can be preserved only by people who are prepared to make sacrifices for it.

BREMERTON CAPTIVE  
NATIONS COUNCIL,  
Bremerton, Wash.

Whereas many of the free people of the United States of America have ancestral roots in Europe and Asia;

Whereas the major portion of these ancestral lands have now been annexed by force into the totalitarian Russian Empire;

Whereas this annexation was perpetrated by a small minority of reactionaries and terrorists;

Whereas this colonial system has been maintained by political genocide and suppression of non-Russians through fear;

Whereas this inhuman process has tended to destroy ethnic languages, values, heritages and societies; and

Whereas this rule by force cannot be conscientiously recognized as the legitimate representative government of these peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the membership of the Bremerton Captive Nations Council assembled, That all evidence supports the proposition that the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic is the one great colonial power still existing today, that world opinion should be continually focused on the criminal deeds of the Russian imperialists, and that the formerly free people caught in this web of international exploitation should be given a chance to regain that lost freedom.

Throughout the country thousands of civic, fraternal, veterans' and other patriotic organizations, and countless American citizens, are preparing to observe the 1961 Captive Nations Week which this year falls on July 16-22.

The Bremerton Captive Nations Council invites the citizens of the Bremerton area to visit their window displays at the Bremerton Chamber of Commerce, First Federal Savings & Loan, and in the Medical-Dental Building. Proclamations by Gov. Albert D. Rosellini and Hon. H. O. Domstad, mayor of the city of Bremerton, as well as statements from Senators HENRY M. JACKSON, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, and Representatives THOR C. TOLLESON, THOMAS M. PELLY, and CATHERINE MAY, an original copy of the joint resolution by Congress designating the Captive Nations Week observance under Public Law 86-90, and President Eisenhower's original proclamation, inclusive, are on display at the Medical-Dental Building location.

Churches throughout the area have initiated the local observance through announcements and special services in accordance with President Kennedy's proclamation.

DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS IN TWO UNESCO  
PUBLICATIONS  
(By Roman Smal-Stocki, Ph. D., Marquette University)

I

This article is the response to a duty which the writer feels, as an American scholar, to evaluate two important publications of the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The basis of this evaluation is Public Law 565, adopted by the 79th U.S. Congress, which authorized this country's acceptance of membership in this organization. The law states that this organization was established in order " \* \* \* to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations throughout education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations."

The first publication to be considered is "The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education" in the "Monographs on Fundamental Education series," second printing, Paris, UNESCO, February 1958.

The work includes an introduction followed by "A Continental Survey of Vernacular Languages and Their Use in Education" (ch. I).

The meaning of a vernacular language, according to the definition given on page 46, chapter II, of the report of the UNESCO meeting of specialists held in 1951 in Paris, is "A language which is the mother tongue of a group which is socially or politically dominated by another group speaking a different language. We do not consider the language of a minority in one country as a vernacular if it is an official language in another country."

There is an interesting editorial footnote to the definition:

"UNESCO recognizes that, while this definition holds in the generality of cases, for it to be universally applied and comply with the conditions governing individual particular cases, variations in emphasis and wording would be necessary."

It is important also to take the other definitions of terms into consideration:

"Mother or native tongue: The language which a person acquires in early years and which normally becomes his natural instrument of thought and communication.

"National language: A language used in the business of government—legislative, executive, and judicial.

"Pidgin: A language which has arisen as the result of contact between peoples of different language, usually formed from a mixing of the languages."

It is clear from the definitions of these terms that the political qualifications of the nations speaking the pertinent languages are involved. Thus for a language to qualify as "vernacular" it must be spoken by a nationality which is in fact not a nation which constitutes its own independent political, social, and cultural entity; it means that this language is not used as the official language in the business of government—legislative, executive, or judicial. In short, the qualifications of language as "vernacular" is the official recognition by UNESCO of the colonial status of a nation.

Discussed in chapter I, which is interesting and detailed, are the following topics: Africa with its 369 languages; the imperialist language policies of the English, the French, and the Belgians toward the vernacular languages of the natives; the American continents with their hundreds of indigenous languages. Other areas considered are Asia and the Pacific with their problems of India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Philippines, Turkey, Iran, Nepal, China, Japan, the Arab-speaking world, Israel, and finally, "Europe Including the U.S.S.R." The information about the U.S.S.R. and the Slavic world which appears on pages 41-43 of the UNESCO publication leans heavily on E. Koutaissof's "Literacy and the Place of Russian in the Non-Slavic Republics of the U.S.S.R.":

"Europe is a crossroads of languages and cultures \* \* \* the number of ways of speaking in the whole of Europe and the Soviet Union is, therefore, enormous. Of the main languages mentioned, only 26 (including as one unit Czech and Slovak, and the Serbo-Croat and Slovene) are official languages; the rest are vernaculars. Some of these vernaculars are dialects of main languages as Alsatian, spoken in France, which is a dialect of German, as Letzenburger of Luxembourg and Frisian of Holland and Germany. Macedo-Rumanian, spoken in Greece, is a variant of Rumanian; Walloon of Bel-

gium may be taken as a French dialect; Judeo-Spanish is a variant of Castilian; the language of the Faroe Islands is very close to Icelandic; Galician of Spain is similar to Portuguese; Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian.

"Main languages which are real vernaculars in Europe, not including the Soviet Union, though some of them are also spoken in the Union, are: Armenian, spoken in Bulgaria, Turkey, and the U.S.S.R.; Basque, spoken in Spain and France; Lapp, spoken in Finland, Norway, Sweden, and the U.S.S.R.; Catalan, spoken in Spain, France, and in Italian Sardinia; Lusatian-Serb or Wend, spoken in Germany; Maltese, spoken in Malta (under British administration); Manx, spoken in the Isle of Man; Provençal, spoken in France; Welsh, spoken in the United Kingdom; Gaelic, spoken in the United Kingdom; Lithuanian, spoken in Poland, Germany, and the U.S.S.R.; Karaitic, spoken in Poland; Romany or Gypsy, spoken in varied forms almost everywhere.

"In the Soviet Union about 100 different main languages are spoken; these include 6 Slavic (Great Russian, Polish); 11 Finnish; 43 Caucasian (Georgian is the most important); 27 Turco-Tatar; 4 Mongol; 4 Iranian-Manchurian (Turco-Tatar, Mongol, and Manchurian are classed as Altaic by some authorities), and some Paleoasiatic and Samoyedic minor languages. "Soviet educational policy," an authority writes, "has aimed at providing education in the vernacular; languages that had no written form have been endowed with scientifically devised alphabets and grammars, a work of great magnitude which is still proceeding, for obviously the earlier grammars were at first approximations. These languages, whose alphabets were difficult and ill-adapted, were made to replace them by simpler Latin and later by the Russian script, which made the art of reading and writing more accessible to the masses. In time, the need for a unifying language led to the introduction of compulsory Russian and the concomitant use of the Russian alphabet for most vernaculars. With the extension of compulsory attendance from 4 to 7 or 8 years, and the provision of boarding schools for pupils from outlying villages, the standards for proficiency in Russian are likely to improve. This will help solve the problem of more advanced education among minor linguistic groups.

"So far there have been no attempts at devising a simplified form of pidgin-Russian. The aim seems to be a bilingual population proud of its own national achievements, yet enjoying access to the wider world through Russian.

"In this connection it should be borne in mind that even great Russian writers have not scorned the work of translating from other languages, the modern Soviet writers consider it part of their vocation. As a consequence, usually good translations of both major European works and popular native songs and epics are available in Russian. A Chukchi may read the *Manas* and a Karelian the works of Rustavelli in Russian. This is admittedly not the best way of knowing the poetry of other nations but it broadens the range of reading of the multilingual population of the U.S.S.R. and enables small linguistic groups to participate in the intellectual life of a much larger community."<sup>1</sup>

II

On this presentation of the language problems of the U.S.S.R. and its sphere of influence we offer the following remarks:

<sup>1</sup> E. Koutalissof, "Literacy and the Place of Russian in the Non-Slavic Republics of the U.S.S.R." Regional paper on vernacular languages, No. 21, Paris, 1951, M.S.

(1) The information about the Soviet Union is, in comparison with the abundance of data on the other countries, superficial and misleading. Responsible along with UNESCO for this are the United States delegate to UNESCO, Dr. M. Swadesh, of Columbia University, and the U.S. Department of State. The U.S.S.R. joined UNESCO in 1954 and therefore shares responsibility for the second printing of this work.

(2) From the linguistic point of view it is inadmissible to mix state units with existing languages and to treat "as one unit" Czech and Slovak, because the linguistic fact is that in existence are two separate units, Czech and Slovak. It is also inadmissible to establish as one unit Serbo-Croat and Slovene because, again, there exist at least two units, Serbo-Croat and Slovene. (In our opinion it is better to operate with three units because of the developed differences between Croat and Serb. In fact, however, in Yugoslavia there is yet a fourth unit, Macedonian, which was completely disregarded in the UNESCO publication.)

(3) Only the 26 main languages in Europe and U.S.S.R. are declared as "official languages"; the rest are "vernaculars." "Some of these vernaculars are dialects of main languages," or "variants." Here, among mention of Alsatian, Letzenburger, Frisian, Walloon, etc., is also to be found: "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian."

The inclusion of "Ruthenian and White Russian" in this paragraph discussing the dialects or variants of main languages and the statement, "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian," induce the false idea in the reader that "Ruthenian and White Russian" are in the same linguistic relation to Great Russian as the enumerated "dialects or variants to their main languages." This is contrary to linguistic fact and is simply Russian imperialist propaganda.

(4) We object to the term "Ruthenian." This medieval term is justified for the proper era and area (as "Bohemian," "Hungarian," etc.), but for scholarly publications of our time the correct contemporary usage is called for; i.e., Czech, Magyar, etc., as are also to be found in the UNESCO publication. Consequently, the term "Ruthenian" here is misleading and inaccurate; Ukrainian should be used instead. This term is known to the editors, for we find in Appendix I, page 142, under the "Tentative Classification of the Languages Spoken in the World Today," "Ruthenian (or Ukrainian), (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania)."

(5) We object also to the confusing term "White Russian," which customarily is used as a political term antithetically to "Red Russian."

(6) The languages of these two Slavic nations legitimately merit in UNESCO publications the application of proper scientific terminology because their states, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Socialist Republic, are charter members of the United Nations. Consequently, for these languages only the terms "Ukrainian" and "Byelorussian" should be used in the official publications of the United Nations.

These two republics, it is to be recalled, have been members of UNESCO since May 12, 1954.

(7) The information about the territories where these languages are spoken is wholly nonsensical and contrary to fact: "Ruthenian (or Ukrainian), (Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania)." Equally nonsensical is it to insist, as is done on page 142, that "Russian" is spoken in "Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland."

The fact is that just as there exists a Bulgarian, Czech, and Slovak Polish, Serbo-Croat, and Slovene linguistic and ethnographic territory (see page 142), there also

exists Ukrainian and a Byelorussian linguistic and ethnographic territory in the mentioned republics of these nations. But to mention only "Ruthenian and White Russian minorities" and not to mention the proper Ukrainian and Byelorussian linguistic territories is confusing.

(8) The term "Russian," which is used without explanation, alternating with "Great Russian," is confusing in its linguistic use; therefore, we prefer the term "Muscovite," because the "Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic," which uses this term "Russian" in its political meaning, is a multinational and multilingual state encompassing the rest of the old czarist Russian empire, the national and linguistic nucleus of which is the Muscovite nation and its language.

(9) Taking into consideration the definition above of the term "vernacular," which states that "we do not consider the language of a minority in a country as a vernacular if it is an official language in another country," we object to the degradation in this UNESCO publication of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian languages to vernaculars because they are official languages in their own republics, which, as pointed out above, are charter members of the United Nations, and because, according to the constitutions of these republics not only their state laws, but according to the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., all federal laws must be upheld and published in the official languages of the two mentioned Slavic Union Republics. Article 40 of the union constitution orders:

"Laws passed by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. are published in the languages of the Union Republics over the signatures of the President and Secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R."

(10) A strange and unscientific argument was employed by the authors in order to degrade these two Slavic languages to "vernaculars": "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers can understand Great Russian." This point of "understanding" demands a scientific qualification "partly"; besides, it is not a one-way argument, but logically also applies in the other direction, to wit, "partly" Great Russian speakers understand Ruthenian and White Russian. But surely this does not degrade "Great Russian" to a vernacular of the official languages of the Ukrainian or Byelorussian Republics. In addition, the authors should know that the "Ruthenian and White Russian speakers" understand Polish far more easily. Do not the Slovaks and Czechs, on the one hand, and the Poles and Ukrainians, on the other, understand themselves partly mutually? And likewise the Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, and Macedonians?

This "understanding" argument betrays linguistic and historical dilettantism and even Russian imperialistic bias, none of which belongs in scholarly publications aspiring to scientific objectivity.

(11) The following excerpt is obscure: "Main languages which are real vernaculars in Europe, not including the Soviet Union, though some of them are also spoken in the Union, are: Armenian, spoken in Bulgaria, Turkey and the U.S.S.R. \* \* \* Lithuanian, spoken in Poland, Germany, and the U.S.S.R. \* \* \*" and together with Basque, Lapp, Catalan, Lusatian-Serb or Wend, Gaelic, etc., they are finally classed in the same group as "Roman or Gypsy, spoken in varied forms almost everywhere" (p. 42). Where is simple logic? The editors cited their definition of vernacular and expressly stated that "we do not consider the languages of a minority in one country as vernacular if it is an official language in another." But they do just that by classifying Armenian, the official language of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, as spoken in Bulgaria, Turkey, and even in the Soviet Union, to

which the Republic belongs, as a "real vernacular." The same treatment is accorded Lithuanian, the official language of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, as spoken in Poland, Germany, and even in the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup>

These three nations—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have a record of heroic resistance to the dictatorship of Russian communism, which by breaking all principles of justice and international law abolished in these countries all human rights and fundamental freedoms. Our Government does not recognize their occupation and integration into the Soviet Union; but just now, when these nations are fighting for their very existence, UNESCO erases Estonian and Latvian from the European family of existing national and official languages while Lithuanian is classified as a real vernacular on a level with the Gypsy language.

III

In the Soviet Union, the reader is informed, about 100 different main languages are spoken. These include six Slavic languages, but only two are given between parentheses (Great Russian, Polish). The languages of the two other Slavic republics of the Soviet Union were not regarded as important enough to cite, although Polish was included by some strange logic of the UNESCO linguists. Then follows the long quotation from the work by E. Koutaissof, an individual cited by UNESCO as an authority on Soviet educational policy. Mr. Koutaissof makes the following points on Soviet educational policy:

(a) that it has aimed at providing education in the vernacular;

(b) that languages which had no written form have been endowed with scientifically devised alphabets and grammars;

(c) that difficult and ill-adapted alphabets of languages were replaced by similar Latin and the latter by the Russian script which made the art of reading and writing more accessible to the masses;

(d) that the need for a unifying language led to the introduction of compulsory Russian and the concomitant use of the Russian alphabet for most vernaculars;

(e) that so far there have been no attempts at devising a simplified form of pidgin-Russian;

(f) that the aim of the Soviet policy seems to be a bilingual population proud of its own national achievements yet enjoying access to the wider world through Russian; and for that purpose even great Russian writers have translated major European works and popular native songs and epics into Russian.

On these points on "Soviet educational policy" which are accepted and publicized by UNESCO as objective truth, we should like to make the following comments:

(1) It is wholly untenable on the part of UNESCO to accept as gospel the Russian Communist point of view about the "place of Russian in the Non-Slavic Republics of the U.S.S.R." American scholars of the Soviet language and educational policy are not provided with an equal opportunity to present their point of view. But above all it is unobjective to disregard the opinions on these problems of the free scholars of those nationalities now in exile. UNESCO presents only one side of the coin—the Communist one. The reverse side is ignored. Is the free world yet to be a free market of ideas?

It is a fact established by an immense amount of material and authoritative statements of the Russian Communist Party itself

<sup>2</sup> "Gaelic, spoken in the United Kingdom," is also falsely degraded to a vernacular because it is the official language of the Irish Republic.

that philology, linguistics and education are subordinated to the dictatorship of the Communist Party for the realization of its program. Therefore, to publish such information on Soviet educational policy and its attitude toward the non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union without critical remarks and factual background information is a flagrant abuse of the UNESCO forum.

This disregard for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of these non-Russian nations is the more unfortunate in that it is displayed by a U.N. organization. Moreover, it appears in a publication whose expenses are paid for by the free world, especially the United States.

(2) As background information for the understanding of the Russian Communist policy regarding education and non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union, one must keep in mind its guiding principles and dialectical method of thinking and acting.

The aim, as formulated by Stalin at the 16th Congress of the All-Union Party (1930) regarding languages, is:

"The flourishing of national culture and languages during the period of the dictatorship in a single country is permitted, but with the purpose of preparing conditions for the dying out and amalgamation of these cultures and languages into a single culture and common language when socialism achieves victory in the whole world."<sup>3</sup>

The historic mission of Russian, as formulated by D. Zaslavsky, is:

"The Russian language has become the world language. \* \* \* The succession of languages runs through the ages. Latin was the language of the ancient world; French, of the feudal epoch; English, of capitalism; Russian is the world language of socialism. French is the fancy language of courtiers, and English is the jargon of traders. They were the tongues of ruling classes and of snobbish intellectuals. The English language corrupted people in foreign lands, Russian is the first language of internationalism. No one can call himself a scholar if he does not know Russian. Russians unquestionably occupy first place in the social sciences. All future progress in these sciences has been determined by the genius of Lenin and Stalin."

For the realization of these aims, the Russian Communist dictatorship used the so-called Soviet Linguistic Theory of N. Ya. Marr, who, after 1920, elaborated it on the basis "of the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism."<sup>4</sup> (The theory was revoked by Stalin himself in June 1950.)

The main principles of Marr's theory are: (a) all things in society—the political, judicial, philosophical, religious, and artistic—are superstructures resting on an economic basis; consequently, language also is a superstructure; (b) as everything in society has class characteristics, there do not exist national languages but only class languages; (c) the historical and economic process moves inevitably toward the establishment of the one and indivisible proletarian republic the world over, and Lenin postulated for this era the emerging of one Soviet nation, with one Soviet culture and one language. The task of Soviet linguistics is to realize

<sup>3</sup> We underscore the point that languages have no rights as such in the Soviet Union but only permission from the Russian Communist Party.

<sup>4</sup> Literaturnaya Gazeta, February 1949.

<sup>5</sup> See Roman Smal-Stocki, "The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union," pp. 79-92.

<sup>6</sup> See Roman Smal-Stocki, "Reasons for the Revocation of Marr's Linguistic Theory by Stalin, June 1951," Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, vol. I, Philological Section, New York-Paris, 1955, pp. 5-22.

the first phase of this process and to speed up through enforced use of Russian the unification process of languages in the Soviet Union, and (d) all Indo-European linguistics, with their conception of an Indo-European family of languages and its original protolanguage, is "bourgeois nonsense"; instead, all languages of the world developed from four original elements—sal, ber, yon, and rosh—from which all words of all languages stem.

Marr, convinced that there exists in the whole world a "single glottologic-language-forming process," classified languages according to stage theory in four groups based on the level of the economic development of the peoples. At the very top appear the Semitic and Indo-European languages. Next appear three groups of languages frozen at a given stage—economically, socially, linguistically—which represent obsolete language systems because their stagnation is final. To these groups belong also the Finno-Ugric, Turkic, and Mongolian languages. Into the most primitive group at the very bottom, Marr placed Chinese and the living Middle and Far African languages. (The main reason for Stalin's revocation of Marr's theory was the Communist conquest of China.)

Marr's Soviet linguistic theory underlaid the linguistic, nationality, and educational policy of the whole Stalin period up to 1950, and it clarifies the statement of Stalin at the 16th Congress in 1930, on the "flourishing of national culture and languages during the period of the dictatorship." But Stalin simultaneously advanced an important condition for this "flourishing," namely, in the non-Russian languages everything has to be of "Socialist content" and must be expressed only in "national language form." Its practical consequences soon became apparent: "Socialist content" could best be expressed by introducing only Russian words and phrases into the non-Russian languages, that is, by Russifying them.

At the same time the Russian classic language and literature, developed by the Russian nobility and bourgeoisie, were proclaimed by the Russian Communists as the "proud heritage of the Russian proletariat." Russian was proclaimed as "classless," "all-national," as the "language of the great Lenin and the Communist revolution" and of the "big brother." Therefore, this language has to be preserved in absolute purity as a holy language. The application of Marr's Theory after 1928 signified an enforced Russification of all non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union.

Russian communism thus established not only a Russian political and economic dictatorship, but a linguistic one as well. All non-Russian languages and nations lost the freedom to express their peculiarities in orthography, terminology, vocabulary, phraseology, and syntactical constructions. The aim of Soviet policy clearly was the creation of a "Soviet nation" with a Russian culture and language.

This aim has been partially realized by applying genocide, by liquidating leading linguists, writers, even Communist leaders of the non-Russian nations and nationalities, by a systematic Russification of the universities and the education of the non-Russian nations and by colonizing their territories with Russians and accusing all opponents of this Russian imperialism of "bourgeois nationalism."

The present Khrushchev era is characterized by the same dialectical thesis-antithesis. In slogans of "flourishing national cultures and languages" for the non-Russian nations and nationalities, on the one hand, and eternal friendship among the Soviet family of progressive peoples, on the other, we note a deepening Russification of the schools of the non-Russian nations. Soviet educa-

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16503

tional standards compel the teaching of Russian 15 hours weekly in non-Russian schools, whereas only 8½ hours are given over to native language instruction. This is in accord with established Soviet goals for the "synthesis" of all nations into one Russian Soviet nation, which will be the "vanguard of humanity" and give the world "Russian as the international language." This cultural world imperialism is pursued by all means, including the so-called "cultural exchanges."

This privileged and master position of the Russian language in the Soviet Union is established by the Russian Communist Party in direct violation of Article 13 of the Soviet Constitution:

"The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federal state, formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal Soviet Republics."

And also of article 123:

"Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, governmental, cultural, political, and other public activity, is an infeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, the establishment of any direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

The Soviet Constitution is thus mere window dressing.

For 40 years the non-Russian nations and nationalities have been resisting Russian cultural imperialism and its linguistic dictatorship. This fight is one of the facets of so-called national communism among the non-Russian Communists, who demanded for all languages in the Soviet Union equal rights with the Russian language. They demanded the right for the writers, poets, and scholars of all nations and nationalities of the U.S.S.R. to develop and to cultivate their languages in order to make language an instrument of perfect understanding among the individuals using it toward popular education in democracy and humanism. They demanded full liberty of languages as realized in Switzerland, the United States, Canada, or the British Commonwealth. The non-Russian linguists and philologists especially demanded the right of language self-determination for all non-Russian nations, including the right—without interference from Russian Communists—to establish the orthographic, grammatical, and terminological norms of the languages and to conduct free objective research in the field of linguistics and philology.

This background information is essential for the understanding of the language problems of the non-Russian nations and nationalities which are inseparably merged with the basic ideas and purposes of the United Nations Charter, namely " \* \* \* to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples—and to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Without this information the American reader in the free world would get a completely false idea from the UNESCO publication about the plight of the non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union; he would be prone to accept the baseless thesis as truth that the Russian dictatorship has left free at least one field, that of language and linguistics, for the non-Russian nations, nationalities, and peoples.

(3) Against this background of the non-Russian languages problem in the Soviet

Union, we now turn to an evaluation of the information about the Soviet Union, point for point:

With reference to point (a) : Soviet educational policy has not "aimed at providing education in the vernacular." First, the Soviet educational policy is aimed not at all at education, in the sense that we understand education, but at Russian Communist indoctrination with the final goal of propagandizing the world revolution. Second, it is wrong to classify the official languages of the non-Slavic Union Republics or even the languages of the autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics as vernaculars. Third, the Russian Communist Party is everywhere providing not education in the vernacular, but Russification of the vernaculars by making their natural development practically impossible.

On point (b) : It is true that some languages which had no written form have been endowed with alphabets and grammars, but it is also true that this was done to facilitate the Russification of these languages and peoples by imposing on them the Cyrillic script, used in Russian.

On point (c) : It is untrue that difficult and ill-adapted alphabets were replaced by simpler Latin and later by the Russian script in order to make the art of reading and that of writing accessible to the masses. The fact is that in order to separate the Moslem nations from the alphabets of their cultural Islamic heritage and to facilitate atheist propaganda and Russification, first the Russians used the slogan: "The Latin alphabet is the beginning of the revolution and of progress." This reform cut off the literate native masses from the art of reading and writing. Becoming aware that the Moslem nations of the Soviet Union acquired through this reform a common Latin script with Turkey and that by this script their opposition to Russification became stronger, the Russian Communist Party then ordered the Cyrillic script to be used in the languages of all the non-Russian nations (with the exception of the Georgian and Armenian) together with the Soviet Linguistic Theory of Marr. Even upon Rumanian in the Moldavian Soviet Republic was the Cyrillic script impressed, and the Rumanian nation was split.

It is unscientific in a UNESCO publication to use for the Cyrillic script the term "Russian"; moreover, it demonstrates the Russian Communist imperialist bias. This script in scientific literature is called Cyrillic after its supposed creator, the Slavic apostle of Christianity, St. Cyril. This script is used by the Bulgarians, Serbs, Macedonians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians, Cossacks, and Russians. To introduce the term "Russian script" in a UNESCO publication, a political term which is preferred by Russian communism and imperialistic pan-Russianism and atheism, is strikingly unfair to all the other Slavic nations and their languages.

On point (d) : It was not the need for a unifying language which led to the introduction of compulsory Russian and the concomitant use of the Russian alphabet for most vernaculars in the Soviet Union, but the interest of Russian cultural imperialism and Russian Communist world revolution, the first stage of which was and is the attempted Russification of the non-Russian languages in the U.S.S.R. and the creation of a Russian speaking "Soviet nation."

On point (e) : The statement that so far there have been no attempts at devising a simplified form of "pidgin-Russian" is only partly true. As a matter of fact, the Russian language is proclaimed as a kind of "holy language" of the Russian Communist secular faith, and the Russian Communists prefer full Russification of the non-Russians to simplified forms of pidgin-Russian.

But we must remark that the term

"pidgin" is not used here in the proper meaning of the definition. Pidgin is a language which has arisen as the result of contact between peoples of different language; it is usually formed from a mixing of the languages, and that presupposes a natural process, as in the rise of pidgin-English. But pidgin-Russian was created by Communist terror, compulsion, mass exiles, and by the artificial methods of Marr's linguistic theory. Therefore, among pidgin-languages it merits a special term: Russian terror-pidgin. (It was a special phenomenon in the concentration camps.) The Russian Communist Party became disinterested in the creation of pidgin-Russian because the Marr method stimulated anti-Russian nationalism among the non-Russian nations, and "national communism" rose among the non-Russian Communists. Also the enforcement of Russian in the captive countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia had the same results. The Russian language, despite its great literature, is presently hated among non-Russian nations as the language of Russian Communist dictatorship<sup>7</sup> and Pan-Russian chauvinism and Messianism.

On point (f) : The statement that "the aim of the Soviet policy seems to be a bilingual population proud of its own national achievements, yet enjoying access to the wider world through Russian" is simply contrary to fact and to the statements of Lenin, Stalin, and even present-day Communist leaders. Everything national in regard to the non-Russian nations is denounced as bourgeois nationalism and counterrevolution by today's Russian Communist imperialists. The classic authors of the literatures of the non-Russian nations (for instance: Shevchenko, Franko, and Lesya Ukrainka of Ukraine) are published in purged and falsified editions while the Russian classic authors remain untouched. Consequently, the non-Russian nationalities have no access to their own national achievements or any feats of heroism to take pride in. In any event, any display of their national pride constitutes bourgeois nationalism.

In the same way the ascribing to Russian writers of a sense of devotion to the non-Russian nations and nationalities which motivates them to supply translations so that all may participate in the intellectual life of the larger community is only partly true, and the examples are badly selected. A "Karelian," which means a "Finn," can read Rustavelli in Finnish, yet a Chukchi fears to read the heroic poem "Manas" since it was denounced as "nationalist Kirghiz" by the Russians and since the purging of many Kirghiz scholars by special "decree" because they were "proud of their national achievements."<sup>8</sup>

IV

Chapter II is dedicated to the report of the UNESCO meeting of specialists in 1951. This discussion completely ignored the language problems in the Soviet Union, their history and experiences since 1920.

To be sure, many of the suggestions and recommendations of this report are valuable, but these will never be seriously considered by the Russian Communist dictatorship. It is worthwhile for linguists to compare the

<sup>7</sup> See the experiences of an American speaking Russian in Poland in the article, "I'm Suspected," in "Talamanac Goes to Poland and Czechoslovakia." Talman Federal Savings and Loan Association. Chicago, Ill., p. 1. One Pole warned another: "This man says he is American but he speaks Russian. Be careful."

<sup>8</sup> See Roman Smal-Stocki, "The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union," pp. 290-293; "Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R.," No. 12, 1950.

suggestions and recommendations on "The Choice of Writing Systems" and "Questions of Vocabulary and Structure" with the real situation enforced on the non-Russian nations by the Russian Communists. The statement of Professor Sauvegeot on pages 72-74 is excellent, a point which especially must be applied to all non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union:

"If Finnish had not adapted itself through centuries to the successive needs with which it was confronted, the Finnish people would today speak only Swedish, and would thereby have lost all the treasures which they have inherited from their ancestors and which they have succeeded in handing down to the present generation. Many other examples of the same type could be quoted, showing that, for a people desirous of preserving their heritage, no price could be too high in an effort to adapt their language to the needs which circumstances impose upon them. Success in this is essential if we wish to preserve, for the future of mankind, that diversity of civilizations which enriches all, and modern linguistics vastly facilitates it."

Here is the great tragedy of present times—that the Russian Communist dictatorship attempts to do just the opposite. It attempts to impose on the non-Russian languages and nations the fate of the Karelian part of the Finnish language whose speaking population the Russians hope to completely Russify and absorb in the next decade, as they have already done with the Jews. Their Karelo-Finnish Union Republic already is abolished.

Chapter III includes some case histories. Only one of them has any connection with present-day Russian communism, namely, the Finno-Ugrian Experiment, reported by Professor Sauvegeot. We are happy to see that the Estonian language, missing in appendix I in the "Tentative Classification of the Languages Spoken in the World Today," appears here. But the article is purely historical, and the author does not mention what happened to the Karelo-Finnish language in the Soviet Union, or to Estonian and Magyar, after World War II under Russian communism. Also the Ingrians, an example of Soviet genocide, are in this connection not mentioned at all.

Only in one case did we find an important principle applied for the solution of language problems. On page 99 in a discussion on Bahasa Indonesia:

"This not democratic in the modern sense, and does not appeal to the generation which has coined the slogan, 'One country, one people, and one language.'"

Thus there is a double moral standard in the UNESCO publication, one, the democratic principle, for the countries of the free world and the languages of the colonial peoples liberated by the free world, another for the languages of the nations and nationalities which fell victim to Russian Soviet imperialism.

In summation, the information on the Soviet Union and its sphere of influence is unobjective and inaccurate. It creates a false impression about the language problems of the Soviet Union by silencing the attitude of the Russian Communist Party toward the non-Russian languages. Lastly, it was allowed to be written with pro-Soviet Russian imperialist bias.

The second publication to be discussed is: "Contributions a l'Histoire Russe—Studies on Russian History—Contribuciones a la Historia Rusa, Cahier d'Histoire Mondiale, Numero Special," 1958; Editions de la Baconniere, Neuchatel; published under the financial assistance of UNESCO.

It consists of a preface of A. A. Zvorikine, vice president of the commission internationale pour une histoire du developpement scientifique et cultural de l'humanite, and three chapters with articles dedicated to

(1) prehistory, (2) the Middle Ages and the 16th century, and (3) the period from the 18th to the 20th century, written by representative Soviet scholars of good standing in the Russian Communist Party.

The following matters cannot but provoke strong criticism in the free world:

(1) Terminology: In English, French, and Spanish the volume uses in the title the terms: Russian, Russe, and Rusa. Just what do these terms mean in this UNESCO publication?

From Zvorikine's preface (p. 13) the reader learns that Georgia, Uzbekistan, Eastern Siberia, North Caucasus, Ukraine, Crimea, Armenia, and Central Asia (p. 14) since the paleolithic and mesolithic ages are "Russian" and the histories of all the colonies of the old czarist Russian Empire from the dawn of man up to the present are "Russian history." Zvorikine does use objectively and systematically in his preface the terms "Soviet Union" or U.S.S.R., but in the title the Russian imperialistic bias comes to full expression, "Soviet Union" being equated with "Russia."

Is this terminology of the title objective and scientific or is it Russian imperialist propaganda?

Would UNESCO write in this fashion in the case of the countries and peoples of the former European colonies in Asia or Africa, including, for instance, India or Egypt since ancient ages in the history of Great Britain, or Morocco and Tunis in French history? Why must "Russian Lebensraum" be respected by UNESCO in such a way and why must it be propagated by such terminology throughout the free world?

The term "Russie-Russia" has a second meaning in chapter I in the article of I. U. Boudovnitz. Here it is used for the Kievan Rus-Ukraine in spite of the fact that even Soviet Academician A. D. Grekov, in his English works published in Moscow, insists for this state and era on the use of the term "Kiev Rus" ("The Culture of Kiev Rus," Moscow, 1947) as well as in his German translations on the term "Rus" ("Die Bauern in der Rus, Geschichte der Kultur der Alten Rus," Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1959).

The term "Russie-Russia" has a third meaning in chapter II, denoting Muscovia-Muscovy—which is also used in the present Soviet terminology in Russian.

To top off this terminological confusion the term "Russie-Russia" is used in the third chapter. Czar Peter I changed the name of the Muscovite Czarism to "Russian Empire"; from that time on this term for the state is fully justified. The ruling Muscovite nation and empire changed its nationality term gradually to "Russian" and now also terms as "Russian" its language, culture, and history. This term is an expression of the Russian imperialism and colonialism of the Russian Petrine empire. It has created constant confusion between "Russian" equalling citizenship or, better, "subjectship," and "Russian" equalling the language, culture, and history of the imperial Muscovites. Consequently, at the present time these two meanings should also always be terminologically separated in the interest of an objective presentation of East European history.

What is behind these terminological tricks of the Soviet "savants"? It is this. By the introduction of a common term "Russie-Russia" for all the periods of East European and partly even Asiatic history from the paleolithic up to the present Soviet Union, the Russian Communists attempt to create, in the free world, the impression of a "continuity of Russia" for the defense of the integrity and indivisibility of "Russia" behind which lurks the old Russian-Muscovite imperialism and colonialism.

In order to provide a firm basis for the evaluation of the present problem of the

term "Russia" being equated with the term "Soviet Union," we submit the scholarly opinion of a distinguished American geographer, Prof. Eugene Van Cleef, Ohio State University, who in his article "Russia or U.S.S.R.?" writes:

"It may be well enough for the 'man on the street' to use the term 'Russia' when he means the U.S.S.R., but when a geographer does so the sin seems unpardonable.

"Today, officially speaking, the U.S.S.R. consists of \* \* \* so-called Republics one of which is commonly named 'Russia' or technically, Russian Federated Socialist Republic. Presumably, the Government of the Soviet Union has a right to organize itself into such political units as pleases itself. Because it has decreed to employ as the name for one of its divisions, a name which once upon a time referred to the whole nation is no justifiable ground for continuing to use Russia in its wrong sense—certainly not among an intellectual folk.

"There are those who contend that 'Russia' is more convenient to say than 'U.S.S.R.,' much less the protracted expression 'Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.' And there are those who argue that inasmuch as the R.S.F.S.R. contains the seat of the National Government and is the largest in area and population of the Republics it is legitimate to say 'Russia' when we mean U.S.S.R. Again, we may hear it said, 'Everybody knows what we mean when we say Russia, so why bother with saying U.S.S.R.?'

"Of course, it is the privilege of any person to use any nomenclature which pleases his fancy, provided he announces in advance what his intentions are. If he declares, 'I am now going to discuss matters pertaining to the U.S.S.R., but I shall use the word Russia in its stead,' he is on safe ground.

"These contentions, justifications, whims, and other bases for deviating from the standard or the official nomenclature may satisfy millions of persons and, arguing 'common usage' to be the criterion for the accepted meaning of a word, these persons are sincere in their continued erroneous ways.

"Even if we were to grant as sound all these misuses by the masses, we as geographers can hardly tolerate an identical attitude among ourselves. Nor can we excuse our own error, when we commit it, on the ground of wishing not to give an impression of superior knowledge by being correct. If there be geographers who dissent, then we can only say they do a disservice to our science.

"After World War I, many nations sought to gain official recognition by other nations, of the native names of their cities. For example, Norway announced the abandonment of Christiania and its replacement by Oslo. Interestingly enough, the world promptly acceded to the request, and few if any of the younger generation are aware of the change. On the other hand Eire, or Ireland, asked that Dublin give way to Baile Atha Cliath. But although modern atlases show this name, hardly a person outside Eire uses that form—the probable reason is clear enough. The correct pronunciation of the native name is almost impossible by those unfamiliar with the Celtic language. Even so, this type of substitution for the correct name is of a different order from that of Russia for the U.S.S.R. The two forms are synonymous. They do not have different official meanings. A part is not substituted for the whole as in the case of Russia for the U.S.S.R.

"The U.S. Board of Geographic Names 'in editing materials for accuracy and consistency of geographic names \* \* \* permits the abbreviation "U.S.S.R." and the term

<sup>9</sup> The Journal of Geography, vol. 54, November 1955, pp. 413-415.



1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16505

"Soviet Union" for the present-day entity, but limits the use of "Russia" to references to pre-Soviet Russia.' Again, 'We recommend "Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic," or the abbreviations "RSFSR" for the largest of the Soviet republics.' So states the Executive Secretary of the Board. This recognition by the Board ought to serve as a sufficiently authoritative basis for anyone to employ the term 'Russia' correctly and without embarrassment. Certainly for the geographer there is no alternative; nor need he be apologetic for being correct."

(2) Scholarly objectivity: In order to evaluate the articles from the scholarly point of view one must consider facts of Soviet life under Communist dictatorship. Having sketched the plight of linguistics under Russian Communist dictatorship, we now present the situation of all liberal arts and sciences under the Soviet regime.

It is a matter of fact, unquestioned by the Communists themselves:

(a) that since the establishment of the Russian Communist dictatorship in Petrograd, its later expansion into the Soviet Union and, after World War II, over the new colonies, academic freedom has been abolished in all the captive nations. The inalienable rights of all scholars in the fields of liberal arts and sciences were destroyed with irreparable damage to these disciplines, to the culture of all the captive nations inside and outside of the Soviet Union, and to the whole of mankind.

(b) that all liberal arts and sciences in the Soviet Union and its sphere of domination are subordinated to the Marxist-Leninist dictatorship of the Russian Communist Party, which has converted them into tools of the Russian cultural imperialism. This is also especially true of the sciences, which have become one of the most efficacious tools of Communist world revolution.

(c) that the Soviet police state created a Soviet police liberal arts and sciences and also a Soviet police literature, according to Marxist-Leninist Party dogmas and the established directives of the Russian Communist Party. Thus in fact from the very top, from the Soviet Academy of Sciences and its system of academies over the universities and its institutions to the lower levels of education, all research and education is directed by the Communist Party according to Marxism-Leninism in a constant cold war inside and outside the Soviet Union against any freedom of thought. All liberal arts and sciences are subordinated to rigid conformism following the party line, and only the party can change, through new directives, the opinions of scholars and professors, who, having no tenure, are completely at the mercy of the party. Scholars cannot collaborate (in the meaning of the free world); one can only collaborate with the Russian Communist Party, which terrorizes them. Soviet scholars are merely the loudspeakers of the Russian Communist Party—not the representatives of free and objective research of the nations, nationalities, and peoples of the Soviet Union.

In the present era of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism since the end of World War I, the Communist Party continues the policy of the old czarist Russian Government, especially with regard to the liberal arts. The old White Russian czarism systematically persecuted all liberal arts of the non-Russian nations, especially history, philology, and linguistics. The far-reaching persecution of all free research was accompanied by the creation of pseudo-scientific imperialist conceptions in history, philology, and linguistics, imposed by the czarist government upon schools and teaching in the empire. The most important pseudo-scientific conceptions of Russian imperialism were:

(a) the official scheme of "Russian history," which negated the existence of separate Ukrainian and Byeloruthenian (Byelorussian) historical streams. The Kievan Rus-Ukraine and all its cultural achievements simply disappeared in the maw of "Russian" history.

(b) the conception of the so-called "Proto-Russian parent language" in Slavic philology, which gave Russian chauvinist politicians the terms "Russia and Russians" in order to deprive the Ukrainian and Byeloruthenian languages of their rank as independent Slavic languages and to degrade them to "dialects of Russian," unfit for use in public life or for instruction. Thus Russian was forced upon Ukraine and Byelorussia as the literary language (by ukase of the czar Ukrainian has been forbidden since the year 1876). These dogmas of "unity in history and language" of the Ukrainians and Byeloruthenians with the Russians became the cornerstone of Russian imperialist propaganda to preserve the "integrity and indivisibility of the Russian empire."<sup>19</sup>

After the expansion of the Russian Communist dictatorship by aggressive wars and subversion into the former colonial territories of czarist Russia, territories which made legitimate use of the right of self-determination and during the revolution proclaimed their independence (Idel-Ural Tartars, Ukraine, Kuban Cossacks, Byeloruthenia, Don Cossacks, North Caucasians, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Siberia, Turkestan—only Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania preserved their freedom) the Russian Communist dictatorship at the end of the NEP period (1928) reestablished the old czarist pseudoscientific conceptions as dogmas. In philology the conception of the "Proto-Russian unity of the Byeloruthenian, Russian, and Ukrainian languages" (amongst which Russian is not equal with the others, but rules as the "language of the older brother" and the "holy language" of the Communist revolution) was revived and Marr's "theory" was used, as discussed, for the forced Russification of all non-Russian languages in the Soviet Union. M. N. Pokrovsky's official Marxist history<sup>20</sup> condemning Russian imperialism and colonialism was banned. The old czarist official Russian scheme of history was reintroduced, and under the editorship of Mrs. A. M. Pankratova, the history of the Soviet Union and of all non-Russian nations was rewritten, according to the conception that Russian imperialism was the "lesser evil," "progressive," and "beneficial" to the economic, political, and cultural development of all non-Russian nations. A glorification of Ivan the Terrible and of Peter I is a peculiarity of the new Communist evaluation of Muscovite and Russian history, which also expanded the idea of the "integrity and indivisibility of Russia equal the Soviet Union" into the paleolithic age.

According to M. A. Zinoviev:<sup>21</sup> "History is a powerful weapon of Communist education and it must wholly serve the cause of the struggle for communism," and so the history of the Soviet Union for the last few decades is a history which is continuously being rewritten. This fact is proven by a large

<sup>19</sup> In 1906 some objective Russian academicians, among them the leading Russian linguists—F. E. Korsh, F. F. Fortunatov, A. A. Shachmaty—defended the independence and equality of the Ukrainian language in a "considered opinion" of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

<sup>20</sup> M. N. Pokrovsky, "Brief History of Russia," vol. I, II, Marxist Library, Works of Marxism-Leninism, New York, 1933, International Publishers.

<sup>21</sup> M. A. Zinoviev, "Soviet Methods of Teaching History," Washington, 1952.

literature (example, C. E. Black, "Rewriting Russian History," Frederick A. Praeger, 1956, New York). The history of Slavic philology and linguistics in the Soviet Union has also a large literature (see the writer's work, "The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union," Bruce Co., 1952, Milwaukee, Wis., pp. 93-259) and the work (in Ukrainian) of Panteleimon Kovaliv, "Principles of Formation of the Ukrainian Language in Comparison With Other Eastern Slavic Languages," Memoirs of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, vol. CLXVIII, New York, 1958). How the Russian Communist Party eliminated free creativeness and thought in the literatures of the nations under its dictatorship is well represented in the work of Avrahm Yarmolinsky, "Literature Under Communism," Russian and East European Institute, Indiana University, 1957, Bloomington, Ind.

To recapitulate, all the articles of the mentioned book published under UNESCO auspices reflect Russian Communist Party dogmas and directives. No credit attaches to UNESCO for its endorsement and financial support of this work of Communist propaganda. Briefly, in "Russian history" mention is made of all paleoanthropological finds on the territory of the U.S.S.R. and Siberia; the study of the Urartu civilization in the Caucasus of such great importance for Armenia and Georgia; the Rus-Ukrainian written monuments of the 11th century; an article minimizing the influence of the Mongols on the Muscovite civilization (in order to counteract the school of thought that Russia-Muscovy, in spite of her Byzantine Orthodox religion, belongs not to the Byzantine civilization but to the Turanian); the great cultural achievements of Armenia and Georgia before the Mongol invasion; the first printed books of all Slavic nations. Then all articles are restricted to the Russian-Muscovite aspect of the history: the political and social Russian literature of the 16th century (attempting to make the tyranny of Ivan the Terrible a European phenomenon of the Renaissance); the Russian-Muscovite inventors of the 18th and 19th centuries; the evolution of the Russian theater, 1800-1860; the development of Russian plastic arts in the 19th century; Russian music in the 19th century. Hence these articles tend to leave the reader with the impression that not one of the Russian-conquered colonial nations, nationalities, and peoples, who in previous chapters were included in this "Russian history," also had its own development in literature, the theater, the plastic arts, and music.

The book ends with an article on the Marxian philosophy of G. V. Plekhanov and with a eulogy for Lenin the philosopher, which reaches the level of a typical Communist agitka.

vi

In light of the above, we hold that both UNESCO publications are unobjective and are permeated with the dogma of the Russian Communist Party. An abuse of the objectives of UNESCO and a waste of the money of the American taxpayer, they comprise at the same time a direct aid in the present cold war of ideas to the Russian pseudoscientific infiltration in the free world.

Not to be overlooked is the effect on the American scholar, who, grounded in the idea of free scholarship from birth, labors under the delusion that in collaborating with a Soviet scholar he is advancing the objective search for truth. In actuality, he collaborates with the Russian Communist Party, the fountainhead of all the scientific opinions of its UNESCO delegates.

Hence such collaboration as in these UNESCO publications comprises a direct violation of the spirit of the UNESCO Constitution.

The attention of our Government is called to the fact that it would be illogical and



August 30

16506

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

without legal foundation to justify the content of these UNESCO publications by point 3 of article I of the UNESCO Constitution which says:

"With a view to preserving the independence, integrity, and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States members of this organization, the organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction."

We do not hereby propose any intervention in Soviet domestic affairs; but we do demand as an American scholar and citizen that UNESCO publications must comply with its constitution and that they be the expressions of an "unrestricted pursuit of objective truth" and of a "free exchange of ideas and knowledge," rather than a vehicle for Russian Communist propaganda.

The truth is that the Russian Communist dictatorship, as a signer of the U.N. Charter, has violated its pledges regarding the non-Russian languages, nations, and nationalities, even with respect to two U.N. members, Ukraine and Byelorussia, as are implicit in article 55:

"With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote: (c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

By collaborating with the Russian Communist dictatorship, as it has in these ill-conceived UNESCO publications, the United States is depriving the United Nations and herself as well of political and moral prestige among all the non-Russian victims of the Soviet Union. The publications comprise a blatant disregard and contempt of their human rights, their fundamental freedoms and their right to self-determination.

This collaboration manifests the double standard of morals of the United States which, on the one hand, condemns the Dominican and Cuban dictators, but on the other collaborates in UNESCO with the delegates of the Russian Communist Party, the most tyrannical regime history has ever known.

Finally, this collaboration with Soviet scholars is based on a naive belief in "peaceful coexistence" with and a "gradual liberalization" of Russian communism, a dangerous obsession of some State Department officials who did not even wait for the Soviet "Trojan Horse," but voluntarily opened wide the gates at UNESCO to it (at American expense), anticipating the "liberal Khrushchev era."<sup>13</sup> Zvorikine is properly appreciative of this (p. 13):

"Le consentement donne par la redaction des Cahiers a la publication de ce numero special temoigne que le principe de la collaboration amicable des savants de divers

<sup>13</sup> For the whole Soviet Union all scholarly activities are now regulated by the Resolutions of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party, which are enforced on all Academies of Sciences of all Union Republics of the non-Russian nations. In liberal arts the aims are: "increasing the struggle against bourgeois ideology, especially against bourgeois nationalism and revisionism \* \* \* an integral part of the propaganda of Marxist-Leninist ideas must be an aggressive criticism of the reactionary bourgeois ideology, especially contemporary revisionism, bourgeois nationalism and cosmopolitanism." To these directives are subordinated history, linguistics, philosophy, literature, law, social sciences, and ethnography. Cf. "Dopovidi Akademii Nauk U.S.S.R.," copy 6, 1960, p. 848-849.

pays se realise dans notre travail en commun."

(3) On behalf of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, an American learned association, we protest against these publications and request our Department of State:

(a) To influence UNESCO in the name of fair play to grant equal rights to American scholars whose opinions do not conform with Russian Communist Party lines in a similar "numero special" publication under the auspices of UNESCO and with its financial assistance.

(b) To insure that this UNESCO publication receives the same treatment in Soviet Union libraries as the mentioned UNESCO publication got in the free world. Only then will a basis have been established for a scholarly discussion and exchange of ideas.

(c) To insist that the American delegation to UNESCO be supplemented by American scholars—specialists in the field of liberal arts and sciences of the non-Russian nations, nationalities and peoples inside the Soviet Union and within the sphere of influence of Russian communism.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, SPONSORED BY THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS (AF-ABN), JULY 16, 1961, NEW YORK CITY

Whereas the President of the United States of America has proclaimed Captive Nations Week according to Public Law 86-90 in support of the liberation of all captive nations; and

Whereas the Communist menace has increased during the last year, especially in Cuba, Laos, and in Berlin; and

Whereas the free world, particularly the United States of America has become the last resort and bastion of hope of the captive nations; and

Whereas the Communists, pursuing their openly declared policy of world domination, have violated and usurped the then-free nations of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, China (mainland), Cosackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czechia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, and Ukraine and destroyed their respective Governments, individual rights, and freedom and carried out a policy of genocide, deportation, and widespread deployment (reshuffle) of native populations for the purpose of completely subjugating these nations; and

Whereas we and all God-fearing and peace-loving peoples, who demonstrated by their actions the respect for human rights and freedom as well as the integrity of all other nations, are firmly convinced that there cannot be real peace until and unless the wrongs which have been perpetrated by Communist Russia and Red China are righted by returning to all the captive nations and all the captive peoples their fundamental freedom and national independence; and

Whereas we are further convinced that any compromise with Communist Russia in any area of the world will lead to nothing less than the confirmation of the declared policy of Moscow aimed at world conquest, and will in fact encourage it to further aggression and territorial aggrandizement; and

Whereas in recent declarations by statesmen of the United States and other free countries there has been expressed the traditional faith in self-government and national independence of all the nations, thus making us confident that peace, justice, and liberty shall be restored as the inalienable rights of all the captive nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully request the President, the Government and the Congress of the United States of America:

1. To implement the Captive Nations Week resolution with appropriate and fitting actions;

2. To call for a full-scale United Nations investigation into Russian Communist aggression against all formerly independent non-Russian nations now held in bondage both within and outside the Soviet Union;

3. To ask the United Nations General Assembly to adopt a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all Soviet Russian troops and political police from the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe and Asia and for the return to their respective homelands of all peoples and their families who have been deported to Soviet slave camps, contrary to their will and in pursuance of Soviet Russia's policy of national genocide, and to allow them to resume their lives under a system of freedom and democratic governments, elected by free and unfettered peoples within their own national boundaries;

4. To provide material aid and support to the enslaved peoples who are struggling for their liberation from Communist tyranny;

5. To create an international military force to be composed of troops from all countries enslaved by Communist-imposed regimes to help uphold the principles of the United Nations Charter;

6. To refrain from an economic aid to countries now enslaved by Communist Russia, including Yugoslavia, thus weakening the Red regimes to the point where their enslaved peoples can successfully rebel and throw off their yoke of captivity;

7. To press relentlessly in the United Nations to bring Khrushchev and his murderous regime to trial for his crime of destroying the freedom of Hungary;

8. To regard the people of East Germany as much in captivity as the other Communist-enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain; any compromise on Berlin should be considered as the abandonment of the cause of freedom;

9. To move toward the recognition of free representatives of the captive peoples, rather than the tyrants who now misrepresent them;

10. To oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations; such an admission would be in violation of every principle upon which the United Nations was founded and for which it stands, and would in effect end the usefulness of the United Nations as an instrument of justice and peace;

11. To support the passage of the Flood resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent House Committee on Captive Nations, which is now before the House Rules Committee. Such a committee would provide authoritative and unbiased knowledge and information on the captive nations, which could be made available for the U.S. Government policymaking agencies; finally, be it

Resolved, That we express our sincere and lasting gratitude to the President, the Government and the Congress of the United States for their resolute and fearless encouragement rendered to all captive peoples in their struggle for liberation and national independence.

This resolution is hereby unanimously adopted the 16th day of July 1961, and attested to by the signatures of the president and secretary general of the executive council of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc.

IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,

Chairman.

CHARLES ANDREANSZKY,

Secretary General.

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16507

JULY 19, 1961.

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,  
President of the United States of America,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The executive council of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations takes the liberty of transmitting to you the resolutions which were unanimously adopted at a commemorative meeting observing the second anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, which was held on Sunday, July 16, 1961, in New York City.

We also want to express to you, Mr. President, our heartfelt gratitude for the great foresight and wisdom which you demonstrated by issuing a special Presidential proclamation of Captive Nations Week on July 14, 1961.

Your proclamation is a great and encouraging manifestation that the U.S. Government and the American people as a whole will never acknowledge the enslavement of the captive nations of Europe and Asia. We can assure you that the captive nations in Russian Communist slavery are relieved and encouraged by your step and will continue to fight against Communist despotism with redoubled determination and courage, knowing that the United States, the leader of the free world, is on their side and against Communist enslavement.

Respectfully yours,

IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,  
Chairman.

CHARLES ANDREANSZKY,  
Secretary General.

AMERICAN FRIENDS OF ABN OBSERVE CAPTIVE  
NATIONS WEEK

Marking the second anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution approved by the U.S. Congress in 1959 and signed as a law of the Nation by former President D. D. Eisenhower, in which the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. Executive Council of the American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations held a special observance, on Sunday, July 16, 1961, at the Hotel New Yorker, in New York City, at which Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz read the proclamation of Governor Rockefeller.

The ceremony, which was attended by a large audience of the representatives of captive nations and American guests, began at 7:30 p.m., with the addresses of Mr. Charles Andreanszky, secretary general of the AFABN, and Mr. Ignatius Billinsky, chairman, stressing the significance of Captive Nations Week and the possibilities of a practical implementation of the liberation policy, after which the resolutions, concerning the American foreign policy in regard to nations enslaved by Moscow, were adopted. It was decided to forward copies of these resolutions to President Kennedy and Members of U.S. Congress.

The culminating feature of the evening was an address by Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, of New York State, who also read the proclamation of Governor Rockefeller urging the observance of Captive Nations Week in the State of New York.

Among the other speakers on the program were Mr. Justin McCarthy, New York State chairman of the Captive Nations Committee, Mrs. Catherine Dorney, secretary of the American Educational Association and Dr. Albert Kalme, vice chairman of the AFABN.

The ceremonies commenced and were concluded with a moment of silence which symbolized the suppression of free speech

and individual liberties under communist tyranny.

Preceding the ceremonies a press conference was held with representatives of New York newspapers and press agencies attending.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1961]

DR. KLOCHKO'S DEFECTION

It was not uncommon in the 1920's or early 1930's for Soviet scientists to defect when given the opportunity by a trip outside the country. Many of such defectors then were people who had come to maturity under czarism and were unsympathetic to communism, while to be a Soviet scientist then was a source neither of prestige nor appreciable material reward.

All this has changed greatly in recent years, and Soviet scientists are today the relatively well-paid elite of that country. Not surprisingly, therefore, there have been few, if any, defections of Soviet scientists in recent years until Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko made his dramatic break in Ottawa last week. His story reveals that there are still powerful motives for even a relatively affluent Soviet scientist to be at odds with that system. Dr. Klochko denounces "the lack of human dignity in the U.S.S.R.," the political pressures on scientists, and the lack of freedom among the factors impelling his decision.

No doubt there are other factors, too, that played a role. His name sounds Ukrainian and he may well have smarted over great Russian rule in the Soviet Union. His pay was good, but his lodging was a one-room cubbyhole pervaded by gasoline fumes and noise. If a relatively prominent Soviet scientist had to live in such an environment, we can imagine how much worse living conditions must be for ordinary Soviet citizens. Dr. Klochko, we may assume, represents a current of Soviet dissidence which is far more important than his isolated act alone implies.

[From the Toronto (Canada) Telegram,  
Aug. 17, 1961]

KLOTCHKO ASKED ABOUT WORK HERE BEFORE  
DEFECTING

(By Leon Kossar)

MONTREAL.—Questions that Soviet scientist Dr. Michael Antonovich Klotchko asked people here before he asked for asylum in Canada indicate he took the step only after careful planning and thought.

"He asked about the working conditions here and the manner of life," said a local man who met Klotchko.

PERSONAL LIFE

This man, who did not want his identity revealed, reported that Dr. Klotchko did not say much about his personal life.

But he said he had no family in the Soviet Union. He is a widower.

The Montreal man who met him said Klotchko was born in the Ukrainian region of Poltavschyna and had lived in Moscow since 1935.

UKRAINIANS

Dr. Klotchko told him at least one-quarter of the Soviet scientists are Ukrainian, and asked about Canada's 500,000-strong Ukrainian community.

"Dr. Klotchko had an opportunity to talk to his professional colleagues here and as he speaks English quite well, he was not restricted to those who spoke only Russian or Ukrainian.

"It seemed as if he was earnestly trying to find out as much firsthand information about Canada as he could."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 23, 1961]

VIENNA, August 22.—A Soviet electronics expert has asked Austrian authorities for political asylum, reliable sources said today.

The scientist, 24-year-old Nikolai I. Sereda, of Kiev, a member of a Soviet tour-

ist group, is said to have walked up to a Viennese traffic policeman and told him he did not want to return home.

The sources said Mr. Sereda's father, a professor and member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, flew to Vienna and made an unsuccessful attempt to persuade his son to change his mind.

In Ottawa last week, a Soviet scientist, Dr. Mikhail A. Klotchko, requested and received political asylum.

A holder of the Stalin Prize for his work in general and inorganic chemistry, Dr. Klotchko went to Canada to attend an international scientific meeting.

He was the first important Soviet scientist to defect to the West since the death of Stalin.

THE RULES COMMITTEE

(Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, after today's vote on the Federal aid to education bill there should no longer be any doubt about whether the House Rules Committee was accurately reflecting the sentiments of the House in not reporting out an omnibus Federal aid to education bill.

It is now quite clear that the House Rules Committee was not thwarting the will of the House.

Perhaps now we can go back and re-examine the stories of the past to see if the Rules Committee was ever at any time thwarting the will of the House. It has been my contention that the Rules Committee has seldom, if ever, thwarted the will of the House. Calendar Wednesday procedure was placed in the Rules of the House to guard against just such abuse of power.

The reason Calendar Wednesday has been used infrequently in the past is because there has been no serious abuse by the Rules Committee, not because Calendar Wednesday is a cumbersome procedure. Calendar Wednesday procedure is not cumbersome; it is very simple. It is not subject to filibuster or delay any more than any more procedure of the House. Of course, any procedure is cumbersome if one lacks a majority of the votes.

Finally, I would like to say a word to my unperceptive Republican friends who were so anxious to beat the phony reform of the Rules Committee back in January this year. Had you been successful do you think that the political by-play to divert the public's attention away from the basic schism in the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition by blaming the Rules Committee and the Republican members on it would have ever been exposed? I think not. We can all be thankful that the Rules Committee is no longer the handy scapegoat for the left-wing politicians to blame when their ill-conceived legislative proposals founder for lack of votes. I think a few apologies are in order to the Rules Committee for the unfair castigation it has received in the past. It was not the Rules Committee that needed reforming but rather some of the half-baked and incompletely considered legislative proposals presented to it.

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6783

Nuckolls, principal, and the Ashland Public School system in desegregation work.

He said a New York university recently commended Ashland Public Schools for its success in the desegregation program.

Of 790 schools in the United States that were investigated, Ashland schools had the greatest success in desegregation, he noted.

Other comments made at closing ceremonies were:

"Professor Nuckolls has done for the people of Ashland things which might have never been achieved. He is the most conscientious educator I know of in Kentucky."—Dr. E. T. Bufford, principal, High Street High School, Bowling Green.

"This is the first school I know of which closed when the principal retired. This is a demonstration of what can be done when people of good will work together for what is just and right."—Dr. A. D. Albright, provost, University of Kentucky.

"The approach to desegregation in Ashland was sensible. Professor Nuckolls has been an excellent representative for Ashland and the State of Kentucky to the Kentucky and National Educational Associations."—Dr. J. Marvin Dodson, executive secretary, Kentucky Education Association.

Others present at the closing ceremonies were:

Dr. A. E. Harris, dean of the graduate school, Marshall University; Dr. Rufus Atwood, president, Kentucky State College; Dr. Clyde Orr, director, Ashland Center, University of Kentucky; members of the Board of Education and Ashland Board of Trade; city officials; and other school officials.

Musical interludes were provided by the Ashland High School band, under direction of Ernest White, Jr., and the Booker T. Washington chorus.

The Reverend T. D. Johnson, one of the first graduates of Booker T. Washington and pastor of the First Baptist Church of Winchester, pronounced the invocation.

Benediction was given by the Reverend J. E. Newell.

### A Food-for-Freedom Program by the Honorable Cal D. Johnson

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BEN F. JENSEN**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a food-for-freedom program which our former colleague, the Honorable Cal D. Johnson, advocates.

Calvin D. Johnson is one of America's outstanding contemporary speakers. In the course of his public life, he has addressed hundreds of business, civic and fraternal organizations and has stimulated the thinking of many Americans to a new hope in the future of our country.

He began early his career in the public's service. A resident of Belleville, Ill., he served as a member of the school and park boards of his community; 4 years as a member of St. Clair, Ill., County Board of Supervisors; 6 years as a member of Illinois General Assembly.

Elected to the U.S. Congress in 1942, he continued his fight for the American people.

His concern for the traditional American ideals of freedom is inherited from

his ancestors who landed at Jamestown in the early 1600's. Born near Fordsville, Ky., Mr. Johnson is a descendant of the famous pioneer Kentucky surgeon Ephraim McDowell, whose likeness stands in Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol.

Few men in public life today can match him for his ability to impart to the people the principles of the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, after giving Mr. Johnson's program considerable thought, a plan whereby the military would use our farms as they use our factories to win the cold war, I feel that the President, the American people and the Congress should give serious consideration to such a program, especially since it is crystal clear that the program now in effect, to make friends in foreign lands to head off the devilish Communist threat to enslave the world, has not been effective to say the least. Mr. Johnson's food for freedom program follows:

#### FOOD-FOR-FREEDOM PROGRAM—A PLAN WHEREBY THE MILITARY WOULD USE OUR FARMS AS THEY USE OUR FACTORIES TO WIN THE COLD WAR

Have the military initiate a giant food-for-freedom program, utilizing present farm surpluses and starting with 1961 supplement the program with approximately \$2 billion of military or foreign aid funds to purchase additional farm products over and above those originally purchased by the Department of Agriculture. This would permit the acquisition by the military of special foods to meet the needs of various religious or ethnic groups. It would also permit the military to order the production of products other than feed grains to supply various needs. The transfer of corn acreage to soybean production would materially help to remedy the world's food shortage as millions of the world's hungry to whom corn is unknown have known soybeans as a food since the dawn of history.

Suggestions have been made by leading Americans that this country's surplus food should be made available to the world's hungry through the United Nations. I would suggest instead that we merely notify the United Nations of the total tonnage of various foods we are willing to make available, but let the United Nations act only as an allocating agency, setting the amount to be delivered to each respective country.

I reemphasize, do not let the United Nations distribute our products. Have every pound of food carried abroad by American ships, delivered by American military trucks, and distributed to the needy under the supervision of men clothed in the military uniform of the United States. In other words, have American Armed Forces approaching the foreign needy with a biscuit as well as a bullet, and thus build the image of a benefactor as well as a protector.

I would also suggest that in every package of prepared food supplied by this country, that we enclose a miniature plastic replica of the Statue of Liberty or an American flag or a miniature Uncle Sam. Children would keep these and they would serve as a continuing underfoot reminder of American help. It is high time that America starts getting credit for her generosity. The psychological effect of a program of this type would be enormous.

If every American base overseas is a food-distributing center, I cannot imagine any nation demanding that we remove that base as long as it is used to distribute food to needy of that country. In countries where there are no bases, establish military missions (with uniforms but without guns) to handle the distribution of all foods supplied by the United States. Men in uniforms of

the United States distributing food to the needy countries will go a long way toward removing the stigma of militarists and imperialists so successfully applied to our Armed Forces by the Russians. That term just doesn't apply to a man giving you food for your needy family.

No doubt the Russians would object to a program of this kind, as for the first time it would put them in a position percentage-wise where they have always belonged.

To the total amount of food made available for allocation by United Nations, it would probably be necessary for the United States to put up 95 percent with Russia and the rest of the world putting up the other 5 percent. If the Russians insisted upon initiating a program of this type of their own, it would be fine for us as we would be distributing 19 pounds to their 1 pound.

No doubt the charge will be that we are destroying the markets of our allies, namely, Canada, Argentina, Australia and New Zealand. To meet this charge, I would suggest the following:

Insist that any country participating in the United Nations allocating program must first purchase annually one-fifth of the total tonnage purchased during the past 5 years before they became eligible for additional assistance. This could be modified if it could be proven that economic changes within a country made this procedure impossible. This, however, will be the problem of the United Nations, but my personal thought is that we should insist on the adoption of this grandfather clause in order to protect our allies. It should be our intention to assist the needy—not the greedy.

In conclusion, the military of this country does things in a big way. We appropriate \$40 to \$43 billion for defense, and food for a freedom program should definitely become a part of our military operation. Building good will among the people of the world is as important as manufacturing guns with which to subjugate them. Thus taking \$1 to \$2 billion of this military appropriation and going to the American farmers asking them to produce instead of curtailing production, then distribute the results of their efforts to the world's needy would build unlimited good will throughout the world and restore confidence to the American farmers. There are 2,800 million people in the world and 1,800 million of them go to sleep each night having consumed less than 2,000 calories of food. Communism thrives on empty stomachs and 1,800 million of them is a fertile field in which to propagate.

CAL D. JOHNSON,  
Former Member of U.S. Congress.  
GLAD ACRES, UPPER MARLBORO, Md.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnson wrote me, as follows:

DEAR JEN: Enclosed is a copy of my proposed food-for-freedom program.

America has through various foreign aid programs given away approximately \$100 billion. I consider it high time that we start receiving some credit for our generosity.

Sincerely,

CAL.

### House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 29, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling

for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

*Santa Barbara, Calif.  
August 18, 1961.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations on your wonderful bill, House Resolution 211. We desperately need bills such as this one to counteract the actions of those who are determined to go along with communism.

We are writing our good Congressman, Mr. TEAGUE, to ask that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be formed at once.

Your thanks to you for acting like an American.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT WHITEHEAD.

AUGUST 18, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to congratulate you for your House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations, and all your other efforts in this very important and urgent problem concerning our enemy, communism.

Yours is a courageous and splendid example of establishing a policy which is in accord with the finer impulses and desires of the thinking majority in the world, as one of best, the weapon against communism.

We are in a war which the Communists can win without changing their tactics. We cannot win without changing ours.

All loyal Americans will join you in your efforts. For the majority anticommunistic people in the captive nations, your efforts are an encouragement and a witness that this country does not lack morale and other resources needed to contribute to freedom and independence.

Kindly send me a copy of House Resolution 211. I need about 50 copies. These copies

I wish to send to my friends in this country who wish to support the resolution as I am doing.

Sincerely yours,

MILINKO D. ALEKSICH,  
Secretary of American-Serbian Veterans,  
Chicago Chapter.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am very, very much in favor of House Resolution 211. This would be of great strategic value, and would show the captive people of the world that we still care.

Mrs. EDWARD STASEIT,  
Los Angeles, Calif.

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., August 17, 1961

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am sending you a copy of the letter I have written to Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Congressman from my congressional district in Missouri, in support of the House Resolution 211 which you introduced. I feel that no effort or objective has ever been more timely than the House Resolution 211 is.

We must do our best to turn on, or turn brighter the lights of freedom in the hearts and minds of the people of the world if we are to continue to enjoy freedom for ourselves. As President Kennedy said in the inaugural address "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it \* \* \* and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

Very truly yours,

VIRGIL C. PFEIFFER.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of the Hall letter to President Kennedy.

SPRINGFIELD, Mo., August 16, 1961.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I want to write a note in support of the House Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, which, as you know, proposes the formation of a Special House Captive Nation Committee. It would, as I understand, have the primary objectives of studying systematically and objectively and continuously the problems of peoples of the captive nations.

President Kennedy in his inaugural address said, "Man holds within his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebearers fought are still at issue around the globe \* \* \* the belief that the rights of men come not from the generosity of the state but from the hands of God." Somehow one feels that there President Kennedy was stating the heart of the issue of the "long twilight struggle," of which we are so conscious as a result of the current Berlin crisis.

I think that this House Resolution 211 would provide, we the people of the free world, up to date information relative to how millions of silent efforts are now being made by people in captive nations to secure freedom and human dignity for themselves.

It would enable us to seize the propaganda initiative, too long held by the Communists, and strengthen the hopes of the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain. And surely as a result of a better universal understanding of the problem, means can be found to help these people to freedom.

It would help display for all the uncommitted people of the world to see the inside working of Khrushchev's "communistic

paradise" and thus strengthen the cause to freedom among these people.

It would strengthen the "self-determination of peoples" phase of our foreign policy by giving us all in the free world a better understanding of it.

I hope you will lend your support to Congressman Flood's Special Committee on Captive Nation Resolution which I am convinced would strengthen the spirit and the voice of freedom around the world.

It is my understanding that both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have approved this, or a similar resolution.

Very truly yours,

VIRGIL C. PFEIFFER.

AUGUST 16, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily endorse your fine bill, House Resolution 211, to give help and encouragement to the captive nations. Such a committee should be of value in keeping the finger on the pulse of these poor peoples and encourage them to assert themselves more.

Mrs. J. B. DICKINSON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

AUGUST 17, 1961.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I strongly commend you for your House Resolution 211 proposition which would provide a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. This committee will be of great value and will be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we do not now or shall we ever write off the captive nations.

Keep up the good work.  
Cordially,

JACK McWETHY.

AUGUST 15, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD: I am in hearty agreement with your House Resolution 211 for a special House Committee on Captive Nations to be formed at once.

I hope this resolution will be passed.

Sincerely,

MARTHA C. TALBOT.

PASADENA, CALIF.

CHANNELVIEW, TEX., August 12, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Congratulations on your authorship of House Resolution 211. I feel that we should do all that we can to encourage the millions of people enslaved by communism to revolt for freedom. I was very dismayed at letting the bloody butcher come to our shores. I am sure that his slaves were convinced that the United States was against them when we let Khrushchev and our President kiss each other.

Tell my Representative, Mr. ALBERT THOMAS, that I am expecting him to support your bill or similar bills.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT LINDSTROM.

ALTAVISTA, VA., August 15, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It is not, of course, a privilege of mine to be a constituent of yours.

I did want to express my admiration, however, for your splendid statement on the Manion Forum, July 16. In this, among other things, you made correct reference to the cynical meaning behind Khrushchev's statement of last December 27, about "Subjugated colonial peoples," etc.

I have earnestly wondered for some time why our Government has not made more use against the Communists of some of their completely provable bald faced lies, not only to the world in general but to their own people, as well as documentary proof of their announced lack of good faith in any agreements or negotiations.

Recently, I secured from a Communist bookstore in New York a copy of the volume Soviet State Law, printed in Moscow. For purposes of identification, I am enclosing the title page of this, as well as the first page of the appendixes, which contains the constitution of the U.S.S.R. Am also enclosing reproductions of the pages which include articles 13 and 17 of the U.S.S.R. constitution.

As complete and total evidence, borne out by our historical experience, of their deliberate bad faith, you will notice that in article 13, in the very same sentence in which they provide for the ratification of treaties, they also provide for the denunciation of same.

As proof of their utter and sardonic cynicism, you will note that article 17 states that each Union Soviet Republic has the right to freely secede. Considering their actions in Hungary and East Germany, to mention merely two examples, which areas are not even officially Soviet Union Republics, it is doubtful that Satan ever coined a more mendacious jest than this provision in their constitution.

If our State Department is sincerely interested in winning the contest with Russia (which on more than one occasion I have had reason to question), why, with ammunition like this, don't we hold them up to the world as the cynical liars they are?

Respectfully,

LONDON B. LANE.

AUGUST 11, 1961.

HONORABLE SIR: In reference to your bill, House Resolution 211, more power to you. God bless you for your work.

MARGIE ALEXANDER.

GLENDALE, CALIF.

## Impressive Progress of the Small Business Administration During First 6 Months of 1961

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report of the Small Business Administration. It is particularly gratifying to note that the aid given through each of the major SBA programs during the first 6 months of 1961 has been greater than any comparable period since the beginning of the agency.

Certainly John E. Horne, the Administrator, is to be congratulated on this signal service to the small business community of our Nation.

The report follows:

REPORT ON SBA ACTIVITIES IN FIRST HALF OF 1961—HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

Recent gains in significant economic indices show clearly that the Nation is moving out of the business recession, and an economic resurgence is now under way. Small

firms are benefitting from this economic upturn, and a continued rise in business activity should bring further improvement in the position of small business in the last half of 1961 and the early part of 1962.

At the same time, various economic barometers indicate that the recession had an especially sharp impact on small firms, and that small business therefore has farther to go than other sectors of the business population in regaining lost ground.

In the 6 months which ended June 30, 1961, and which marked the start of new leadership of the Small Business Administration, the Agency gave record assistance to small business.

Without exception, the aid given small firms through each major SBA program was greater in January-June 1961 than in any comparable period since start of the Agency.

The record volume of assistance to small business resulted primarily from objectives set for the Agency by the present SBA Administrator after he took office in February 6, 1961.

Specifically, SBA has sought since then to make all its services to small business more effective than ever before; to give maximum aid to small businesses and communities in areas of substantial unemployment; and through this expansion of assistance, to help attain President Kennedy's goals of recovery for economically depressed areas, and more rapid growth of the national economy.

Accomplishments in each major SBA program in January through June, 1961, with significant comparisons, are summarized below:

**Business loans:** SBA received 6,356 applications for \$403,901,000 and approved 3,068 loans for \$154,170,000. This was a 47-percent increase over the 4,329 applications for \$263,752,000 received in January-June 1960, and almost a 47-percent increase over the 2,091 loans for \$98,887,000 approved in that period.

**Government contracts:** SBA and cooperating purchasing agencies jointly set aside 22,320 proposed Government purchases totaling \$998,464,102 to be bid on solely by small business; 22,361 contracts amounting to \$746,827,443 were awarded to small firms as a result of set-asides. (The number of proposed purchases set aside for small business bidding and the number of contract awards resulting from set-asides do not necessarily correspond in a given period, because bids may not be asked on a set-aside purchase for several months. Further, a single set-aside may result in several contract awards to small business.) The number of set-asides for small business bidding was 81-percent higher in this 6-month period than in January-June 1960; the number of contract awards resulting from set-asides was 69-percent higher. It should be noted, however, that contract awards resulting from the joint set-aside program for small business are only a part of total Government contract awards to small firms. Therefore, an increase in small business awards under the set-aside program does not necessarily lead to an increase in overall awards to small business by the military and civilian agencies. In fact, as discussed subsequently, despite continuing progress of the SBA-Department of Defense joint set-aside program, the small business percentage of total military purchasing declined steadily from fiscal year 1954 until the early part of calendar year 1961.

**Small business investment companies:** In January-June 1961, SBA licensed 128 additional investment companies to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small business. By comparison, in January-June 1960, SBA licensed 48 small business investment companies. From August 18, 1958, when the program was authorized by the Small Business Investment Act, to January 1, 1961, SBA licensed 175 companies. As of

June 30, 1961, SBIC's had total funds of \$240.5 million for small business loans and investment purposes; if their authority to obtain operating loans from SBA totaling up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus is included, their potential capital as of June 30 was \$360 million.

**Development company loans:** In January-June, SBA approved 37 loans for \$4,480,000 to local development companies, and 2 loans for \$490,000 to State development companies, to help provide financing and facilities for small business. In January-June 1960, SBA approved 19 loans for \$1,972,000 to local development companies, and 2 loans for \$1,300,000 to State development companies. In almost 2½ years' operation of the program prior to January 1, 1961, SBA approved 81 loans totaling \$9,349,000 to local development companies, and 5 loans for \$3,614,000 to State development companies.

**Management assistance:** In January-June 1961, SBA and 144 leading educational institutions cosponsored 207 administrative management courses which were attended by more than 6,700 small businessmen. This compares with 123 courses, cosponsored by 113 schools, and attended by 5,000 businessmen in January-June 1960. In the management publications program, businessmen obtained nearly 1,370,000 copies of SBA publications in the first half of this year, compared with approximately 932,000 in the same period of 1960.

#### SBA ACTIVITIES IN JANUARY-JUNE 1961

##### I. INTRODUCTION: ECONOMIC POSITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Recent gains in a number of significant indexes show clearly that the Nation is moving out of the business recession of 1960, and an economic resurgence is now underway.

Personal income has been increasing. In February of this year, the seasonally adjusted annual rate was \$406.2 billion; by June it was \$416.5 billion. In June of 1960, the annual rate was \$406.1 billion.

As a result of the rise in personal income, retail sales have improved. On a seasonally adjusted basis, they increased from \$17.8 billion in February to \$18.1 billion in May. Department store sales during the 4 weeks ended June 24 were better than a year ago—42 percent above the 1947-49 average, compared with 39 percent a year ago.

Manufacturers' new orders (seasonally adjusted) increased from \$29.1 billion in February to \$31.07 billion in May; in durable goods, the increase was from \$13.36 billion to \$14.87 billion. The trend is up.

Industrial production also is increasing. The seasonally adjusted index of production, based on the year 1957, rose from 102.1 in February to 108.2 in May.

The average workweek in manufacturing industries (seasonally adjusted) also has risen, from 39 hours in January to 39.8 hours in May. An increase in the average workweek typically occurs during the month just prior to new hiring.

Small business—like all business—has benefited from the economic upturn. Furthermore, a continued rise in economic activity should lead to still greater improvement in the position of small firms in the last half of 1961 and the early part of 1962.

At the same time, there is abundant evidence, such as a slowdown in growth of the business population and a continued high rate of business failures, that the 1960 recession was especially severe on small firms. The small business sector of the economy therefore has farther to go than the other business sectors in regaining lost ground, and in recapturing stability and profitability.

##### Business population

Because most businesses start out as small ones, growth of the business population largely reflects the small business "birth rate." A slackening in this rate has been



mitment, will put the statesmanship of the Kennedy administration to its supreme test.

Even so, resentment against Western power is likely to persist among neutralist nations, and with it the tendency to play off the East against the West. To counteract this, it will avail the United States little to try to curry favor with the neutralists by trimming its policies to their preferences; neutralism feeds on this kind of weakness. Rather, we must pursue clearly defined, strongly executed, and ably presented policies to a successful conclusion, thereby demonstrating to all concerned that we know what we are about and that it does not pay to cross us. Only so will we gain the respect of the neutralists and have a chance to win their support as well.

And we might well remind the neutralist nations—at appropriate occasions, and tactfully but firmly—that their neutralism is but a function of the power of the United States.

Neutralism, like peaceful coexistence, is for the Soviet Union but a stepping stone toward communitization. A nation can afford to be neutralist, not because this is what the Soviet Union wants it to be, but because the power of the Soviet Union is not sufficient to absorb it into the Soviet bloc.

Were the United States not committed to containing the Communist bloc, neutralism could not exist as a policy and would at best survive as an impotent desire and a vain hope. For neutralism in the cold war, like neutrality in a shooting war, depends upon the balance of power. It is a luxury which certain nations can afford because the power of one antagonist cancels out the power of the other.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1961]

#### THE NEUTRAL SUMMIT

Mr. Nehru's blunder about Berlin may have had the effect of increasing apprehensions about the 25-nation neutral summit meeting opening Friday in Belgrade. The somewhat reluctant presence of the Indian Prime Minister had been looked upon in the West as a moderating influence against any tendency toward extremism in conference resolutions—though perhaps some of the other nonaligned nations attending would not welcome it in quite this fashion.

Certainly no plague on both houses statement from Belgrade would be very helpful in the tense test of rights and determination at Berlin. Still, the neutral nations can hardly be expected to remain unconcerned about a situation that could plunge the world into war. What one must hope, therefore, is that there will be at least some appreciation of the human values at stake.

On questions involving colonialism, the West is altogether likely to come in for criticism, with greater or lesser applicability. It would not be at all surprising to have protests about the French role in Tunisia. There is a very great difference, however, between the policy heretofore followed by, say, Portugal in the case of Angola and that followed by Britain in the case of British Guiana. Mr. Khrushchev views every Western policy as imperialist. Will the neutrals be objective enough in their own remarks to recognize the very substantial imperialism of Mr. Khrushchev in Eastern Europe?

In point of fact the colonialist line is getting a bit thin. President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, one of the sponsors of the Belgrade meeting, has implicitly recognized this in his own recent policies. Preoccupation with the sins of others is not a very constructive substitute for attention to real internal problems. To his credit, the United Arab Republic President has been showing increased concern with practical measures to help the standard of living at home.

It also is likely that the neutral summit meeting will have something to say about disarmament and about the situation of the

United Nations. The realities of disarmament make it peculiarly an affair between the Soviet Union and the United States; and a mere denunciation of nuclear weapons or testing would not be much contribution to agreement. Here again, though, an expression of concern would be understandable and perhaps helpful.

With respect to the U.N., the neutrals have a case for more adequate representation on, say, the Security Council. But the Soviet troika concept for the Secretariat would be quite as dangerous for the neutrals as for the West. Indeed, the neutrals have an especial dependence upon the executive authority and initiative of the Secretary General.

Whatever may be the expectations of the State Department from the Belgrade assembly, happily there have been no advance panics and alarms here like those before the Bandung Conference of 1955. It would be difficult to find a strong common denominator among the rather disparate nations represented at Belgrade except, perhaps, the quest for status. It would be even more difficult to arrive at a definition of neutralism or nonalignment acceptable to all the participants. These factors militate against the formation of a neutral bloc as such.

In any simplistic view of world affairs, it is more gratifying to have another country stand positively with you than to remain aloof. Still, the United States fortunately has moved away from the for-me-or-against-me formula and the "neutralism is immoral" view of Mr. Dulles toward a better understanding of the motivations of new countries and their rather specialized way of expressing their independence. The proper criterion for judgment of the results of the Belgrade Conference will be in how neutral the neutrals really are.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Saturday was the anniversary of the enactment of the 19th amendment. This amendment, which extended the right of voting to women, is one of the many markers along our path of effective democracy, standing alongside the 15th amendment and the 17th amendment. The former guaranteed the right of the people to vote regardless of "race, color, or previous conditions of servitude." The latter guaranteed the right of the people to elect Senators of their choice. Each amendment in its own way was an expression of the belief that the people can govern themselves. Universal suffrage is at once the cornerstone and keystone of a genuinely human way of living.

It is entirely appropriate today, as a tribute to those who are working and sacrificing so much for true universal suffrage, that we pay our respect to the ladies who also made sacrifices for universal suffrage.

The struggle for woman suffrage in this country was long. It took seven decades. Suffragettes were at first armed only with their ingenuity, imagination, courage, and remarkable perseverance. Few elected officials were responsive to the pleas of these voteless citizens. However, those who firmly believed in self-determination befriended them, and soon women could cast their ballots in selected States and elections. In Illinois, by legislative action, they were able to vote for President and certain State officials. Despite efforts of some to over-

come this advancement by challenge in the courts, Illinois women retained their precious victory.

The basis of a lasting and responsible democracy is one where the government is responsive to the needs and wishes of its people. The achievement of woman suffrage and the history of efforts to attain it stand as an encouraging example for all those who truly want to achieve a representative form of government.

#### THE INDOMITABLE SPIRIT OF CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let us never forget that to the captive nations of Europe we owe an invaluable debt of gratitude for their courage and indomitable spirit, which has been and shall continue to be, the rallying point for freedom behind the Iron Curtain. This passion for liberation from the tyranny of communism inspired the Hungarian revolt of 1956. This hatred of dictatorship led to the Berlin revolt of June, 1953. This refusal to be chained to a life of regimentation and misery guided thousands of East Germans across boundary in the city of Berlin to the free society of the West. And now, Mr. President, the Communists have barricaded that boundary in Berlin and shoot to kill any man who dares to defy the will of the puppet government.

But we should not think that this will halt the desire of the East Germans for freedom. Wherever there are people under the yoke of tyranny these people have the hope for freedom.

Mr. President, I would like to offer as an example of the spirit of a captive peoples a speech delivered by Hon. Joseph Kajekas, the chargé d'affaires ad interim of Lithuania, before the Second Festival of Songs of Canadian and American Lithuanians in Chicago last month. I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It is a particularly great pleasure to be the honorary chairman of this Festival of Songs, and to address you today. The circumstances of our gathering are especially meaningful for me, because it was in this country that I spoke my first Lithuanian word, and learned my first Lithuanian song. And I know that the honor which you show me today in having invited me to address you in our mother tongue is honor which you show to our dear homeland.

At first glance, it might be hard to understand how it is that songs and a diplomat could go together on an occasion such as this. But I remind you that many are the roads that lead to Lithuania. There are the ways, for example, of politics, nationality and culture. But today, the Lithuanian songs and dances stand in the forefront of our minds; this is especially so for me, as I recall that just several weeks ago, Lithuanian folk dances were performed in the U.S. Department of State, in the world's greatest diplomatic center.

At any rate, we certainly know that Lithuanian songs are much older than Lithuanian diplomacy. Thousands of years before Christ, we may think, our earliest ancestors found themselves at the ambered shores of the Baltic Sea, and surrounded their arrival with song. It was with a song



that Lithuanians drew water from the Danube. And at the height of our national existence, Lithuanian soldiers often raised their native songs even at the very gates of the Kremlin. And these songs resounded as well on the fields of Zalgiris (Tannenber) in 1410.

When, at the end of the 18th century Lithuania was covered with the darkness of czarist rule and a ban on all Lithuanian printing, there were only two ambassadorial tasks left for our homeland—and these were Lithuanian prayers and Lithuanian songs. Today, we are again in a position of adherence to work, prayer and song as our leaders in hope for a brighter future for Lithuania.

The power of songs is remarkable. A song will outlive the most moving speech or sermon; it is the first thing which moves a child to wonder and to imitate. And it is in song that great love is always expressed, for words are not enough to bespeak the deepest things that fill a man's heart. Is it any wonder that Beethoven's immortal "Ninth Symphony" breaks into song in the final chorale movement, the "Hymn to Joy"?

It is in song that the history and the heart of a nation are revealed. Lithuanian songs encompass, throughout the many centuries, all the powers of God and man, all sadness and all joy, beauty and fear, nature and love. They have been admired by many writers, among them Lessing, Herder, Goethe and Schiller. Both Schumann and Chopin used them for themes in their own compositions. And when Lithuania as a nation embraced Christianity in the middle ages, the power of song was led to express a powerful faith, and the beautiful simplicity of a people's luminous quest for the numinous, the sacred. It is in this tradition that the aspirations of a nation developed, with respect for freedom and human dignity. And today, when one hears a Lithuanian congregation intone Strazdelis' hymn "Fall On Your Knees," one never forgets the experience: it is impossible to forget the moment at which song becomes prayer. And when this prayer is fashioned from a whole history of trials and sufferings in the life of a nation, it is even more unforgettable. As Joyce Kilmer once said: "The very best songs that ever are sung are sung while the heart is bleeding."

The treasury of Lithuanian song is a vast one. I can recall having witnessed a group of London Lithuanians singing all night which journeying from Manchester to London. Several weeks ago, I know that a group of Lithuanian dancers sang almost without ceasing from Boston to Washington. And here, on the banks of Lake Michigan, any Lithuanian who hears again the language and song of Birute, may well know that, someday, his country will again be free.

It is because Lithuania is a land of song that we have set aside this festival in honor of our country. We have gathered here freely and of our own will. But in the present circumstances, we also gather in remembrance of the fact that it is a far different tune that the Kremlin sings.

For it was the tyrants of the Kremlin who, in July of 1940, falsified the will of the Lithuanian nation, just as they falsified her history and her aspirations. Every one of our meetings, and this significant occasion in particular, serves as an opportunity for us to make clear to the whole world that the will of the Kremlin is not the free will of the Lithuanian nation and its people. As the world hears our songs today, it may know that Lithuania cries out for justice, for the harmony of a free and independent national life to which she has a God-given right.

This month marks the passage of 21 years since the U.S. Department of State refused to recognize the illegal absorption of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. The remem-

brance of this act and its continued validity is an occasion of rejoicing and hope for all Lithuanians, both in the free world and under Soviet enslavement. This month is also the 39th anniversary of the recognition of the Baltic States de jure by the United States.

As a commemoration of these two anniversaries, let our songs rise as a sign of thanks to the American people and their government. May they also rise as a token of gratitude to the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, for his sympathetic and impressive proclamation of Lithuanian Day here in Chicago. In these expressions of gratitude, all the participants in this festival join wholeheartedly.

Finally, we take note of the fact that, in 2 days, all Americans celebrate the 185th anniversary of their Declaration of Independence. This declaration acknowledged God-given, inalienable rights for all men; Abraham Lincoln pointed out that, as such, the declaration gave lasting hope not only to the people of America, but to all freedom loving peoples for all time. In this hope, let us raise our voices in song, and proclaim throughout all lands our aspirations to liberty: until the day when we shall surely hold a festival of songs on the day of Lithuania's triumph, in the very city of Gediminas, in our beloved Lithuania.

#### PROGRESS IN SAMOA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 26 of this year I rose in the Senate to describe for my colleagues the appalling state of affairs in American Samoa. The title in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my remarks that day, "South Sea Slum," was unfortunately an all too accurate description of conditions on those islands. Today, in the Washington Post, there appears an editorial concerning American Samoa, which suggests that progress is now, if somewhat belatedly, being made to institute a comprehensive development program. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SOMETHING FOR SAMOA

It finally appears as if American Samoa will cease to be a forlorn ward of the Department of the Interior. A new Governor is on the island, and the administration is working out a development program for this tiny outpost in the South Pacific. The fact that New Zealand is due to grant independence to nearby Western Samoa next year has helped to wake up the administration to the backward colonial policy heretofore practiced for the 20,000 Polynesians who live on an island about the size of the District of Columbia.

Thanks to the initiative of Senator OREN E. LONG of Hawaii, Samoa has been included in the recently enacted area redevelopment bill and would also benefit from the aid-to-education measures still before Congress. Industries are being sought for the island, and hotel and recreational facilities planned to help the Samoans to help themselves.

H. Rex Lee, the new Governor, is an experienced Interior official who will have his hands full, among other things, in preparing for a South Pacific conference to be held in Samoa next year. The conference will bring together indigenous leaders from various corners of the Pacific and it will be important that U.S. territorial policy show to good advantage. About \$500,000 is due to be spent on conference facilities which can subsequently be used as classrooms and other

permanent structures. A new \$2.3 million jet runway will also be constructed as part of the plan.

Taken together, these steps can help the Samoans prepare themselves for a meaningful choice when the ultimate status of the island is decided. However regrettable the delay, it is good that something is being done to make up for lost time.

#### PROVISION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1969) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, being in the nature of a substitute is open to amendment and, for the purpose of amendment, will be considered, under the precedents, as original text.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SENATOR HAYDEN AND THE 19TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this month the League of Women Voters honored our wonderful colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] at a surprise party because he is the only Member of the 87th Congress who voted for passage of the amendment which gave women the right to vote.

Senator HAYDEN was a Representative from Arizona at the time. His vote helped open wide a world of new experiences for women in our country. Perhaps there have been times when Senator HAYDEN wondered if he had cast a wise vote.

I hope that we women will never disillusion him and make him sorry for that historic vote. I first heard about Senator HAYDEN when my husband became a Member of the Senate, and I remember his telling of the fact that here was a Senator who had been in Congress ever since his State had been a member of the Union.

I would ask Senator HAYDEN to be patient with us. After all, the women have only had the privilege of helping select their national officeholders for 41 years. In the life of a woman that is a short time. We hear often that phrase

power—note the word “legal”—to change its mind and amend a law in practically any way it deems appropriate. But hanging on legalisms here substantially begs the question—certainly where delicate and far-reaching arrangements with sovereign foreign nations are involved.

His superior, Secretary Rusk, told the House Committee on Appropriations that “As a matter of the law and the Constitution, it (Congress) would have the same control. However, I would be less than candid if I did not say that the exercise of that control by the Congress on an annual basis would be a more serious step in terms of our commitments and relations with other governments than would be true under the present arrangement.”

#### LIMITING EXPENDITURES

This question of control by Congress is so crucial to the understanding and consideration of the proposition that I again quote from Secretary Dillon. He was asked what would be the situation if Congress decided to cut a part of the \$8.8 billion but in the meantime under long-range programing, commitments had been made with foreign countries. Could Congress then limit expenditures below what had been committed? Dillon said:

“I would like to be perfectly clear on that, Senator. Congress does have the authority to limit it, and could limit it, but it would have the effect of the United States not living up to its commitments. So I believe there would be very strong pressure on Congress not to have the United States default on a commitment which it had legally made.”

In the fact of that statement, Mr. Tannenwald says Mr. Krock was “incorrect” when he suggested that if Congress were to limit or terminate the previously granted borrowing authority the United States would be in default in its foreign-aid commitments. Then hanging on technicalities, he concludes that “there could be no question of a default.” Secretaries Rusk and Dillon say otherwise.

Mr. Tannenwald insists it is not true, as Mr. Krock states, that:

“Since technically the Executive could commit in 1 fiscal year the entire \$8.8 billion Congress had given it for 5 years, there conceivably could be no money left for Congress to recapture.”

Once again, let's see what Secretary Dillon says: “Mr. Passman: In effect, the executive branch could, if it should so determine, commit the entire \$8.8 billion during fiscal year 1962 on a conditional basis?” “Secretary Dillon: They could commit \$1,187 million firmly, and they could commit the rest of it conditionally.” “Mr. Passman: It could be committed, nevertheless?” “Secretary Dillon: Conditionally, it could be.”

In conclusion, this long-term financing proposition, and some others similar to it and now rather commonly known as backdoor financing, raises questions vital to the orderly processes of representative government. The Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, has but one certain way effectively to control the Government. That is the power of the purse.

So when such a proposition as the pending \$8.8 billion, 5-year borrowing authority is submitted, above all things, we must know it full dimensions and characteristics before we finally vote. Do what we will—but know what we are doing.

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,

Representative, Fifth District, Michigan.

WASHINGTON, August 10, 1961.

#### SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was granted permission to

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic weaknesses of the Soviet Union slave empire is the discontent of the people of the so-called satellite nations and the discontent of non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union proper.

This opposition, if properly sustained and if, through our efforts the continued attention of the world is focused upon it, could result in placing the Soviet Union in a position of complete defense in the propaganda phase of the cold war.

The Soviet charges against U.S. colonialism and U.S. aggression relative to Guantanamo Bay are a perfect example of the smokescreen leveled by them to take the eyes of the world off their own imperialism and colonialism as practiced in Eastern Europe.

With these thoughts in mind, I have repeatedly urged that the Rules Committee approve for discussion on the floor one of the resolutions dealing with the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations. These various resolutions introduced by many Members of both political parties, must be acted upon by the Rules Committee in the very near future, or for all practical purposes, they will have been killed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to place in the RECORD a copy of the letter I have written to each member of the Rules Committee, urging that body to permit the House to work its will on the subject to create a special House Committee on Captive Nations.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I don't wish to wear out my welcome and take up your tremendously busy schedule with an issue with which you are thoroughly familiar but feel it imperative that one of the captive nations resolutions be cleared by the Rules Committee for discussion by the entire House. I would like to call some additional items to your attention that show the urgency and bipartisanship of this special House committee.

On April 23, a State Department press release, discussing the letter from Khrushchev to President Kennedy on Cuba stated:

“The people of the United States believe that the right of self-determination is fundamental and should apply throughout the world. We reject the right of any narrow political grouping or any country to allot to itself the power to determine the real will of the people.”

May I also call your attention to this statement from President Kennedy's state of the Union message:

“We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and well being of the Eastern European peoples.”

And last, but not least, I call your attention to the following quotation from President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week proclamation:

“Whereas it is in keeping with our national tradition that the American people manifest its interest in the freedom of other nations:

“I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of all peoples for national independence and freedom.”

Along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and numerous other Members on both sides of the aisle, I have urged that the creation and operation of this special House committee would be of extreme value to the State Department and to our United Nations representatives in

dealing with Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism, pointing out the true facts that imperialism and colonialism as practiced by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe far exceeds any abuses which could be charged to Western nations.

It is my understanding that the State Department has not taken a position in support of the creation of a Captive Nations Committee. If this be the case, I believe it is acting in contradiction to the above-quoted items, and it would be most consistent for the House to create this special committee and work effectively with the State Department in exposing Soviet manipulations of the previously free peoples of Eastern Europe.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vital issue, and I am enclosing for the RECORD additional material which very effectively points out the area of Soviet weakness in Eastern Europe. The additional matter I refer to is an editorial in the August 26 issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled “The Veiled Offer.”

#### THE VEILED OFFER

Arthur Veysey, our London correspondent, reports that the British Government is promoting a conference of foreign ministers for late September in the belief that agreements governing West Berlin and the status of divided Germany, can be reached with the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, Khrushchev continues to apply the heat, his latest move being a veiled threat to cut off Western access by air to West Berlin on the theory that the allies are abusing the air routes by ferrying in spies and troublemakers.

In these circumstances, what kind of agreement is possible with the Russians? Some persons may think they see the essential clue in overtones of appeasement in British official circles. But perhaps a more direct clue has been provided by President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk.

While the President and Rusk have said what they will not give up in Berlin, they have told Khrushchev by indirection that they are willing to give up a great deal elsewhere. Too little attention has been directed to this veiled offer of a quid pro quo.

Mr. Kennedy's overture, made in his speech July 25, began with the statement that “we are willing to consider any arrangement or treaty in Germany consistent with the maintenance of peace and freedom, and with the legitimate security interests of all nations.”

Directly after this statement came an offer that covers a good deal of ground.

“We recognize,” said Mr. Kennedy, “the Soviet Union's historical concerns about their security in central and eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions—and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet those concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area.”

Mr. Rusk, speaking 2 days after Mr. Kennedy, expressed belief that there could be a “peaceful adjustment.” He said the President had indicated “some broad possibilities that might open up” for negotiations.

While the Secretary's remarks are to some degree ambiguous, Mr. Kennedy's are less so. Russia has expressed its “historical concerns” about the security of its borders by pulling more than half a dozen countries of eastern and central Europe into the Communist orbit and installing over them puppet governments responsive to every command from Moscow.

It has taken territory from Poland, one of these captive nations, and had Poland compensate itself by taking German territory on its western frontier. And the Russians themselves have converted what was supposed to be a temporary military occupa-

tion of Eastern Germany into permanent possession by erecting a fictitious state in that territory, with which Khrushchev now proposes to conclude an equally fictitious treaty of peace.

All of these actions express what Mr. Kennedy calls Soviet "historical concerns" over the safety of its own frontiers. If Mr. Kennedy is willing to acknowledge that these concerns are historical, and to that extent acknowledges their validity, what "arrangements" can he work out to allay these concerns except by confirming Russia's title to all the territory it holds as a consequence of military occupation in World War II?

It is to be noticed that, while the State Department's long note to the Soviet Union of July 18 spoke of the right of self-determination of all the German people, and of the necessity of reunification of the whole of Germany, Mr. Kennedy did not once refer to unification in his speech.

What he seems to be offering Khrushchev is a settlement on the basis of the status quo, just so long as Berlin is left as it is. Although this will take care of "historical" Soviet concerns about Russian security, it will constitute no grant of freedom in eastern and central Europe, whatever Mr. Kennedy may choose to say about freedom.

As for the historical concern, Russian mobilization in 1914 had quite as much bearing on the outbreak of war as German iniquity, while the repetition of this conflict in 1941 resulted from a falling out between Hitler and Stalin because their territorial ambitions could not be mutually accommodated. It is admitting too much to concede that the Soviet Union has valid fears about the safety of its frontiers, for it need have none if it were willing to respect the frontiers of others.

#### COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 8429.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### INDUSTRIALIST SUPPORTS H.R. 4222—THE HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS ACT

(Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. HECHLER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, public support for the President's program to provide health care for the aged through social security has been building up at a dramatic rate over the last several months. Gallup poll figures show that 67 percent of the population favors the health benefits program contained in my bill, H.R. 4222. An increasing number of newspapers and responsible magazines have endorsed the program during last year, a major insurance company has declared itself in support, and a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Eisenhower administration has urged its enactment. Recently, H.R. 4222 has received the enthusiastic public backing of a substantial number of phy-

sicians. To this growing list of persons and organizations of stature and integrity who believe that the preservation of dignity in old age is a worthwhile goal, who are not paralyzed by shibboleths and scare words, and who know that effective Federal action is needed to finance the health needs of the aged, there has now been added another strong voice.

H.R. 4222 has been vigorously endorsed by one of America's greatest, most successful, and most imaginative industrialists, the president of Kaiser Industries Corp., Edgar F. Kaiser. Mr. Kaiser had hoped to appear before the Ways and Means Committee at its recent hearings on health care for the aged, but was unable to do so because of illness. He has just sent me the statement that he had hoped to present in person. This careful statement presents an excellent analysis of the reasons why one of the country's outstanding businessmen, who is also the head of a voluntary prepaid health plan serving more than 800,000 persons, believes that, in his words, "voluntary cost spreading organizations cannot, alone, meet the health care needs of retired persons adequately and realistically," and why "the simple and proven social security system, coupled with provision of services through private and voluntary organizations, constitutes the most practical and desirable solution yet proposed to this major national problem."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the text of Mr. Kaiser's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY EDGAR F. KAISER, PRESIDENT OF KAISER INDUSTRIES CORP. AND PRESIDENT OF KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN

#### INTRODUCTION

I appreciate the opportunity which this committee has afforded me to present the following statement in support of H.R. 4222, the King-Anderson bill, and I am sorry that an illness made it impossible for me to appear before you in person. The viewpoint on which this statement is based is the result of our combined experience in industry and in the prepaid health care field.

A management viewpoint: Kaiser Industries Corp., together with its affiliated companies, carries on a variety of industrial engineering and construction operations in the United States and throughout the free world. As management, we are concerned that too many Americans, individually, cannot afford the costs of being sick. We know that this problem is especially serious for retired people. As management we are also concerned with production costs and are keenly aware of the impact of additional payroll taxes on production costs. Because my principal work is in management, it is fundamental to me that the justification for increased payroll taxes must be real, substantial and pressing.

A health care viewpoint: Kaiser Foundation health plan is the largest community-based group-practice prepayment health care plan in the United States. It now serves well over 800,000 persons in the Pacific Coast States and Hawaii. As president of this health plan, I am vitally concerned with problems of health care and the distribution of health care costs.

The essence of the bill: In essence the King-Anderson bill provides for collection of funds on a very broad economic base, and disbursement of these funds to purchase needed services from private institutions.

Reluctant as I am to see increased payroll taxes, my combined experience in indus-

try and with our health plan has led me to conclude that the payroll costs increases required under this bill are warranted and necessary to provide a fair and adequate base for financing institutional health care services for our retired population.

Preference for private enterprise solutions: Before outlining the considerations leading to this conclusion, I want this committee to know that I appear as a proponent of voluntary solutions, within the framework of private enterprise, to the problems which confront our Nation. Indeed, it is because of my belief in private enterprise, rather than a socialized economy that I am submitting this statement in support of H.R. 4222.

King-Anderson bill is not socialized medicine: We firmly believe that the Kaiser Foundation health plan is the antithesis of socialized medicine. In fact, we feel that health plans such as our are the best single answer to socialized or Government-administered medicine. Similarly, I do not believe that the King-Anderson bill in any way fosters socialized medicine.

In many fields, Federal, State, and local governments must perform cost distributing functions which cannot be handled effectively through private institutions. Thus, our Nation's need for a highway system has been met through governmental collection of tax revenues to pay for the construction of highways.

Similarly, if a major national problem, such as financing health care services for retired persons, is not being effectively handled through nongovernmental means, then the Government has an obligation to assist.

King-Anderson bill will foster nongovernmental health care: The logical outgrowth of social security financing, as contrasted with appropriations from general revenues and administration through social welfare agencies, will be to keep a greater and increasing proportion of retired persons in the main stream of medical and hospital care, with services provided in private and voluntary hospitals. This will reduce reliance on county hospitals and other governmental institutions.

Thus, far from having socialistic implications, the King-Anderson bill will actually tend to strengthen the role of nongovernmental institutions. The expansion since World War II of voluntary prepaid health coverage by health insurance companies and service type health plans is the private enterprise alternative to a nationwide governmental health insurance program. In similar fashion, governmental distribution of the cost of key health care services for retired persons, with services actually being provided through private and voluntary means, constitutes not socialized medicine but rather an effective alternative to satisfy this need through private enterprise.

Is governmental cost distribution essential?

The answer to this question is undoubtedly and emphatically, "yes." But, in part, the question conceals the problem. Governmental action to finance health services for aged persons is not only necessary; it is a fundamental fact of our present medical economy.

The extent of government participation in providing health care to our citizens is indicated by the fact that in 1960, 25 percent of total expenditures for medical and hospital services were made by governmental agencies. In California, the State of my residence, two governmental programs alone will, by the end of this year, provide health care coverage paid for by tax revenues to nearly 60 percent of the population aged 65 and over. The first program—for the indigent aged—covers 256,000 persons, or about 18 percent of the population over 65 years of age. The second program—for the medi-

however, if returns on capital investments are not attractive in the United States, capital funds will seek markets overseas—as we have painfully witnessed in recent months—and they will be hoarded until a better investment opportunity appears.

We have heard much in the past year about how America must increase her economic growth rate—I could not agree more, but when will Government take the steps essential to promote such growth.

We cannot expect to achieve an income tax rate-schedule which will foster increased capital investment by permitting our Government to sink deeper and deeper into deficit spending as this necessarily precludes a sound revision of existing tax laws. Efficiently administered national defense expenditures are essential, of course, but Government expenditures in other areas could be sharply curtailed. Capital accumulation must precede capital formation for if business profits are half taxed away to pay for the many Government ventures, capital accumulation is severely restricted. Our present tax structure digs deeply into the very sources on which capital investment and a growth in our national employment depends. If we are to have a 3-, 4-, or 5-percent economic growth rate, we must revise our thinking about unfettered Government spending programs.

As stated initially, Members of Congress have an obligation to the 5.6 million unemployed and, more particularly, to the 1.6 million longtime unemployed. A realistic reappraisal of our national unemployment problem should be made, for the present administration has already demonstrated millions of dollars alone will not change the statistics. The administration is gearing its efforts to the results of unemployment, rather than the cause of the problem. The unemployed men and women, particularly those with families, cannot wait forever for a solution to their distress. It is time the widely circulated, fine sounding phrases of expanding job opportunities be replaced with the action necessary to encourage a growing economy, and an appropriately trained labor force.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. I think the point made by the gentleman is very definitely underscored by the statements which are made by the administration that we are at this moment in our economy on the upward move, as a matter of fact, rather dramatically moving upward, and it is anticipated that we will have in the period of high prosperity by the winter of 1961-62—and yet the administration spokesmen have been making it clear that they anticipate an unemployment low point of about 6 percent next winter. This in spite of their big spending program, in spite of their deficit financing, and presumably they are going to go ahead and spend more money from the Federal Government to try to correct this problem, even in a period of high prosperity. I think it is generally con-

ceded by even the economists who feel we should spend more than we take in in periods of recession, but certainly we should not do it in periods of prosperity because then you are just stoking the fires of inflation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman from New York is certainly correct in his statement. The thing that to me is tragic is the way the administration spokesmen say that if they get to a 4-percent unemployment figure, that is what we are always going to have. I do not understand such a negative approach to this thing, but they nonetheless have said that. In my judgment and in the judgment of many others I think we should not be content with such a figure.

Mr. GOODELL. It is almost as if they were anticipating the failure of their own program and are laying the groundwork in advance to prepare the public for the failure.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The point that the gentleman from New York just made was excellent because in 1960, during the campaign, there was a deliberate attempt first of all to plant a fear psychology in the minds of the people and then to work from that point.

Coming into power we find that a lot of their basic philosophies are anti-free enterprise, anti-American business. The unemployment statistics which the gentleman gives show a high and continued rate of unemployment which is at least in part the result of anti-America free enterprise attitude on the part of key administration officials.

Mr. DOLE. According to the administration, it will be the latter part of next year before we will have a substantial reduction in unemployment. We can account for a large part of that. That is not due to anything except the fact we have appropriated \$3.5 billion for defense. This will create new jobs. We are going to draft a couple of hundred thousand people, we are going to call the Reserves. That will take care of some unemployment. I do not think that is what we had in mind when we talked about an objective solution of this problem.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. We are going to take care of 200,000 to 300,000 young people by putting them in the armed services. The reason that is important is this: In the past 8 years of the recent administration, spokesmen of the present administration were constantly critical of this area of unemployment. They pointed to the recession year of 1954. I would point out that at that time we had just closed down the Korean war. We had returned out of the armed services many hundreds of thousands of young men, as well as many people from munition plants. We had to find jobs for them. To this day the administration spokesmen and economists will not pay any attention to the impact of war on employment. Sure, you can solve

unemployment tomorrow by going to war. The gentleman in his speech referred to the fact that the New Deal did not solve unemployment in the great depression; in fact, there were over 10 million unemployed after 6 or 7 years of its operation. Unemployment and the depression were solved by World War II, by America becoming the arsenal for the democracies. That is the record.

Our job is to try to figure out how we can take care of unemployment based upon a peacetime economy, not a wartime economy. I hope that the Kennedy administration will bear in mind as we look into these next few months that they have not been able to help alleviate unemployment by drafting people into the service.

I hope they do not try to take credit for that method of operation.

Mr. GOODELL. Regardless of whether they try to take credit for it or not, I hope they will assign the right reasons for the improvement in unemployment. I would agree it is related to the fact we have gone into an emergency, we are drafting more people, and it would be a sorry thing for them to claim that the big spending programs they have initiated were the reasons for some improvement in this figure. I think we all anticipate there will be a slight improvement due to the fact they are going to draft more people and take people in the Reserves. But that is not the way we want to solve the unemployment problem.

Mr. DOLE. I have heard it said they could draft people from the State Department and solve two problems: First, help unemployment, and, second, the world situation in general.

Full employment is and will continue to be a primary goal of the Republican Party. Full employment cannot be attained by wishful thinking, by massive expenditure of public moneys, by high sounding phrases, tours of inspection, or by Executive order. We are dealing with deep personal misfortunes of millions who have every right to expect progress, not pity, cooperation not charity, and, most of all, results not regimentation by Federal bureaucracy. To this end Congress should be dedicated.

Mr. GOODELL. I conclude by thanking my colleagues for their contribution this discussion and particularly to pay tribute to the chairman of our Operations Employment Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for the very great and constructive effort that he has put forth, and we are very proud of it—our party—both as Republicans and as Americans.

*CN file*  
**PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since last March the proposal for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations has been before the Rules Committee. Hearings on the measure were conducted on two occasions, and all essential aspects of the numerous resolutions advancing this important proposal have been carefully considered. I know that I express the thoughts and hopes of an overwhelming number of my colleagues when I say that the necessity and urgency of such a committee warrant immediate final determination of these resolutions. Time is running out in more ways than one.

WIDE SUPPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS

Wide popular support of the resolutions calling for a Special Committee on Captive Nations is clear and unmistakable. In these many months an impressive amount of evidence substantiating this support has accumulated. Led by the original resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] almost two dozen similar resolutions have been submitted as a clear reflection of this growing support.

Consistently, week after week, letters have been pouring in from all parts of the country in favor of such a special committee. The RECORD has shown some of this two or three times a week since last March. Moreover, in response to this popular support, the House Republican policy committee placed itself on record on May 23, 1961, fully and unequivocally backing the proposal of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK CRYSTALLIZES SUPPORT

Mr. Speaker, this year's observance of Captive Nations Week crystallized this support for a special committee. In area upon area one of the major themes of the observance was the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in this session of Congress. And, as was shown over a week ago in this chamber, this paramount theme was sounded not only in cities like New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, but also in Miami, New Orleans, and Los Angeles. I should like to add to the material and evidence provided in that discussion on Captive Nations Week, 1961, and the necessity of a Special Committee on Captive Nations—RECORD, July 24, pages 12203-12232. I request that at the conclusion of my address, this material from the Miami Herald, New Orleans Times Picayune, the Denver Register, and other sources be inserted in the RECORD. The mounting interest in the strategic importance and value of all the captive nations, as shown in every section of our country, offers solid justification for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. It cannot be emphasized too often that nowhere in this Nation is there any systematic, methodic and continuous study being made of the captive nations in the aggregate.

We in this body have now an excellent opportunity to satisfy this urgent need and to meet and abet the interest shown by our people in the captive na-

tions. This need, this interest—can be effectively realized and satisfied only by the creation of this special committee.

THE BERLIN CRISIS, THE PRESIDENT, AND MOSCOW

Mr. Speaker, it has frequently been pointed out that there is nothing more irritating, more fear inducing, more disturbing to the Moscow colonialists than the subject of captive nations. As a matter of fact, except for the U-2 incident last year, no single event in the last ten years has produced such an outburst of staged indignation and hurt than the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution by Congress in 1959. The most sensitive chord of Moscow's colonial empire was struck. Khrushchev knew it and most of us did.

We cannot ignore the fact that last year and, significantly again this year, Moscow and its colonial puppets have reacted even more vehemently and vituperatively to the Captive Nations Week observances. Last week, others pointed to the sharp attack in *Izvestia* and many puppet organs against President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week proclamation. To this I should like to add the fact that the Russian organ, *Pravda*, launched a similar attack in its July 21 issue. More than this, a report distributed by the American Committee of Liberation, which I append to my remarks, shows the staff of Radio Moscow going to the lengths of calling Mississippi Gov. Ross R. Barnett to establish for its listeners the fantastic thesis of enslaved people in the United States.

These and other facts demonstrate beyond doubt that we have pierced the sprawling Bear where it hurts most. We should be guided by this evidence and also profit by it, particularly in this period of the Berlin crisis. We should uncover, cultivate, and disseminate such facts in the interest of American public enlightenment and also of U.S. policy and action. Once again, for the purpose and objective only a Special Committee on Captive Nations can do the enormous job required.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to mention a grievous error committed by the President in his address to the Nation last week on the Berlin crisis. But this also proves the need for precise and sound knowledge about the captive nations which a special committee, by its specialized undertaking of study and information, can guarantee and insure. The President's statement. "We recognize the Soviet Union's historical concern about their security in central and eastern Europe after a series of ravaging invasions," is shocking for its historical inaccuracy and lack of factual base. I shudder to think what the Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian, White Ruthenian, Polish, Byelorussian and other captives in and outside the Soviet Union must feel upon hearing this—their lands ravaged and exploited by Moscow. But this dominant fact is rationalized away by an American President under the cloak of some fictitious historical concern on the part of the Soviet Union for its security. And this only 1 week after the President's proclamation of Captive Nations Week.

ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, when we witness such gross inaccuracies and historical fatuities on the highest levels of our Government, what could be expected from some other spheres of our society with regard to accurate knowledge and understanding of our natural allies, the captive nations? This should be reason enough for the establishment of a special committee devoted to this vital subject. However, there have been many reasons offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania and others—reasons which have yet to be refuted—RECORD, May 10, pages 7221-7222.

I should like to add to those reasons and arguments the following points which have emerged in discussion about this crucial subject:

First. A Special Committee on Captive Nations would have definite legislative intent. This intent is indicated in the proposal and resolutions. The sequence of events leading to the full realization of this intention would be:

(a) Extensive and intensive study and investigation;

(b) Conclusions based on the committee's findings;

(c) Recommendations founded on conclusions for legislative action; and

(d) Formulation of legislative acts in connection with the captive nations. A whole spectrum of activities in relation to the Red colonial empire could conceivably come for reexamination in the light of the committee's findings.

Second. In reality, such a committee would not encroach upon the work of any standing committee. The outstanding fact is that none of our committees is engaged in a systematic, methodic, and continuous study of the captive nations as a whole, in the aggregate. Indeed, our committee structures do not even run along these lines to perform the tasks contemplated. For example, with the draft of the 20-year plan announced by Moscow, it is appropriate to ask what committee has had the time and resources to investigate the reality of economic imperialism and colonialism within the Soviet Union or the plight of the over 30 million Moslems in this empire? Yet, one need not think twice about the possible impact that detailed facts in these areas could produce on our legislation and general policy.

Third. These examples alone suggest that considerable time, effort, and application would be necessary for the fulfillment of the objectives of such a committee. No existing committee could possibly afford this. A special committee, comprised of Members who have a profound interest in the captive nations and are dedicated to the task of showing the tremendous strategic value the captive nations have for the security of our Nation and the free world, could alone meet these requirements.

Fourth. There are, of course, numerous proposals and resolutions made for special and select committees to deal with various matters. But who, in these times of foreign crises, the threat of Moscow, and the threat of war, would deny the priority of purpose and value



attached to the necessity of studying, knowing, understanding, and functionally appreciating the captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union? It is an open secret that we lag badly in this important respect and yet, sooner perhaps than we think, we may have to depend heavily on these natural allies in the Red colonial empire.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons and the many others that have been given since the beginning of March that I urge speedy bipartisan action on the resolutions proposing a Special Committee on Captive Nations. The full justification for such a committee is being discussed and well received in many quarters of this Nation. As a further example of this, I wish to introduce as part of my remarks the lecture delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "A History of Communist Aggression." This lecture was given last week at the anticommunism strategy seminar held at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. One of the conclusions reached by Dr. Dobriansky is that our general knowledge of the history of Communist aggression is basically faulty. In the public interest, in the interest of our national security, this defect can be rapidly overcome by the work and effort of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this time an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Tuesday, August 1, entitled "Ventriloquist," which is illustrative of the Red propaganda against Western imperialism and other illogical suggestions that we turn the tables on the Communists in this arena.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up my purpose in once more calling this matter to the attention of the House, may I point out that we are obviously in the home stretch of this congressional session. It would be most practical for the Rules Committee to approve a captive nations resolution so that the House could act, and the committee organize and commence this most needed work immediately at the close of the session. It is my understanding that the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has had numerous invitations to appear before the Rules Committee on this subject, and has failed to avail himself of the opportunity.

I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that I am in error if I draw the conclusion that there is a deliberate attempt being made to block the creation of this special House committee on captive nations. Surely there must be some people in our State Department with enough imagination and energy to realize that we must take the counteroffensive in propaganda against the Soviet Union, and that this special House committee would perform a tremendously important function to the benefit of our State Department in its concern with international problems. I have repeatedly emphasized the value of this committee to our representatives in the United Nations and to the entire American position in world affairs. I am convinced

that a vast majority of House Members would give the creation of this committee their vigorous support, and I express my appreciation to my colleagues who have been untiring in their efforts to achieve this goal.

The sands of time in this session, Mr. Speaker, are running out. They must not do so before we have created this committee, put it to work, and then properly anticipate its progress, accomplishments, and effective contribution to the cause of freedom for the enslaved captives of communism.

#### A HISTORY OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University, to the Anti-Communism Strategy Seminar held at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.)

"History is bunk"—so observed one of America's foremost industrialists and a prominent maker of history. Instinctively, of course, we would brush this statement aside, as, indeed, many in the past have. But actually this extreme observation cannot be written off entirely because, in fact, there is much bunk in the written histories of Eastern Europe and central Asia which constitute primary and basic parts of the composite history of Communist aggression. In our schools and in the public forum much of this bunk is being uncritically transmitted, and the results become clearly and appallingly evident in the bleak record of our struggle with communism.

For some quite intellectually vulnerable critics of these indispensable seminars this may be the introduction to an extremist speech. However, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the contents of this lecture are open to any honest criticism by popular deliberation rather than by secret memoranda. Many scholars, writers, and leaders with a keen sense of history have pointed to this grave defect in the fundamental history of Communist aggression. Among them, even President Truman has said: "I have several histories of Russia—not one of which has been satisfactory. Most of them are based on ideas that were formed before the man started his book and are not based on facts."<sup>1</sup> In short, if our historical accounts of Russia, the base of the world Communist conspiracy, are inaccurate and even fictitious, then what can be expected of our higher formulations of thought, concept, policy, and operation regarding this global menace?

#### LESSONS FROM THE HISTORY OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

"Human history," said H. G. Wells, "is in essence a history of ideas." The history of Communist aggression is undoubtedly a major episode of human history and in basic essence sharpens the contrast between the ideas of national and personal freedom and those of imperialist domination and totalitarian control. History, one can say, is philosophy teaching by examples, and the examples we shall consider here are not, as Khrushchev would have it, evidence of any spurious contest between communism and capitalism but, instead, growing examples of Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism versus national self-determination and personal liberty. Needless to say, those who do not know or remember the history of Communist aggression are condemned to repeat it.

What, then, can we learn from this history? What are the general lessons to be gained from the history of Communist ag-

gression? For one, this history provides an indispensable background for our understanding of the motives, aims, and actions of the last formidable imperialist power on earth. It, more than anything else, empirically and concretely answers the essential question, "How did this menace come to be what it is?" In effect, it answers the further crucial question, "What is the nature of the threat?" Second, the history of Communist aggression portrays a genetic development of conquest, predation, and exploitation without which pure analysis remains sterile. In this respect, our short understanding of this history explains in largest measure our persistent misconception of the Soviet Union, our gullibility for skillful Russian propaganda, and our constant reactionism to the cold war ventures of the adversary.

The third important product of a complete history of Communist aggression is a vivid appreciation of what the aggressed, the conquered think and feel about the nature of the disease rather than what we, at a remote distance in time, place, or experience, think it to be or what the conqueror pretends it to be. For example, in 1956 the Hungarian patriot shouted, "Russkie, go home!" instead of wasting his breath on the myth of communism, and earlier in the same year the Georgian patriot scrawled on the public buildings of Tiflis the positive slogan "Long live an independent Georgia!" instead of the negative one "Down with communism!" These and endless more teachings by example lead to the fourth benefit derived from the history of Communist aggression; namely, the insights obtained for opportunities of action, of the positive offensive, against the calculating and increasingly confident enemy.

Thus a complete and factually grounded history of Communist aggression is indispensable to our thoughts and actions in the permanent cold war staged by Moscow. It is no more necessary for our behavior and operations in any hot global war. The history of Communist aggression is the very basis of justification and confirmation of the sound warning given by the renowned Russian philosopher, Nicholas Berdyaev: "It is particularly important for Western minds to understand the national roots of Russian communism and the fact that it was Russian history which determined its limits and shaped its character. A knowledge of Marxism will not help in this."<sup>2</sup> As one views the history of Communist aggression over the years—including even the form of spiritual aggression against certain non-Russian nations prior to 1917—this sober warning sounded by one of Russia's greats in this century cannot be repeated too often.

#### THE BACKGROUND OF THE WHITE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

It is an open secret that we Americans are not exactly conspicuous in the areas of historical research, interpretation, and analysis. In fact, until recently, in our schools and in our daily existence we have even shown a disdain for historical inquiry and historical understanding. With regard to the reality of Communist aggression some of us woke up only when colonial Moscow took to overt means of threat and bluff against the interests of the United States following World War II. Of little concern was it to most of us that we, by private or official agency, helped substantially to build up this monster from 1917 to the present, either by commission or omission of various deeds and works. Without the indispensable aid of history we were content to form our illusions, some of which thrive this very day, such as the illusion that the cold war began

<sup>1</sup> Hillman, William, "Mr. President," New York, 1952, p. 232.

<sup>2</sup> Berdyaev, Nicholas, "The Origin of Russian Communism," London, 1948, p. 7.

in 1947, or the illusion that Communist aggression commenced with the Russian invasion of Poland in September 1939, or the illusion that if Marx hadn't existed, we would not be threatened from the Russian source today. These and other illusions can only be permanently dissolved by grasping the major forces and patterns in the history of Communist aggression.

As Berdyaev, Struve and others solidly teach, it is impossible to arrive at such a grasp without an intensive analysis of the real, empirical background to the series of Communist aggressions in our time. The roots of these aggressions by Soviet Russia rest deep in the background presented by the White Russian Empire of the Czars.

Every conceivable Communist technique today has an able institutional precedent in the empire-building enterprise started by Ivan the Terrible in the 16th century: divide and conquer, conspiratorial networks, genocide, Russification, two steps forward and one backward, broken treaties, a self-assuring mystical messianism, smokescreens of totalistic ideologies, political partitionism, the police state, inventions and distortions of history, incitement of class struggles, slave labor, anti-Semitic pogroms, Potemkin village tactics, peaceful coexistence—in brief, the fashioned implements of cold war gaming aimed at eventual conquest.

Lest we deceive ourselves, we are bucking up against 500 years of cumulative empire-building experience from which Lenin primarily drew on and Von Clausewitz distilled his classic cold war formulations. It is an experience based on the institutional nexus of internal totalitarian rule and external imperialism and colonialism. It is an experience masked by a succession of deceptive ideologies: the Third Rome doctrine of Orthodox supremacy, racist Pan-Slavism, and materialistic communism.<sup>3</sup> Where it serves Moscow's purposes, each of these is put into use today. For example, the Morros testimony which led to the Soble spy case in New York brought out the fact that, as Morros put it, the "Russian plot \* \* \* goes beyond communism. They are for Pan-Slavism on a scale more ambitious than Hitler's fanatical dreams of world conquest."<sup>4</sup> And Morros operated with functionaries on the highest levels of the Kremlin conspiratorial setup.

But more immediate to the first phase in the history of Communist aggression is the period from the end of the 19th century to the downfall of the White Russian Empire. We cannot intelligibly comprehend the first wave of Soviet Russian aggression unless we come to know and appreciate the powerful force of nationalism which manifested and expressed itself in the empire during this period. Regrettably our studies of this subject are virtually nil, and as a consequence we are ill prepared today to exploit in behalf of world freedom this same force operating within the Soviet Union.

The White Russian Empire suffered from the same rebellious upsurge of patriotic nationalism that the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires did. We know of the Polish resistance and fight for national freedom in the spirit of Mickiewicz, Kosciuszko, and Pulaski, but do you know of the freedom fighters and the resistance against Russian domination elsewhere within the empire: the White Ruthenians Kalinovsky and Hryniavetski who assassinated Alexander II in 1881; the Ukrainian Shevchenko and the pervasive spirit of Mazepa in subjugated Ukraine; the jealous independence of the Don and Kuban Cossacks in the spirit of Razin and Pugachov; Chamyl, the freedom star of the Caucasus and the innumerable revolts of the North Caucasian peoples

throughout the 19th century; the Muslim Congresses of 1905-06 through which Turk-estani and Azerbaijani formed a religious common front against Russian colonialism?

This is only a small fraction of the history for freedom in Eastern Europe and Central Asia—a history that assumes increasing meaning, value and significance in the light of current developments in Turkestan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. In marked measure the Russian defeat in the Russo-Japanese War was attributable to the rumblings and dissension of the subjugated non-Russian peoples, and the Revolution of 1905 was in part the explosion of this force of nationalism. A decade later, in World War I, mass desertions of these non-Russian nationals crippled the so-called military steamroller of the Russian Empire; and over two decades later—after a long period of ostensible Communist indoctrination—millions of these non-Russians deserted again, practically placing the platter of victory before the Germans. Even the socialist movement in the White Russian Empire was split along national lines, such as the Armenian Socialist Party, the Tartarian Socialist Revolutionary Party, the Ukrainian Socialist Democratic Party and others.

Although we still have to uncover and make use of these facts, in the field of experience the Bolsheviks led by Lenin knew them well and used them well for their own ends. Today, this account would be condemned by Moscow as "the provocations of bourgeois nationalism"; before the collapse of the White Russian Empire it was accepted by the forthcoming heirs of the empire in the name of national self-determination. "If Finland, if Poland, if the Ukraine break away from Russia," wrote Lenin, "there is nothing bad about it. \* \* \* Anyone who says there is, is a chauvinist. No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations." As today in Africa and Asia, this record on national self-determination was played over and over again until the overwhelming force of non-Russian nationalism contributed heavily to the breakup of the White Russian Empire in 1917. But it wasn't too long before Lenin and the heirs of the empire proved themselves as outright chauvinists. By the established techniques of lies and deception they committed a spiritual aggression even before 1917.

You and I know of the two Russian Revolutions in 1917, but how many of us are aware of the widespread Non-Russian Revolutions for national freedom and independence at that time? Yet the significance of these Non-Russian Wars of Independence cannot but have profound meaning for us today. Independent national republics were established in area after area: Idel-Ural, November 12, 1917; Finland, December 6, 1917; Ukraine, January 22, 1918; Kuban Cossackia, February 16, 1918; Lithuania, February 16, 1918, followed in that year by Estonia, White Ruthenia, Don Cossackia, North Caucasia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Poland and Latvia. In Siberia, on April 4, 1920, the Democratic Republic of the Far East was founded, and in Central Asia a republic was proclaimed by Turkestan on April 15, 1922. With some of these, such as Georgia, Poland and Ukraine, formal recognition was tendered by Soviet Russia by treaty or official declaration. Yet, in short time, only a few of these independent nations and states survived the first wave of Soviet Russian imperialism.

#### THE FIRST WAVE OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

As shown in part by the former Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, the history of Communist aggression commenced with the onslaught by Trotsky's Red

Russian army against most of these non-Russian republics.<sup>5</sup> States like Ukraine and Georgia were subverted, conquered, and made to appear as independent Soviet Republics by the end of 1920. Familiar techniques of "intensive revolution," infiltration, propaganda distortion, espionage, conspiracy and planted governments were in full use before the military blow struck. One republic was picked off after another on the traditional basis of divide-and-conquer. By 1922 the first wars between non-Russian nations and Soviet Russia were over, and on January 31, 1924, the forcible incorporation of these many nations into the new prison house of nations was formally declared with the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A new Red Russian Empire was now in being.

This eventful period gives us much cause for serious and sober reflection, and the fruits of this reflection may have considerable bearing on our own future and destiny. The "ifs" of history are just as much parts of reality as the "whens." If the leaders of the victorious West had understood the nationalist forces at work throughout the Russian Empire and fully supported them on the principle of national self-determination, it is reasonable to assume that communism would have only been a short echo in the arena of human history. If the Russians desired to apply its philosophy on the legitimate terrain of Russia, then, as in the similar case of Germany, nazism and non-Germans, non-Russians wouldn't go to war over it. If these newly independent non-Russian republics had formed a common front against Soviet Russian imperialism, the outcome of world developments would surely have been different. Little is it appreciated that the first smashing defeat of the imperialist forces of Soviet Russia was registered in 1920 by the Polish-Ukrainian alliance between Pilsudsky and Petlura. If their combined forces had crossed the proper borders of Russia and completely wiped out the Red Russian Army, Europe and the rest of the world would certainly have benefited from far more than a 20-year breathing period. As reflections of historical reality many of these "ifs" have pointed meaning for us today.

Foolish, indeed, is the notion that Soviet Russian aggression starts and finishes with a military war. After the conquest of any non-Russian country the aggression continues—in fact is intensified—against the institutions, the historical past, and the future hopes and aspirations of the conquered people. Finland, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia escaped the ravages of this aggression in the 1920's and 1930's. The other non-Russian nations, now parts of the Red Russian Empire under the guise of the Soviet Union, were not this fortunate. The two decades are historically replete with deportations, slave labor, a horrible man-made famine in 1931-32, severe Russification, the Vinnitsa genocide, and extensive economic colonialism. It is in this period that Khrushchev first soaked his hands in the blood of these early and first captive peoples.<sup>6</sup> It is also in this period that so-called Soviet history is punctuated with recurring uprisings, passive resistance, and the mortal danger of "bourgeois nationalism," as witness the uprisings of 1929-30 and the purges of 1935 and 1937 in Georgia, the revolt of the young Turkestani in the Basmachi underground during 1935-41, the armed revolts of the Azerbaijani in 1925, 1929-30, and 1933,

<sup>5</sup> Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R., House of Representatives, 1954.

<sup>6</sup> "The Crimes of Khrushchev," pt. 2, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, 1959.

<sup>3</sup> Radzinski, John M., "Masks of Moscow," Illinois, 1960, p. 268.

<sup>4</sup> The New York Times, Aug. 13, 1957.

<sup>5</sup> Lenin, V.I., "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," New York, 1951, p. 123.

and the persistent opposition of the Ukrainians which caused a Russian satrap, Kossior, to blurt out in 1933 that "Ukrainian nationalism is our chief danger." Aside from revisionism, the greatest and most enduring of crimes in the Soviet Union today is so-called bourgeois nationalism, which for us is plain national patriotism.

Most important in this first stage of Soviet Russian aggression is the dominant fact that the imperio-colonial foundation was laid for the subsequent waves of Moscow's aggressions, whether direct or indirect. History was indeed repeating itself. The cycle of Russian conquests in the 18th and 19th centuries was again in motion. Without these conquered non-Russian areas, Russia and its 100 million people in itself could only be a second- or third-rate power. Ukraine by itself stands as the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain. It should be noted, too, that the major economic resources in the U.S.S.R. are largely concentrated in the non-Russian nations. Turkestan, which Moscow deliberately partitioned into five artificial central Asiatic republics and exploits severely, literally abounds in diverse natural resources. Over 110 million non-Russian captives under the alien yoke of Moscow live in the Soviet Union today. About 24 million were added in the second wave of Soviet Russian aggression in World War II.

#### THE SECOND WAVE OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

This second wave of Soviet Russian aggression was really triggered off by Moscow signing a 10-year nonaggression treaty with Berlin on August 24, 1939. The treaty paved the way to the Nazi invasion of Poland, the outbreak of World War II followed, and the opportunity for Russian colonial expansion presented itself in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic States. The paramount feature of this massive aggression was, of course, the forced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Moscow's prison house of nations. The fate met by other non-Russian nations in 1924 now, inevitably, befell these. Dependent on the fortunes of World War II, it was only a matter of time before others would meet a similar fate.

The struggle for national freedom in Eastern Europe and central Asia in the very course of World War II is a saga of invincible will and heroism still to be written for the benefit of the free world. While the war gave Soviet Russia the opportunity to extend its colonialism, it also gave the non-Russian captives an equal opportunity to strike for national freedom. Even some freedom-loving Russians saw their opportunity, too. As in World War I, mass desertions from the polyglot multinational armed forces of the U.S.S.R. were the order of the time. White Ruthenians, Cossacks, Bashkiri, Georgians, Tartars, Chechens, Ukrainians, and others who were supposed to be hopelessly indoctrinated by communism deserted in the millions in the hope of fighting for the freedom of their lands. For example, let's listen to the words of a German journalist on the eastern front: "The steady flow of Ukrainian volunteers for the German forces we ignored. The millions of Ukrainians, who by themselves could have turned the scales in the east, were not only being left unused, but were actually being repulsed and disillusioned."<sup>8</sup>

Here, in a nutshell, is the explanation of the unsurpassed political blunder in this century. The German Nazis attempted to foist their type of imperialist totalitarianism upon these non-Russian nations and in reality, fortunately for us, it cost them the war and victory. Throughout this period and, as a matter of fact, up to 1950 the national un-

derground systems of Lithuania, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Turkestan, and others engaged in guerrilla warfare against both the Russian and German totalitarians and later against the Russians and their colonial puppets. Our interest in guerrilla warfare today can be well satisfied by a study of the warfare waged by the Ukrainian insurgent army in that period.<sup>9</sup> To project this further, there is abundant evidence to show that throughout the last decade this resistance and opposition of so-called bourgeois nationalism has by no means diminished in the Soviet Union. Arrests for this crime of crimes continue under Khrushchev.

As we now turn to the third wave of Soviet Russian aggression, the tragedy of having won the war but lost the peace should awaken us to some grave defects and failures of our thinking and policymaking regarding aggressive Soviet Russia: Imagine, twice in this century we have suffered this tragedy. The colossal naivete of our leaders was displayed in the Yalta agreements and other unnecessary concessions made to the greatest imperialist power on earth. Up to that time hundreds of agreements, treaties, and promises had been callously broken by colonial Moscow but, for a variety of reasons, our leaders felt it could not happen to us. The roots of today's Berlin crisis go back to this period, and so does the captivity of many additional non-Russian nations. The causal reasons of ignorance and even degrees of Russophilism, then, are still at work today.<sup>10</sup>

#### THE THIRD WAVE OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

In short, by these reasons, we, the victors of World War II and the advocates of national independence and personal freedom, literally accommodated the third wave of Soviet Russian aggression. The list of victims is as long as that of the first wave in 1920-23: In 1945, Poland, Moldavia, East Germany, multinational Yugoslavia, Outer Mongolia; 1946, Albania, Bulgaria; 1947, Hungary; 1948 Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Rumania; 1949, mainland China, where, we were told, an "agrarian revolution" was under way.

Whether by military occupation or by indirect means of the traditional Russian borderlands policy or "intensive revolution," the process of aggression and the end result of conquest and domination of a people are the same. Satraps in most of these areas are Moscow-bred, and although differences have arisen, as in the cases of captive Poland, satellite Yugoslavia, the junior partner, Red China, or rascal Albania, who logically can deny that the permanence of the unrepresentative regimes in any of these areas is inseparably bound up with the strength and future of their originator, Soviet Russia? Aggression by indirection was shown in Korea in 1950.

With the inner colonial ring in the Soviet Union and now the outer colonial ring in central Europe and Asia, Moscow had placed itself in position to penetrate, directly or indirectly—through its captives, junior partner, satellite, or quisling Communist groups in the world at large—any area of the free world, including ours. The world's masters in empire building continued to reap successes of indirect aggression despite the alliances, the United Nations, the horrendous presence of nuclear weapons, the Maginot wall of containment. By the use of Moscow's traditional argument of no interference in internal affairs, by skillful propaganda inducing fears of war, and by gaining sanctuary from us in the consolidation of their vast empire, they have a free field for subversion, infiltration, and indirect aggression in the nontotalitarian free world.

<sup>8</sup> Codo, Enrique M., "Guerrilla Warfare in the Ukraine," *Military Review*, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., November 1960.

<sup>10</sup> Crocker, George N., "Roosevelt's Road to Russia," Chicago, 1959, p. 248.

#### FREE AGGRESSIVE PLAY IN THE FREE WORLD

By our basic policy of containment we accommodate colonial Moscow in a free aggressive play in the nontotalitarian free world. Tibet in 1951, North Vietnam in 1954, and Cuba in 1959 are further results of this play. What new nations will be listed into captivity in this decade: Laos, Cambodia, Iran, Iraq? These and others are real possibilities for which economic aid, military assistance, the United Nations, singly or in combination, are not the adequate answer.

To approach the adequate answer, it is necessary to keep firmly in mind this outline of the history of Communist aggression. Within the framework of this outline many other detailed acts of aggression can be included, as, for example, in Spain, Greece, Iran, Guatemala, and elsewhere. But whatever additional facts are assembled, it should be clear that as the permanent instigator of the cold war, Moscow is a constant aggressor. In less speedy times and with less advanced technology the princes of Muscovy were also on the permanent aggressive, and with patience, skill, fraud and deception, built an enormous and unique empire. The inheritors of that empire may use different specious arguments but employ substantially the same techniques and, above all, have the same patience and propaganda skills. As before, so now, what falls under the Iron Curtain becomes an "internal affair," and what lies outside the curtain of the empire is the field for free aggressive play. What, then, can we do? Or, in other words, what profits us to know the history of Communist aggression?

#### THE LESSONS AND GUIDELINES OF THIS HISTORY

The "ifs" of history, as I said, are parts of our reality, for they continually haunt us into wiser and more intelligent action in the present and for the future. If, for example, our Western leaders had a vivid appreciation of the first wave of Soviet Russian aggression and the already long record of Moscow's broken agreements, with proper action in 1945 we would not today be confronted by any Berlin crisis. These "ifs" sharpen the lessons of history and contribute to its guidelines of our action in the present.

These lessons and guidelines of the history of Soviet Russian aggression are as follows:

1. The nature of the threat, or the disease, or the cancer—characterized however you will—is the imperio-colonial system of Soviet Russia. This system has historical roots in 500 years of empire building. By virtue of its materialistic basis and character, the ideology of communism—in essence a millenarian ideology of economic myth—is only a weapon of deception but more powerful than the preceding ideological weapons of orthodox supremacy and pan-slavism. It is hardly encouraging to know that we are fighting against an ideological myth. In posing the spurious conflict between communism and capitalism Khrushchev would want us to fight the myth rather than the blood-and-flesh reality of totalitarian Russian domination. Philosophically and economically, Marxism bears as much relationship to the Red totalitarian empire as mercantilism does to our society. As one writer aptly puts it, "Like a bull in the arena, we have been concentrating on the red cloth rather than the matador behind it."<sup>11</sup>

2. The paramount challenge is not in the area of comparative military power and build up but in the determining area of propoganda, political psychology, and psychological warfare. It is in this latter area that images are built up, minds are moved, and loyalties shifted. Bred on Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, and 500 years of em-

<sup>11</sup> Radzinski, John M., "Masks of Moscow," p. xiii.

<sup>8</sup> Kern, Erich, "The Dance of Death," *New York*, 1951, pp. 103-104.

pire building, the present Russian totalitarians are masters of the art and experts in Potemkin Village tactics, stretching from space to athletics. On the basis of all available evidence, the Gagarin story may well turn out to be the gangrene story of history, and I am convinced that Moscow cannot possibly, with any hope of victory, commit its multinational armed forces in any serious military engagement. We saw what happened in Hungary; we saw what happened in the two World Wars and the Russo-Japanese War. In comparison with these political psychological experts, we've been but puny amateurs, despite the ace cards available to us. It requires little imagination to call men to arms; it requires much in imagination and vision to exploit the weaknesses of the enemy to eventually strangle him without the horrible costs of a hot war.

3. The policy of liberation, accurately construed, is inescapable for our country if we are determined to survive as an independent nation.<sup>12</sup> In addition to the given quantity of armed protection, the greatest weapon we have is the captive nations of Europe and Asia. The case of Hungary proved our failure to implement this policy, not the inefficacy of the policy itself. With good reason there is nothing more frightening to Moscow than a developing concentration by us on the numerous captive non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. itself.<sup>13</sup> In the U.N. debate on colonialism and imperialism last year the Canadian Prime Minister had the courage to bring up the colonialism and imperialism rampant in the Soviet Union, and Moscow went into convulsions.<sup>14</sup> The image of Russian power could be changed overnight with this concentration on Russian colonialism and imperialism within the U.S.S.R., and with enormous impact on Asia, Africa, and Latin America.<sup>15</sup> Many of us still haven't pondered over the question, "Why was it that Khrushchev, sitting on a pile of missiles and nuclear bombs and boasting about economic progress and victory of communism, almost suffered apoplexy when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959?"<sup>16</sup> The answer was the call for this concentration. Today a proposal is before the House Rules Committee to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations for the purpose of achieving this concentration. But there is no question that Russophilic and other elements in our Department of State resist and oppose endeavors in this area.

(4) Based on the salient features of the history of Communist aggression and also the unique development of our Nation, our course of policy and action must be in the explicit and frank terms of a universalized declaration of independence. A declaration aimed primarily at all the captive non-Russian nations in the Red totalitarian empire and also at the freedom-loving rather than just the peace-loving masses of the Russian nation.

Paradoxically enough, Marx recognized a century ago the same problem that faces us today: "They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the

timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way."

[From the Miami Herald, July 17, 1961]

**K.'S FREEDOM TALK A CRUEL JOKE—THE CAPTIVES REMEMBERED**

Two holes in the Iron Curtain are leaking people by the thousands.

The closest is Cuba. Fugitives from short rations and militarization there are streaming across the Florida Straits any way they can. Immigration officials expect the torrent of refugees to crest during the next 8 days. Cubans fear the Red Dictator Fidel Castro's blatantly advertised speech on July 26 will seal the island tight, forbidding the departure of anyone but the aged.

But the biggest leak remains in West Berlin, an enclave of freedom more than 100 miles inside Communist East Germany. Since 1949, about 2.6 million East Germans have fled to the West. The flow increased sharply when Nikita Khrushchev began whipping up a new Berlin crisis. Now it is nearly 5,000 a week.

On the other side of the globe, Hong Kong is jampacked with fugitives from starvation in Red China. Tibetans are trudging over high mountain passes into India to avoid extermination at the hands of Chinese Communists.

All these refugees are the lucky ones: they got away.

What of the 840 million other men, women, and children held in bondage by communism, the only expanding colonial empire on earth today? They have not been forgotten, in the United States, at least.

Captive Nations Week, which started yesterday, is designed to remind the world of the victims of Sino-Soviet imperialism. Its sponsors are men who made their way to this country from once-free nations conquered by Communist force or guile.

The list is long and melancholy. It begins with nations or land areas incorporated, willy-nilly, into the Soviet Union. Their names are familiar in some cases—Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, East Prussia. Others have exotic titles which mean little to most Americans—Bessarabia, Bukovina, Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia, Karelia, Sakhalin, Tannu Tuva, the Kurile Islands.

The new colonialists maintain the myth of independence for many of their captive nations, but they are truly colonies of the Sino-Soviet Communist Empire. Next door Cuba is the latest.

"You know that on the national question the Soviet Union is invariably guided by the principle of the right of nations to self-determination," Khrushchev blandly told an African assembly.

Then he bellowed like a bull under the branding iron when the National Captive Nations Committee suggested free elections behind the Iron Curtain.

A counteroffensive for freedom has been proposed by Dr. Charles Malik, the Lebanese diplomat who was president of the United Nations General Assembly in 1958. He is now professor or philosophy at the American University in Washington.

Dr. Malik urges the United States to take the offensive in debates with Communists in the United Nations and elsewhere.

"Those who believe in the dignity of man and his freedom, who know truth and trust in God \* \* \* must pass to the offensive, not only of thought and conviction, but of that real, decisive, historical action which shall cause the Communists to take to their heels," says the philosopher-statesman.

This week is as good a time as any to commence.

[From the Miami Herald]

**COMMUNISM: WHAT IT MEANS TO YOU  
THEIR WORK WILL GO ON—LEGAL? ILLEGAL?  
REDS DON'T CARE**

(By Jeanne Bellamy)

New rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court should handicap the efforts of Communists to conquer this country. But the Reds will keep trying. They have orders to work illegally even if outlawed.

The Court upheld the right of Congress to find that the Communist movement is controlled by the Soviet Union. Therefore, it and its members must register as agents of a foreign power and tell where the party's money comes from.

Citizens are free to join the Communist Party, but they are guilty of a crime if the Government can prove they know its purpose is to establish Communist totalitarian dictatorship by whatever means necessary.

This applies to outright members of the party. They are a small part of the Communist network. They work through fellow-travelers, fronts, sympathizers and dupes. The party members are the trained, dedicated conflict managers—the self-starters for the whole apparatus serving as communism's transmission belt.

What they are trying to foist on this Nation and every other is an idea more than a century old which history's march has made obsolete. Karl Marx, founder of communism, based his theory on conditions which existed in the infancy of the industrial age. He lived at a time when laborers in factories and on farms worked long hours for low pay. He decided, erroneously, that the cure was for these workers to seize all real estate by violence, throw out the owners and run everything themselves.

Marx claimed infallibility for his doctrine. However, he has been proved wrong on at least two counts. He failed to foresee that employees would become capitalists, as in the United States today. He thought his revolution would occur first in the most industrialized countries, but only the least developed have fallen into its clutches.

Nothing much was done about Marx's proposal until Russians rebelled against their czar in 1917. Nikolai Lenin, who had studied Marx's writings, added some thoughts of his own and put the combination into practice. With a few henchmen, Lenin overthrew the real revolutionists in Russia, and took over.

Lenin's contribution to Marxism was absolute regimentation. He said political, economic, and intellectual life must be ruled by the Communist Party—an elite group unbound by any law or ethical consideration. Individual rights should be disregarded, according to Lenin, and terrorism used at will to enforce conformity.

The methods of Lenin and his successors date back nearly a thousand years. Then the hordes of Genghis Kahn, a Mongol warlord, overran Asia and Eastern Europe, including Russia and Poland, to the gates of Vienna. Like those ancient barbarians, modern Communists get control of a country any way they can, by force or guile. Then they kill or imprison every leader who opposes them, and proceed to rule through handpicked stooges.

From their base in Russia, Communists quickly enlarged their empire. First, they conquered nearby nations, forcing them to join the Soviet Union. Today they control over one-third of the earth's surface and one-fourth of the human race, including China.

A recent conquest is the island of Cuba, only 90 miles from the United States. Their announced purpose is to use Cuba as a springboard for taking over the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

<sup>12</sup> Dobriansky, Lev E., "A Policy of Emancipation and Liberation of Khrushchev's Captives," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 20, 1961, pp. 12174-12176.

<sup>13</sup> Smal-Stocki, Roman, "The Captive Nations," New York, 1960, pp. 98-101.

<sup>14</sup> "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire," Neve Zuercher Zeitung, Switzerland, Nov. 20, 1960.

<sup>15</sup> Barton, Paul, "Imperialism in the Soviet Union," NATO letter, June 1961 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, pp.1225-1227).

<sup>16</sup> Dobrianski, Lev E., "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 21, 1960, pp. 918-923.

They never have made a secret of their aim. It is simply to conquer the whole world by fair means or foul; by subversion, if possible; by shooting, if necessary.

To that end, they have set up Communist Parties in 83 countries. The 33 million members are mostly in the Soviet Union and Communist China. The rest, whether in large groups or small, work day and night, openly or secretly, to extend communism's domain.

Present membership in the Communist Party of the United States is estimated at fewer than 22,000. But that number cannot be dismissed as insignificant. Party members are an organized, disciplined force, shrewd and determined to reach their goal. They are backed by the immense resources of their international army. Their power can be measured by the fact that when Lenin captured Russia, his followers numbered only 240,000 out of a population greater than the present 183 million in the United States.

Why would any American, or any thinking person, join this worldwide plot against freedom? Because Marxism-Leninism has been turned into a religion, a devilish faith which demands blind obedience. Its appeal is not, as its propagandists claim, to the poor. Communism fishes for and hooks intelligent men and women who can be trained to manipulate ignorant mobs to do their bidding.

The basic teachings of Marxism-Leninism are four:

1. Everything that exists is due to the interaction of material things struggling against each other and adapting their forms to the nature of the conflict.

2. Man is solely a product of his environment, and has developed to his present form through natural selection. The main influence on mankind's destiny is economic conditions.

3. The moral code of any era is determined by the necessities of the time. It is not wrong to kill, lie, cheat, steal or commit any crime if it advances communism. The end justifies the means.

4. Belief in a deity is a trick invented by the leaders of society to control the other classes. Marx called religion "the opium of the people." Atheism is required for membership in the Communist Party.

These contemporary heathens tell one another their beliefs are "scientific." However, they rewrite history and twist proved principles of science to fit their materialistic dogmas.

The main power of communism is that it proclaims itself sure to win. Its adherents are taught that they are worthless except insofar as they serve the Communist cause. They are drilled to believe that by living or dying for communism, they attain the highest virtue of working for the final victory of communism everywhere.

Communists call themselves the only "progressives" but their theory and practice resemble those of the assassins in the Dark Ages. The original assassins were fanatics who believed that murder of their sect's enemies was a sacred duty. They were drugged and sent out to slay, assured that if killed they would go straight to a paradise full of material rewards—beautiful women, food, drink, and high living.

Communism is the 20th century version of thousand-year-old practices.

AND THEIR RULES DON'T CALL FOR A FAIR FIGHT—  
WE'RE NO. 1 ON RED HATE LIST

To Communists the No. 1 enemy is the United States of America.

They hate everything this Nation holds dear. They fear U.S. military and productive power. Most of all, they dread the American ideal of individual freedom and responsibility under God. That is what communism is bent on stamping out.

So the Reds are waging all-out war against the United States. They are using weapons

never before wielded on a worldwide scale. They are attacking from two directions.

Globally, they are trying to annex every free nation to their slave empire. They shoot whenever they think they can get away with it. They stop short of acts which would send atomic warheads crashing onto Soviet soil. They like guerrilla warfare and sabotage—hard to pin on them. Their pet trick is to turn other people against the United States: "Let's you and him fight." That way, they don't appear in it themselves.

Communists also bore from within. Their chief tool is a poisonous emotion: hate. They know that hate can enslave men to action as love cannot. Their aim is to widen every line of division, however tiny, among Americans.

Their agents and dupes also try to sap the will to resist communism. To that end, they sow uncertainty and doubt. They strive to undermine the morale of the Armed Forces. They sneer at patriotism, spreading distrust of representative government, justice, and the free-enterprise system.

Bribery, blackmail, and character assassination are other devices for Communist subversion.

The blueprint for Communist conquest of the world was drawn nearly 40 years ago by Nikolai Lenin, cofounder of Marxism-Leninism.

That declaration of war was repeated and amplified last December 5 in a 15,000-word manifesto from Moscow. It calls the United States "an enemy of the whole world," meaning the Communist world, of course.

The manifesto gives the marching orders for Communists everywhere. For example: "It is the supreme internationalist duty of every Marxist-Leninist party to work continuously for greater unity in the world Communist movement," directed from the Kremlin.

Like all Communist talk, the December 5 manifesto is written in a "doublespeak" jargon to deceive non-Communists. Instead of calling themselves Communists, the Reds use the less-despised term, "Socialists." "Democracy" on their tongue spells Communist rule. "Peace" to them means no resistance to communism.

Their current line is "peaceful coexistence." But they are bold enough to say: "Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems does not mean conciliation of the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist Parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas."

If anyone tries to oppose them, "the possibility of nonpeaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind."

The manifesto gives the "comrades" specific instructions.

They are to push for total disarmament, the end of free world defense treaties and the closing of military bases maintained by the United States and its allies. They must insist on noninterference in the internal affairs of countries which the Communists are trying to take over.

They are ordered to form "united fronts" with political parties in free nations as the first step toward seizing control.

They must infiltrate labor unions. They must stir up strife and riots by playing on racial tensions, nationalism, resentment and discontent of every kind. They must denounce anticommunism as "a witch hunt."

A clear line is drawn between nuclear war and local wars for extending the Communist domain. Every new or emerging nation is to be a battleground for the Reds. There, and in other free lands, they will try to squeeze out and bar the door to American economic aid and private investment—"monopoly" is their word for it.

Latin America, France, Italy, Spain and Portugal are among the countries pinpointed for Communist agitation.

Their object is simple: to isolate the central fortress of freedom, the United States. That way, they believe, this country will fall into their hand like an overripe plum. Shooting would come afterward, merely to liquidate their opponents.

Of course, the Communist Party line is subject to change without notice. It reversed direction three times to match shifts in Soviet relations with Nazi Germany. When Adolf Hitler was rising to power, the Soviets were afraid of him, so Communists were hot against nazism. They did an about-face the day Josef Stalin signed an alliance with the Nazis and was given part of Poland in 1939. They flip-flopped again when Hitler invaded Russia in 1941.

Communist policy anywhere, any time, is whatever will help communism enslave more people.

CHECK YOUR PERSONAL ARMOR—WHO'S TO  
FIGHT REDS?—ONLY YOU

America's chance of beating communism depends on you.

"Why me?" you may ask.

Because the strength of any free nation springs from the stamina and patriotism of its people.

There are about 183 million men, women and children in the United States. Each is like one link in the chain-mail armor of national defense against outside attack and subversion within. Each is like a molecule of steel in a sword, our country's power to overcome its enemies.

National character, like an object, is only as strong as its weakest point.

It's useless to wag our heads and complain that "So-and-so isn't doing his share to combat communism." That way lies the Red trap of suspicion and division among ourselves.

The Communists—if they believe what they say—consider us soft, weak and corrupt. They think we have lost the spirit which moved Patrick Henry to shout: "Give me liberty or give me death."

Nor do they respect our belief in individual responsibility. They look on 183 million Americans as on their 700-million Chinese slaves—as faceless masses to be manipulated by clever Communist bosses.

So the finger points to each of us. What are we doing about it? What are you doing?

Each of us must rise to new heights if our country is to stand united and unconquerable.

Here is a little check list to help you rate the strength of your link in America's defense against today's barbarians:

Are you strong and healthy? Do you eat right, sleep well and get enough exercise to keep a sound mind in a sound body?

Do you give a full day's work for a full day's pay?

Are you honorable in your dealings? Do you shun shady practices in work, business or personal affairs?

Do you keep informed on what's happening in your community, State, Nation and the rest of the world? Do you commend your elected representatives for good decisions and scold them when you think they have erred?

Do you obey the law?

Have you read the U.S. Constitution lately? Do you know your liberties under the Bill of Rights, and the duties that go with them?

Do you vote in all elections for which you are eligible? Do you serve on juries when called?

Are you loyal to the United States and proud of it? Do you show respect for the flag and the national anthem, and encourage others to do likewise?

Do you really do unto others as you would have them do unto you, in traffic, at home, wherever you are?

Do you use your right to worship God as you choose?



August 3

13590

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

If your answer to all these questions is "yes," you are doing your part to make America strong.

This is not to say that every American must be superhuman. We can hate, too. Hating evil as much as a mainspring for right action as fighting for something good. We can do both.

The Communists use hatred to destroy us, cynically fabricating it out of lies and false insinuations. Their wicked doctrine deserves to be hated. All we have to do is tell the truth about communism.

The Reds cannot prevail against 183 million Americans who are incorruptible and live by our national motto: "In God We Trust." That is their undoing—a faith and dedication better than theirs.

You can be sure that communism isn't going to vanish overnight like a bad dream. It is real, entrenched and vicious. Turning the tide against it will be a long, hard job. Are you ready to start?

**SPECIAL REPORT—WHAT'D LIFE BE LIKE IF REDS TOOK UNITED STATES?**

If Communists should ever take over the United States, here's what would happen to you:

You would do exactly as you were told. If you objected, you would be killed or put in jail.

You would be assigned to a job, and you couldn't quit.

Your home or business and any other property you own would be subject to confiscation.

Your children and neighbors would be taught to spy on you and report anything you said against your Communist bosses.

If you went to church or said prayers at home, you would lose any chance of getting ahead in the world.

You could never tell when a man in uniform might knock on your door in the middle of the night and haul you off to prison for any reason or no reason.

This is the kind of living death the Communists are trying to spread all over the world.

**SPECIAL REPORT—YOU COULD BE HELPING REDS PENETRATE THE UNITED STATES**

Without knowing it, you may be the weak spot through which communism can penetrate America.

Are you lazy and flabby?

Do you loaf on the job?

Are you proud when you've "pulled a fast one?"

Do you ignore news of public significance?

Do you think it's smart to break the law?

Do you harp on "what's wrong" with the United States?

Are you a snob?

Have you forgotten how to pray?

If so, chances are that Communists are rubbing their hands in glee over you. They're counting on apathy and corruption to let them snatch control of America.

Our national character is made up of 183 million men, women and children.

**SPECIAL REPORT—ARE YOU PLAYING INTO REDS' HANDS? THEY HOPE SO**

Do you look upon any group of your fellow Americans with dislike or suspicion? If so, watch out. Communists are working to widen every tiny split among citizens of the United States.

"Divide and conquer" is their aim.

They will use any trick to turn us against one another. They are busy day and night to get us fighting among ourselves.

They use words as dum-dum bullets. You may never know what hit you until you're boiling with hate, ready for violence. That's what the Communists want. Then, they figure, they can move in and enslave us all without firing a shot.

Stiff-arm Communist booby-traps. They can't hurt you when you know what they're

doing. Learn about their tireless efforts to conquer the United States.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times Picayune, July 20, 1961]

**HONOR FOR RED CAPTIVES URGED—ACTIVE MAYOR PROCLAIMS WEEK'S OBSERVANCE**

A proclamation designating the week of July 16 through 22 "Captive Nations Week" was issued Wednesday by acting Mayor Victor H. Schiro.

The proclamation urged "all our citizens to appreciate and recognize the fact that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a positive means to the cause of freedom for captive peoples everywhere."

The proclamation stated that "the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom dictates we commence to win the cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, and all the rest.

Schiro presented the proclamation on the second floor balcony of city hall to a committee composed of Festus Brown, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee of the Louisiana Department of the American Legion; Anthony Naquin, commander of the Legion's First District in Louisiana; and George Soule. The ceremony was attended also by a group of women including various members of the American Legion Auxilliary, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other patriotic organizations.

Schiro, in a brief address traced the evolution of the United States from its beginnings to its status as the greatest Nation in the world, but warned against the sort of complacency which he said had caused the fall of Rome.

Brown in an address asserted that: "While we stand as the greatest Republic in the history of mankind, we have retreated from our historic policy of courage and forthrightness that once held the respect of all nations of the world."

He expressed the belief that "the people of America must call an immediate halt to the strange policy of our Government of fraternizing with, or honoring in a manner reserved for respectable leaders, the heads of the Red conspiracy—of sending tanks, guns, ammunition, fighter planes, food, money, and supplies to strengthen the very same bloody butchers whose atheistic conspiracy not only holds in bondage these nations and these people we honor today, but who are this very minute plotting, scheming, and driving to destroy America itself both economically and militarily."

At the request of some of those present, a city hall aid hauled down the United Nations flag from the staff where it was flying while the ceremony was going on. In its place was transferred from another flagstaff, the flag of Louisiana in a position next to the flag of the United States which the U.N. flag had occupied.

[From the Denver (Colo.) Register, June 18, 1961]

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The third week of July provides for the public pronouncement of a foreign policy that has proved its worth.

Public Law 86-90 authorizes and requests the President of the United States to proclaim Captive Nations Week, as President Eisenhower did in 1959, to the great consternation of Khrushchev.

President Kennedy is not bound by law to issue such a proclamation; he is simply authorized and requested by Congress to do so. We believe, judging from the irate reaction of Khrushchev, that it would be good policy; for it hits him where it hurts.

Writing in the Ukrainian Quarterly, Edward M. O'Connor, former U.S. Commissioner of Displaced Persons, declares that the slogan "Africa for the Africans" would have real meaning if translated into a policy of "Russia for the Russians."

The Russians number only 55 percent of the population of the many-nationed U.S.S.R. So powerful have been the stirrings of the submerged nations in what is carelessly called Russia, that many think that the collapse of the czars in 1917-18 was brought about by the national independence movements in the non-Russian nations of the empire.

Since the Soviets have been so successful in exploiting the legitimate yearnings of the peoples of Africa for national independence, why could we not make the same appeal to the submerged nations of Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R., some of whom, like Poland, have proudly enjoyed a thousand years of Christian heritage and a nationhood such as Russia never knew?

**OMAHA CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE PROGRAM, SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1961, AT 7 P.M. AT THE OMAHA PLAYHOUSE, OMAHA, NEBR.**

Placing a wreath at the World War II Memorial Saturday, July 22, 1961, at 12 a.m. from the Captive Nations of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, White Ruthenia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and others.

II

1. Presentation of colors.
2. National anthem (Soloist Mrs. John Gunig).
3. Invocation (Msgr. Floid Fisher).
4. Welcome by the chairman of Omaha Captive Nations Week Committee (Mr. Ben C. Sulskis).
5. Greetings.
6. Address (Albert C. Walsh, attorney).
7. Adoption of resolution. (Ten-minute intermission.)

III

Performance of national groups:  
Czechoslovaks, East Germans, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, and Ukrainians.  
Master of ceremonies: Joe Martin, radio WOW.

**PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA**

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism, and

Whereas the people of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties, and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent, and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence:

Now, therefore, I, Frank B. Morrison, Governor of the State of Nebraska, do hereby proclaim the week of July 16 through 22, 1961, as "Captive Nations Week."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Nebraska to be affixed.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

13591

Done at Lincoln this 17th day of July in the year of our Lord 1961.

FRANK B. MORRISON,  
Governor.

FRANK MARSH,  
Secretary of State.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 111

Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week"

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependence of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) America, July 27, 1961]

THE REDS—WHAT NOW?

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

GIVE HOPE TO CAPTIVE NATIONS

By a happy coincidence, Our Captive Nations Week was prefaced by the publication of Pope John's Encyclical on Social Justice.

This papal document is marked by the same sense of balance as distinguishes all Vatican utterances on the social question—voicing opposition to the tyranny of communism but insisting upon the need for many and deep reforms among ourselves. We can observe at once two major points in the encyclical which expose the falsity of allegations distributed by the Communists in their present worldwide war on the church. In recommending large-scale aid to under-developed countries, that message emphasized that such assistance should not be given in such a way as to be merely "a new form of colonialism."

AIM OF THE CHURCH

Of that caution, much can and will be said in the future, but for the present, we can note that this explodes the Communist lies that Catholic missionaries are "neo-colonialists in cassocks." It demonstrates the fallacious character of the Communist statement that "the aim of the church" is to turn "from a faithful servitor of the old colonialism into an instrument of neo-colonialism."

Both of these fantastic declarations appear in a lengthy directive in the May World Marxist Review, which is being widely distributed here as well as elsewhere.

The same thing happens with the fantasies disseminated by the Kremlin regarding the Church's stand on private property. The encyclical brings out that defense of the right of private property is for the purpose of assuring its wider distribution among the working people. It is not, as the Kremlin's "philosophers" have contended in the March, 1960, World Marxist Review and thereafter, that the stand for private property "expresses the interests of the bourgeoisie—today it would be more exact to say the interests of monopoly capital."

Refuting such an accusation, the encyclical goes on to give the real basic reason for the right of private property, as "the guarantee of the essential freedom of the individual."

That such is the case—that where private property is abolished complete freedom does not exist—is silently testified to by the long line of refugees fleeing East Germany. This flight has become so marked that Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has described it as a "panic."

The Soviet rulers are very sensitive to the desire for freedom on the part of the enslaved peoples. Congressman DANIEL FLOOD of Pennsylvania, who has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives to create a special committee on the captive nations, has disclosed what fear spread recently among those rulers in the Ukraine alone. The mere speech by Premier John Diefenbaker of Canada in the United Nations, denouncing Soviet colonialism, caused a panic of enforced letter writing and mass meetings throughout the Ukraine, called by the official party hacks.

EATON STATEMENTS

In their endeavor to shut off all real examination of the slavery in the captive nations, Moscow has also sent around the world during the last few weeks a series of statements by Syrus Eaton, American industrialist and winner of the Lenin Peace Prize.

After a tour through Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria—and Eaton's tour

reminds us again that the United Nations has never been allowed inside Red Hungary—he writes:

"These countries have competent and intelligent men heading their governments, and the United States' obsession that there is any substantial opposition to the political leadership of these nations is erroneous and should be abandoned in the interest of a practical U.S. policy."

To which he adds:

"It is abundantly clear to an objective observer that Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria are completely committed to their present forms of government and to their political and economic systems, and that their relations with the Soviet Union are cordial."

So well does the Kremlin think of this declaration that it plays it up in the June 26, 1961, New Times, coming here from Moscow. But Congressman FLOOD has the proper answer to such drivel, and we can support him in his attempt to get a permanent congressional committee on these "socialist countries." In describing Khrushchev's cynicism in saying on December 27 last that "the subjugated colonial peoples" can depend for their freedom on Soviet Russia, Congressman FLOOD goes on to ask:

"But aside from the underlying objectives, can we truthfully say that our demonstrated and sincere interest in all of the captive nations, particularly those in the U.S.S.R. itself, exceeds the cynical interests displayed by Moscow in the peoples of Africa and Asia? I think not."

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, July 8, 1961]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK WILL BE OBSERVED

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Captive Nations Week, sponsored by the National Captive Nations Committee in implementation of Public Law 86-90, will be observed this year from Sunday, July 16, through Saturday, July 22. In announcing plans this week for the second anniversary observance of the week, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the committee and professor of economics at Georgetown University, stated that major themes this year would be "a firm policy on Berlin and determined opposition to the admission of Red China into the United Nations."

In coordination with National Captive Nations Committee, the Assembly of Captive Nations, American Friends of the Captive Nations, and other groups, cities throughout the country will join in ceremonies reaffirming the belief that "our freedom will be secure only when all men everywhere are free." Mayor Daley in Chicago and Mayor Wagner in New York City, among many others, are sponsoring huge citywide ceremonies.

Dr. Dobriansky, who originated and authored the Captive Nations Week resolution, said: "The 1960 observance was so successful that the vehemence and vituperation of Moscow and its puppets exceeded that of Khrushchev's explosion the year before. We intend to surpass last year's successes."

"The committee is now looking forward to an early proclamation of the week by President Kennedy. President Eisenhower proclaimed the week twice, in 1959 and 1960, and on the basis of President Kennedy's expressed feelings in the past, we expect him to issue the proclamation soon."

National Captive Nations Committee, which depends on contributions to carry out its year-round program of informing the public on developments behind the Iron Curtain countries, has a growing membership of university presidents, labor leaders, church officials, industry executives, newspaper editors, publishers, and civic, patriotic, and ethnic groups. It is headed by a newly elected board of directors. In addition to chairman Dobriansky, the board consists of:

13592

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 3

Col. Charles H. Kraus, vice chairman; Col. Daniel F. Boone, executive director; Mrs. Colby Bowden, secretary-treasurer; and John T. Doolittle, assistant secretary. Seventeen Senators and sixty-five Congressmen comprise the honorary committee membership. The headquarters of the National Captive Nations Committee is at 1000 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 22, 1961]  
GREATER NEW YORK OBSERVES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

NEW YORK.—Captive Nations Week observances in New York City were held under the official chairmanship of the Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York, and received wide publicity in the New York metropolitan press, including pictures of Ukrainians, some in Ukrainian costumes. Mayor Wagner accepted the chairmanship of the week in response to a request by five American organizations concerned with the plight of the captive nations.

On July 12, 1961, a delegation from these organizations, including several Ukrainian members, received the proclamation from Mayor Wagner at city hall.

New York observers of Captive Nations Week began on Sunday, July 16, with a solemn high mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral, which was celebrated by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Balkunas. A special sermon on the suffering and plight of the captive nations was delivered by Bishop James H. Griffiths, auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of New York, and Francis Cardinal Spellman presided. Similar religious services were held in Protestant churches and Jewish synagogues in the city. At St. Patrick's Cathedral the Ukrainian national flag was among the flags of other captive nations and representatives of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America were present.

ATTORNEY GENERAL LEFKOWITZ READS GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S PROCLAMATION

On the same day two separate ceremonies were held in New York City. The Assembly of the Captive European Nations, held a flag-raising ceremony at United Nations Plaza, where Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn, was the principal speaker.

Late in the evening the American Friends of the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations held a special observance of Captive Nations Week at the Hotel New Yorker, at which Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz read the proclamation of Governor Rockefeller and urged that the captive nations be supported morally and materially by the American people and the U.S. Government. Justin McCarthy, New York radio commentator, was master of ceremonies, and among the speakers were Mrs. Catherine Dorney, secretary of the American Educational Association, and Ignatius M. Billinsky and Charles Andreanszky, chairman and secretary general of the American Friends of the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations, respectively.

IMPRESSIVE CEREMONY AT CITY HALL

The culminating and final ceremony dedicated to the observance of Captive Nations Week was held at noon, on Monday, July 17, 1961, on the steps of city hall, during which Mayor Wagner read his official proclamation of Captive Nations Week.

Among the participants were the representatives of organizations supporting the captive nations, many in national costumes, city officials and American veterans.

The master of ceremonies was city councilman Thomas J. Cuite of Brooklyn, representing the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C. The program included the rendition of the American national anthem by Neil Carlin of the Oriol Society, the invocation by Rabbi Leo Storozum, prayer by Msgr. Bela Varga, and benediction by Rev. Imre Kovacs, and short ad-

resses by the following speakers: Christopher Emmet (American Friends of the Captive Nations); Dr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas (Assembly of Captive European Nations); Stephen J. Jarema (American Conference for the Liberation of the non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R.); and Rt. Rev. John Balkunas (Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent).

There were over 300 participants and several flags of the captive nations. The Ukrainian group, organized by the United Ukrainian American Organizations of Greater New York, a branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, was the largest ethnic group at city hall.

In his short address Mayor Wagner said that New York City was always a haven for European refugees and escapees from tyranny. He promised that the city will always assist those freedom fighters who struggle for the liberation of their native countries.

Neil Carlin concluded the ceremony by singing the "Battle Hymn of the Republic." There were many cameramen and reporters, and the entire observance was broadcast over New York City municipal radio station WNYC.

[From the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet, July 22, 1961]

SEEK ECONOMIC BOYCOTT OF REDS—NASSAU CONSERVATIVES SET IT AS HELP TO CAPTIVE NATIONS

"An economic boycott against the Communist world" is called for by the Nassau Conservatives in a resolution adopted for Captive Nations Week, July 16-22.

Such a boycott "would breed discontent and increase the chance of revolution and eventually freedom and peace behind the Iron Curtain," the Conservatives declare, "and, by multiplying the problems of the Communists at home, would increase the chance of peace in the free world."

Following is the text of the resolution:

"Whereas loyal Americans, whether conservative or liberal, admit that world communism is a continuing threat to peace, "Whereas our national policy of diplomatic recognition, foreign trade, and cultural exchange has done nothing to lessen the threat,

"Whereas a new policy is needed to put the Communist tyrants on notice that we will actively oppose their further advances and that we will not rest until the captive nations have been freed,

"Whereas the international conspiracy is dependent upon the free world for the machinery, tools, food, foreign aid, etc., necessary to continue its subjugation of the captive nations,

"Whereas an economic boycott would be cheaper than war, in money and material as well as in the most precious commodity of human lives,

"Whereas an economic boycott would breed discontent and increase the chance of revolution and eventually freedom and peace behind the Iron Curtain, and, by multiplying the problems of the Communists at home, would increase the chance of peace in the free world: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Nassau Conservatives do hereby beseech our national leaders in the legislative and executive branches to give immediate and full consideration to the implementation of an economic boycott against the Communist world."

"Мир и Дружба"—  
("Peace and Friendship")

Under this banner, Kremlin Boss Khrushchev is coming to the United States.

To Khrushchev, "peace and friendship" means the total enslavement of all nations, of all peoples, of all things, under the God-denying Communist conspiracy of which he is the current czar.

In exploiting his hypocritical theme, he promises profitable trade to the businessman and heaven on earth to the workingman.

No one, however, has better translated his real meaning and purpose than has Khrushchev, himself, in his ugly boast: "We will bury you."

This invitation to visit the United States will give Khrushchev the additional standing he needs among the Russian people and among the peoples of those countries teetering on the Communist edge. It will also create despair among the peoples of his Communist-enslaved nations.

If our statesmen or business leaders overlook that Khrushchev is reputed to be one of history's most brutal murderers and most vicious liars they will tend to rob the Khrushchev-captive peoples of their belief that their best hope for liberation is through the United States.

It is imperative for our national survival that our people realize the vast difference between what Khrushchev says and what Khrushchev does.

The terrible brutality of burial into Communist enslavement is known to the people of the 22 captive nations listed below.

Let there be no concessions, no appeasement, no deals with Khrushchev. Let us not be negotiated into that position which Khrushchev plans for us—the position of becoming his greatest captive nation.

Meanwhile, let us remember those thousands who died trying to defend their freedom in these Khrushchev controlled captive nations: Poland, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Tibet, North Korea, North Vietnam, mainland China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Albania, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

The Allen-Bradley Co., Milwaukee, Wis., urges you to hold fast to your American freedoms. These include your freedom to live, your freedom to worship God, and your freedom to work and to vote as you choose. These freedoms are still with us in the United States of America. But these freedoms have been destroyed by the Communists in those large portions of the world where the Communists have seized control. Don't let it happen here.

The Allen-Bradley Co. manufactures quality motor controls and quality electronic components. With this public service advertisement, the Allen-Bradley Co. is trying to tell you nothing except the importance of recognizing and understanding the horrible threat posed by Kremlin-directed international communism against our country, our people, and our incomparable American free enterprise way of life.

APPEAL OF BISHOP SENYSHYN ON CAPTIVE NATIONS—RECOMMENDED SPECIAL PRAYERS ON SUNDAY, JULY 23, IN THE STAMFORD DIOCESE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the appeal of the Most Reverend Ambrose Senyshyn, ex-arch of the Ukrainian Catholic Diocese of Stamford, which was issued on the occasion of Captive Nations Week and read on Sunday, July 23, 1961, in all the Ukrainian Catholic churches in the diocese of Stamford.)

"O God, hear our prayer. Woe has befallen our land."—(From a prayer for the Ukrainian people.)

Very reverend and reverend fathers, dearly beloved in Christ, no one would have suspected that after World War II we would be faced with the appalling fact of the suppression of people behind the Iron Curtains. Did the American soldiers—many of them of Ukrainian descent—lay down their lives in distant lands so that godless invaders could put many nations—among them the Ukrainian nation—into heavy bondage? No. They gave their lives so that all could enjoy freedom. Unfortunately, the lack of

foresight evidenced by certain powerful nations pushed all the Ukrainian people and many others into slavery. One day history will make known these gravediggers of freedom, but until then a multitude of innocent people suffers a violence of body and soul in the prison of the nation.

On the 100th anniversary of the death of Taras Shevchenko, the entire Ukrainian nation, in spite of all its efforts to gain freedom, finds itself in so mournful a state as that described so vividly by the greatest bard of suffering Ukraine. Today millions in Ukraine and on the limitless wastelands of Siberia still sing sorrowfully Shevchenko's words: "I count in prison days and nights, and I lose the count; O Lord, how slowly these days pass by." Today the best sons of Ukraine along with Metropolitan Joseph Slipy suffer in Siberian labor camps because they love their church and nation and wish these to be free.

The concept of freedom which Taras Shevchenko preached with the fiery word and for which the choicest sons of the Ukrainian people suffer, became the foundation of the universal concept of freedom and found its expression in the law of Congress by which the Captive Nations Week was declared in 1959.

In celebrating Captive Nations Week I call upon all of you, in the words of the great Pope Pius XII to unite in prayer: "Therefore in this very difficult moment, when human strength seems to fail, nothing else is left for us, venerable brethren, than to implore the most merciful God, who renders justice to the afflicted, judgment to the poor (Psalms 139, 13), that He Himself would deign to still this violent storm and bring it to this end." (Encyclical letter "Ad omnes Ecclesias Orientales," Rome, 1946). Let us beseech the Almighty God, that He might send us a Washington with his just laws. Always remember the prayerful address of Taras Shrevchenko to the Mother of God:

"Just and Holy Mother,  
Blessed among women,  
Mother of the Son of God on earth,  
Don't let us perish in slavery."

Millions of our enslaved brothers and sisters await our help, but most of all our prayers for their perseverance in holy faith, for constancy and fidelity in religious and national ideals.

Let us bring to the freedom-loving peoples with whom we live the truth about our suffering church and our oppressed nation. And may these words of Taras Shevchenko find a sympathetic echo in our hearts:

"Give strength to the weakened soul,  
That it might speak with fiery words,  
That it might spread fire,  
That it might melt the hearts of people,  
That it might go to Ukraine  
And that there it might be hallowed,  
This word—incense of God,  
The incense of truth. Amen."

In celebrating Captive Nations Week let us celebrate it with humble and sincere prayers to the Almighty for a better fortune for our people behind the Iron Curtain. To this purpose I enjoy upon all the clergy to celebrate after each divine liturgy on Sunday, July 23, an impetratory moleben to the Almighty for our suffering church and our people behind the Iron Curtain that God may take mercy and free our church and people from chains of cruel bondage.

THE WEEK IN SOVIET PROPAGANDA—JULY  
19-26, 1961

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The Soviet Government newspaper Izvestia charged President Kennedy with aping former President Eisenhower in the observance of Captive Nations Week. While

No. 132—18

"the oversea provocateurs" call for "liberation" of these nations, there is also Portuguese oppression in Angola, Izvestia proclaimed.

Besides angry outbursts of this type, Soviet media borrowed a device from Western correspondents—the personal interview by phone. Raising, by long-distance connection, Mississippi Gov. Ross R. Barnett, a staffer from radio Moscow cornered him with questions on the legal basis for the arrest of freedom riders, on their danger to the security of the State's population, on their number in prison and their treatment there. When the last question was sidestepped, the voice of a freedom rider was inserted describing various indecencies allegedly inflicted on the Negro freedom riders. "Thus," concluded radio Moscow, "one need not go far in the United States to find enslaved people."

(Prepared by the Central Research Department of Radio Liberty in Munich for use by the programing staff. Distributed in the United States and Canada by the Press and Publications Division, American Committee for Liberation, 1657 Broadway, New York 19, N.Y.)

VENTRILOQUIST

The Czechoslovak minister of foreign affairs, Vaclav David, has condemned the French "aggression" in Tunisia, declaring that the Czech Government "resolutely supports the demand to liquidate the shameful colonial system in all its forms and manifestations, and is doing everything possible to help make this demand a reality."

Minister David is evidently something of a ventriloquist, appearing here as a cat speaking with the voice of the canary inside. Since 1948, when the Communists ousted President Benes, the Czech Government has been firmly under the thumb of the Soviet Union, with the Politburo of the Communist Party charting its policies.

We have here another example of the curious Communist mentality which considers a "colony" to be a subject territory which is reached by crossing water. When it lies just across a boundary line, the captive, state is assumed to obey and contribute out of love and admiration for the master nation.

It reminds us of some trained animal acts we have seen. One can, if he wishes, applaud the lions and the elephants which dance and jump through hoops even when the whip is out of sight. We think of the beatings it took to inculcate such docility, and find it profoundly pathetic.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, we are going to receive from our Committee on Foreign Affairs its recommendations on another extension of what is loosely called the mutual security program, which more accurately should be called the foreign handout program. Regardless of what is said about the program, we know that testimony after testimony, statement after statement, has been presented to the Congress and to the American people to show that this program has actually been losing friends for the United States and that it has disrupted governments it was intended to help and it has corrupted officials in those governments.

Of course, I do not know what will be the full content of the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee. But from what

I can learn in advance, I must say that I will be forced to oppose the new foreign aid authorization bills on the grounds that it is unconstitutional and that, even if it were a legal exercise of our powers under the Constitution, it is unwise and unsound, wasteful and destructive of this country's very economy.

I am a Democrat and have always been a Democrat. However, I had hoped, when I assisted last fall in the election of a Democratic administration, there would be some change in this program. In short, I had truly hoped that there would be a New Frontier in our foreign policy.

I am disappointed by the knowledge that there is no New Frontier in foreign policy. The administration has asked us to continue the old policy of the open checkbook.

It is indeed true that the New Frontier has offered a new name for the foreign aid program. That is an old trick to disguise the real nature of an increasingly unpopular program. Foreign aid has at one time or another been called emergency redevelopment or international cooperation or mutual security, and now we are asked to approve something called AID—all in capital letters and meaning Agency for International Development.

It has been said and known for centuries that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. I say that foreign aid by whatever name it may be called must smell as rank as we all know it has smelled in the past. Our administration, I am sorry to say, has not come up with a new program. It has merely come up with a new, Madison Avenue advertising agency type tag—the attractive gimmick name "AID"—as a device for extension of a program which in its useless and wasteful expenditure of the moneys of the American taxpayers, its destruction of American jobs and industries, smells to high heaven.

I am sorry that this is so. I am distressed that within the next few days, at a time when our Nation is at what may be the crossroads between life and death, we in the Congress are being told by the administration we must support, or run the risk of being labeled as unpatriotic, this foreign aid program. Indeed, we are not only being told this by the administration—we are being told it by foreign emissaries who have little hesitation in bluntly demanding that we open our checkbooks for their benefit, or run the risk that they will abandon the free world in favor of a higher bid by the Communist aggressor.

I refer, of course, to the recent appearance before us of the President of Pakistan. This, incidentally, is the same gentleman who only a few days later in a nationwide television broadcast said he was in favor of admitting Red China into the United Nations.

That worthy gentleman, the President of Pakistan, in his appearance in the U.S. House of Representatives, told us quite plainly and bluntly that his country wanted U.S. dollars for its development. Equally plainly and bluntly he told us if his nation did not get our

dollars, it would look elsewhere—meaning, of course, to Russia—for aid in its development.

I do not blame the President of Pakistan for this. He was looking out for his own interests, for the interests of his own country. Under his oath of office, he should have been doing just that.

But I would suggest to my colleagues in the House that we, too, take an oath of office, to look out for our own country. And in the light of that oath, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was surprised to realize that all around me, on that occasion, were colleagues who were applauding what they later called the frankness and the candor of the President of Pakistan. I recognize just what his frankness and candor was—it was a threat, a crude one at that, to blackmail the Congress of the United States into giving him aid. He made no bones at all about what he was up to when he made his "or else" proposition to the Congress. He plainly said to us that "you give us the money we want or you will wish you had—because if you do not, we will get it from your mortal enemy."

That the President of Pakistan would do this does not surprise me—he had his duty to his own country. What does surprise me is that Members of the Congress of the United States would be so taken in by this sort of tactic that they would sit up and applaud this frankness and candor.

What surprises me even more is the fact that this man, and others who have preceded him and followed him, have come before us with similar, if less bluntly expressed, demands for aid—and have come before us because they were invited to this country by the administration, which knew full well, once the invited guests were here, they would be invited as a courtesy to address the Congress or its two Houses separately.

Over a period of years it has been observed that whenever the Navy's appropriations bill was about to come before the Congress, there would be reports of a rash of mysterious and unexplained visits to the coastal waters of the United States of one or more mysterious and unidentified submarines. It has been alleged that once the Navy's supply bill was passed, the mysterious submarines would disappear without a trace—until the following year's naval appropriations bill came up, at which time the mystery submarines would reappear.

It seems to me, as I look at the record, that our President, himself a former naval officer, may have been deluded by this naval tactic. It seems to me that at a time when the decision on extension of foreign aid is coming up, we are being subjected to an invasion of foreign potentates who arrive in this country—by invitation of the administration—just in time to tell the Congress just how important foreign aid extension is to the country's future. To tell us, in short, that if we do not have the dollars to buy friendship, the enemy may very well have the equivalent of those dollars.

I do not go for blackmail. But even if I did, I do not and cannot believe it would be in the interests of this country's welfare—to extend—and extend appar-

ently without realistic limitation—a program which has a demonstrated record of costly failure over the years.

Moreover, many Americans feel that the administration, the Congress, and our entire bureaucratic Federal Government, for too long a time have been too concerned about what other nations thought of our actions. I think it is high time that all Americans begin to think about what is going on in our own country and do the things which are necessary for the good of the United States.

I will not go into great detail over the failures of the foreign-aid program. I know that every Member who sits in this House today is fully aware of what the foreign-aid program has not accomplished in such critical areas as Laos, Cuba, and Korea. The foreign-aid program has been in effect since 1947. Since then, communism has spread to an appalling extent. We have lost friends every year. Our prestige abroad has dropped alarmingly and at an accelerated rate. We have been powerless to promote stable democratic government even where our aid and intervention have been the greatest.

The bitter truth is that since the end of World War II, our foreign-aid programs, totaling \$90 billion, have been responsible for our net budget deficit and our entire increase in national debt, without accomplishing anything for us. The program has been known to cost \$90 billion; but no one knows how much more than this has been spent in aid, but has not been shown in the record. Foreign aid has been the chief cause of our inflation, our unfavorable balance payments, and our loss of gold.

Despite all of this, we sit here today facing the fact that the administration wants us not only to increase outlays for foreign-aid handouts substantially. It also wants us to surrender our power, as the Congress, to deny or grant our approval of borrowing—over the next 5 years—of \$7.3 billion to finance a long-range handout program.

To the whole program, I say "No," but say so realizing that it is likely I will be overridden. But to the proposition that the Congress surrender its year-to-year power of review, I utter an explosive "No," with the hope that a number of my colleagues will join in the defeat of this abortive proposal that the Congress of the United States abdicate not only this power—but its sworn constitutional duty to supervise the spending of the taxpayers' dollars.

If the Congress continues to abdicate its powers—particularly the power to control the public purse—by approving the backdoor spending of tax money without congressional review—we might as well resign—go home—and tell our constituents that not only have we failed to uphold the Constitution, but that we have turned over the functions of the Congress to our bureaucratic executive department.

I have said in this and in other speeches I have made here in opposition to this program that, leaving aside the question of its ultimate usefulness, it has been wastefully and at times dis-

honestly administered. I am sorry to say that the outlook for it under the New Frontier program seems to be no better than has been in the past.

Those of us who supported the installation of the new administration had, I think, the right to expect a little better than we have gotten. We had, I think, the right to expect at least honesty in foreign aid administration, and a determination to expel from it the proven rascals of other years.

But have we realized that right? I do not think so. In fact, I think the testimony of our new foreign aid Director, Mr. Henry Labouisse, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, shows conclusively that he not only condones misfeasance and malfeasance in the foreign aid setup in the past, but has no intention to make any changes to correct the situation.

I think the citation of two instances is sufficient to prove my point.

All of you know, I think, of the scandal with regard to the construction of the highway in Cambodia with this country's money. The foreign aid Director, as a matter of fact, admits that it is—and I quote him—"a sorry page in the history of this operation."

But what has happened to the International Cooperation Administration official responsible for this sorry mess? Why, he is now engaged in building, under Mr. Labouisse, a highway in Burma.

And what has happened to the ICA contractor whom Mr. Labouisse admits botched the Cambodia job? Why, he has been awarded another ICA contract in Afghanistan.

That is not all.

There is the case of Mr. Carter de Paul. Mr. de Paul is an ICA agent who bought an automobile for \$800 and then sold it to an ICA contractor for a \$3,000 fat profit. Thereafter, records of hearings before a committee of this Congress show, Mr. de Paul gave false testimony under oath about this shady deal.

And where is Mr. de Paul now? He is not in prison, where many perjurers go. No, indeed. Mr. de Paul is still working for the ICA, under Mr. Labouisse. Fittingly enough, in view of his successful automobile deal, Mr. de Paul is in the division of private enterprise in the ICA.

The important thing in this is not Mr. de Paul. The important thing is Mr. Labouisse's attitude. Mr. Labouisse told our Foreign Affairs Committee he did not want blanket authority to fire men like Mr. de Paul—he might, he said, find reasons why they should be kept on the payroll.

The case of the Cambodian contractor and the grade 15 used-car dealer are not, in themselves, particularly important. They are but samples of the chicanery which exists in any multimillion-dollar program.

But I say to you, that when such cases of dishonesty and wasteful inefficiency occur in one administration and are condoned by the new administration, they become important. They become important because they are indicative of the fact that, beyond a change in name, the new administration's foreign aid pro-



vance what kind of decisions would come out of it. This, of course, underlines the pitfalls of lack of objectivity in the overcentralized control of intelligence; and it also points up the dangers inherent in overdependence upon electronics rather than human brains.

This is not to say that technological devices should not be used. But it does mean that when the fate of the Nation and our civilization are at stake, wisdom, insight and the rare attributes of inspired leadership will be found in the human brain and never in manmade electrical circuits.

If there is any place in the governmental process where a clash of opinion is appropriate in presentation of information to the responsible officials, it is in the matter of intelligence. Only those responsible for the decision and its results should have the power to judge major intelligence matters. By the same token such judgment must not be undermined by a subordinate having the authority to shape through administrative control the nature of intelligence that reaches his superiors.

The proper place for such clash of opinion to occur and for the judgments to be made is in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the White House.

As a postscript, it seems appropriate to observe that we are indeed, through increasing reliance on electronic computers in attempting to predict the course of warfare, approaching a questionable situation. It has long been axiomatic in the field of military history that one of the most difficult tasks is trying to ascertain for sure what actually happened in war. Are we, in fact, unwittingly seeking escape from crucial decisions by delegating that responsibility to electronic computers; and are we thus trying to write history in advance? Are we succumbing to the same frailties as those ancients who before the battle consulted the oracles who were the then acknowledged experts in reading the future in tea leaves? If so, we have permitted electronics to bypass intellect and carry us full cycle into man's past, and man's mistakes.

*CN file*  
Captive Nations Week

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 14, 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the coming week, July 16 through July 22, is of special significance to the American people and freedom-loving people throughout the world. The third week in July of each year has by resolution of Congress been set aside for the observance of Captive Nations Week.

In a joint resolution approved on July 17, 1959, and enacted as Public Law 86-90, the Congress has authorized and requested the President to—

Issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Congress has thus sensed the importance of focusing the attention of the

free world upon the plight of the captive nations. The compelling reasons which prompted it to take this action are pointed out in the body of the resolution.

The resolution recites the fact that the "imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression to the subjugation of the national independence" of 22 countries. The countries listed are Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, and North Vietnam.

The resolution further recites that "since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world." It reminds us that "these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence."

These are not reckless statements, Mr. President. They cannot be discounted as exaggerated emotional charges of irresponsible alarmists. This is the Congress of the United States speaking the cold, hard, unpleasant truth. We must never forget it. The observance of "Captive Nations Week" helps us not to forget it.

Public Law 86-90 states the case for some 900 million people who are now captives of the Communist Empire. It reminds us that any apathy we may display would mean their despair. Their despair means the loss of 900 million silent allies.

Mr. President, we now have 40 years of experience to guide us if we have any doubts about Communist Russia's aggressive, imperialistic intentions. By 1921 the Bolsheviks had already crushed the independence of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Armenia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, and Turkestan. In 1939 Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were overrun.

Following World War II Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania were pulled behind the Iron Curtain. The mainland of China was next, and in 1948 some 700 million Chinese were placed under the Communist yoke.

Then came East Germany, North Korea, Tibet, and North Vietnam, and we can now add Cuba to the list.

Mr. President, at no time in history has so much misery and oppression been packed into so few years. Never has there been such a systematic, determined, and ruthless suppression of human freedom.

But, if nothing else, these shameful years furnish us our lessons for the future. And as we approach the challenges of the future, we know that human nature is on our side. Man has an inborn desire to be free. His freedom can be suppressed, but his desire to regain it cannot.

We also know, however, that man's desire for freedom will soon turn to frustration unless he has hope. The captive peoples must have reason to hope. They must know that although they have been silenced, they have not been forgotten. They must know that they will not be abandoned for the sake of the status quo and so called peaceful coexistence.

So long as there is a spark of hope there is a spark of resistance, and that resistance, whether it be real or potential, means a help to assure our security.

In 1959 and 1960, Public Law 86-90 was implemented by a Presidential Proclamation designating Captive Nations Week and inviting the American people to participate in its observance. I hope the President will again add the dignity of his Office to the occasion this year, especially in view of some of the more recent world events. On July 11, I sent a letter to the President urging him to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with my remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
July 11, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to urge that a proclamation be issued again this year designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.

You are well aware of the plight of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain and the need for preserving and strengthening their desire for freedom. I won't belabor the obvious.

The annual observance of Captive Nations Week can be an effective means of rekindling hope and reassuring the victims of Communist oppression that they will not be forgotten. I hope you will see fit to set aside the coming week for the rededication of the American people to the cause of freedom in those countries where it is now denied.

Respectfully yours,  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,  
U.S. Senator of Nebraska.

Federal Income Tax—A Communist  
Cancer

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 14, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a statement of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, as it was published in the Manion Forum, of July 9, 1961.

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

## FEDERAL INCOME TAX—A COMMUNIST CANCER

(By Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker)

DEAN MANION. Since his great speech over this microphone last December, I have been busy fielding a flood of requests for the reappearance of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker. This is more evidence of the fact that the American people are longing for the kind of candid, courageous, conservative leadership that Eddie Rickenbacker has supplied to us continuously since World War I.

No person in America symbolizes all that is best in the American tradition of patriotism and private business enterprise more clearly than this distinguished man who fights the foes of human freedom wherever he finds them, at home or abroad. Captain Eddie, welcome again to the Manion Forum.

Captain RICKENBACKER. Thank you, Dean Manion. Our air and our newspapers emphasize the term "cold war." There is no cold war. There is a hot war, literally as hot as the hinges of Hell itself, and we are losing it because we refuse to admit we are in it.

We cry "peace" when there is no peace. We say "another war is unthinkable"—while our enemy goes right on waging that war, expanding his territory, stealing our secrets, undermining our defenses, and washing our brains in propaganda.

We began to lose this war when we gave to an assortment of international associations the control of our foreign policy. Look at Cuba. The enemy landed there, made it an armed camp, and brazenly declared a fight to the death against us. And what do we do? Nothing. We renounce the Monroe Doctrine, we take our cue from neutral international agencies, and refuse to fight back.

On the eve of the Castro revolution we were ready to send helicopters to protect our citizens in Cuba. But someone discovered that our commitment to the United Nations prevented our protecting American lives and property in foreign lands. So, we called off our helicopters. The world will not respect our rights until we show the world that we shall defend them.

Castro did not create this situation. It began 28 years ago when we recognized a handful of bandits as the lawful government of Russia. From the day we recognized the Communist government, the flaming liberals have controlled our foreign policy for the purpose of establishing liberalism as the dominant theme of the Federal Government.

But now, thank God, the wind has shifted. Conservatives are rising up across the land, finding new strength in their old convictions, making their voices heard, and winning at the polls. In the last election, conservatives won two seats in the Senate, some 20 seats in the House, and some 300 seats in State legislatures. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's wonderful book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," was published last year and is on its way to selling over a million copies. The Young Americans for Freedom were organized last fall and now have over 25,000 student members on more than a hundred campuses throughout the country. The battle is joined.

Although the modern liberals derive their name from the Latin word for freedom, their actions and goals have consistently tended to increase the power of the Central Government. The modern conservatives take individual liberty as their battle cry, and they know that individual liberty is imperiled when the Government attains unlimited power.

The idea of limiting the power of government found its way into the constitution of every State and into the Federal Constitution itself. For a century and a half, under this limited Government, where individual

citizens have been able to assert their rights in courts of law, the people have been free.

## WASHINGTON BUREAUCRATS—A CLOUD OF LOCUSTS

And now, by some queer twist of language, the modern liberals are those who ceaselessly strive to pile up the power of government in Washington. Bureaucrats from Washington swoop like vultures over cities, large and small, to infest and assault the countryside. Federal regulations, decrees, reports, and questionnaires find their way into every business office, every home, every school, and every church in the land.

It is not the liberals who seek to reduce the power of government; it is not the liberals who cry out for reduced taxes, reduced regulation, and increased personal freedom.

It is the conservatives who now proudly wave these banners to the great amazement and acute distress of certain office-hungry political pragmatists, who believe that a candidate for office has to call himself a liberal to get elected.

The liberals would sweep aside the constitutional restraints upon government in a blind rush to supply food, clothes, houses, and financial security from birth to death for everybody—not only in this country, but around the world. Conservatives recognize the importance of material goods, but we know one truth that is still more important—that man does not live by bread alone.

American liberalism is driving us into slavery and, with us, everyone else in the world—for the death of liberty here will be the death of liberty around the world, and the beginning of complete Communist tyranny for centuries.

Every time the liberals discover a brandnew misinterpretation of the Constitution, every time they invent a new way to circumvent the constitutional limits on Federal power, they pile up more power in Washington at the expense of individual liberty across the land.

In 1912 the Congress, the President, and the courts uniformly respected the 10th article of our Bill of Rights, which says "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Government money means Government power. In 1912 most of the Government money belonged to the States, counties, cities and towns, who spent more than two-thirds of all taxes collected in the United States, while the Federal Government controlled and spent less than one-third.

Back in 1912 the Federal Government took and spent \$7 for every person in the population. In 1960 it took and spent \$450 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Thus the Federal Government takes and spends today about 65 times as much, per person, as it did 50 short years ago. This means that the Federal Government has 65 times as much power to invade the personal liberty of every American citizen as it had in 1912. And it is using that power to an ever greater degree.

Of course, this disastrous increase in Federal taxation has seriously injured every American's power to spend or save what he has earned. There are about 2,500 Federal agencies, and they all think the American citizen has nothing better to do than fill out forms. Whether you are the boss or the hired man, huckster or housewife, farmer or fisherman, doctor, lawyer, merchant, or even a Swedish prize fighter, you find your Federal paperwork coming at you from all directions every day of your life.

## UNDER TAX LAW, YOU CAN BE FRISKED CLEAN

Under the 16th—the income tax—amendment, which became effective in 1913, the entire gross income of every American is

subject to complete Federal confiscation. You have your brackets, exemptions, write-offs, and deductions purely by the grace of Congress. You do not have these protections as a matter of right.

I ask you in all seriousness, how can this law be enforced? A man could spend his life trying to learn the tax law and still not know it all. How can we expect 60 million people to respect a law that cannot be understood?

Then, too, the tax law has undermined the 10th amendment, which reserves to the States or the people the powers not delegated to the Federal Government.

The Federal Government gets to the tax sources first and with a prior claim, and the States pick up the crumbs. If our States, which once were sovereign, want money for schools, jails, roads, parks, poor relief, and other areas that were left to their jurisdiction under the Constitution, they find that they have to go to Washington with a tin cup and beg for it.

As I stated previously, we are at war and we don't know it. One proof of this is that we have allowed the Federal Government to tear down the constitutional dignity, civil integrity, and financial independence of the States.

The Communists want to take over this country. They would have a tough time of it if they had to infiltrate and subvert 50 sovereign States, which might lead to battles in the streets. But the Communists are not interested in acquiring possession of a pile of rubble. What they want is our industrial organization, our transportation and communication networks, and our banking system—in working order. Their job is made much easier if the complete control of the country is centered in Washington, where the stakes are winner-take-all. All they have to do is take over Washington. This is how they took Czechoslovakia and acquired a superb and successful industry.

The constitutional integrity of the States is our best defense. That is why the Communists, at home and abroad, have made it an important objective to destroy our States rights.

One of the duties of conservatism is to restore States rights. And the best way to begin is to drain off this reservoir of unlimited money power that has collected in the Federal bureaucracy as a result of the 16th amendment.

That amendment is the very prescription given by Karl Marx in his Communist manifesto for income taxation to destroy private property and establish socialism throughout the world. Conservatism must begin the restoration of the American Republic by knocking the 16th amendment right out of the Constitution.

Faint hearts will say it's impossible, but faint hearts thought the American Revolution was impossible, too. Fellow citizens, we must not be afraid, for a nation afraid is already dead.

The tax law will go. Everybody hates it. Nobody understands it. It cannot be enforced. The Communists want it. Our political liberty is endangered by it.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are not yet in bondage. We still have some liberty left. But we are at war to preserve that liberty. Let us, therefore, acknowledge and be grateful for the blessings of freedom which God has given us. Let us dedicate our lives to this one struggle.

Let us pray every night for the strength and guidance to inspire in others the gratitude, the love, and the dedication that we owe to this great land of ours for the sake of our posterity.

Then, and then only, can we say when the candle of life burns low: "Thank God, I have contributed my best to the land that contributed so much to me."

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5199

cumulating the deficits mentioned above. Consequently, to reduce the cost of plutonium by assigning some of the project's joint costs to power would only increase the deficit of the BPA.

Table I gives a picture of BPA income and expenses by project for 1960:

TABLE I.—Bonneville Power Administration: Net revenues for the year 1960 after provision for depreciation

Project:		
Bonneville Dam	-\$602,136	
Columbia Basin		+\$4,715,473
Hungry Horse		+602,318
Albeni Falls	-122,599	
McNary	-2,401,472	
Detroit-Big Cliff	-180,376	
Lookout Point-Dexter	-167,297	
Chief Joseph	-1,003,244	
Yakima-Kennewick-Roza		+161,084
The Dalles	-868,299	
BPA system	-8,619,468	
Subtotal	-13,964,891	+5,478,875
		-13,964,891
Net revenues for 1960		-8,486,016

The deficit in amounts required for meeting scheduled amortization was even larger than table I indicates. This is because the estimated service lives of some of the fixed plant facilities, such as the hydroelectric generating plants, which are used in computing depreciation, are substantially longer than the prescribed repayment periods, with the result that annual amortization requirements exceed the amounts needed annually to recover plant investment through provision for depreciation expenses. Net revenues fell short of meeting amortization requirements by \$11.6 million in 1960.

Table II shows financial results for each project on a payout basis for 1960:

TABLE II.—Bonneville Power Administration: Deficits in project payouts (1960)

Project:	Deficit in net revenues available for amortization
Bonneville Dam	\$920,206
Columbia Basin	
Hungry Horse	
Albeni Falls	22,610
McNary	2,653,341
Detroit-Big Cliff	156,287
Lookout Point-Dexter	110,098
Chief Joseph	179,980
Yakima-Kennewick-Roza	
The Dalles	151,549
BPA system	7,397,802
Total	11,591,873

This deficit is expected to grow in 1961 and 1962 to \$15 or \$16 million since estimates indicate that net revenues available for repayment of capital investment in those years will decrease by \$2 to \$3 million while at the same time annual amortization requirements will grow as new higher cost generating plants are placed in service.

**Border Dispute**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of July 6, 1961:

OFF THE RECORD

Border dispute: It is no skin off South Carolina's nose if North Carolina wants to spend \$12,500 helping Union County prove that Andrew Jackson was born in the Tarheel State. Taxpayers' money is for spending. The amount set aside is equal to 3 percent on \$400,000 worth of groceries. It would buy two Cadillacs for Governor Sanford.

But it is not enough to hijack General Jackson.

If the money, wisely spent, could convince North Carolinians that they have no claim to Jackson as a native son then something will have been done for the peace and tranquility of at least two of these United States.

This is too much to hope. Representative Glenn Hawfield, of Union County, seeks not to discover where Jackson was born but to prove he was born at the George McKemey cabin a few hundred feet across the State line in North Carolina.

The same objective inspired Col. Samuel H. Walkup, prominent lawyer of Union County, more than a hundred years ago. In 1945, the year of Jackson's death, Colonel Walkup laid claim to Jackson for North Carolina during a 4th of July oration. He produced two affidavits to support his claim.

In the years that followed, he worked diligently on the premise that because Jackson's biographers could not agree on his actual birthplace, Jackson himself did not know where he was born. In all, Colonel Walkup secured nearly a dozen supporting affidavits.

None of the affidavits would have been admitted as evidence in a court of law. Their inadequacy, according to Dr. Archibald Henderson, "inhered in the fact that the affidavits set forth not the statements of eyewitnesses \* \* \* but the statements of neighbors of alleged eyewitnesses" to the actual birth of Jackson.

Two fallacies: Colonel Walkup was in error in two major instances. He did not know or chose to ignore a simple historical fact. At the time of Jackson's birth in 1767 the George McKemey house was in South Carolina.

The second error was Colonel Walkup's assumption that Jackson did not know himself where he was born. No statement or writing can be found to support this. On every public occasion when the subject came up Jackson claimed South Carolina as his native State. Twice in writing he named the South Carolina plantation of James Crawford as the place of his birth.

The most convincing of these, because it was unsolicited, was his letter to Robert Mills, famous South Carolina architect and cartographer, who fought under Jackson at New Orleans. Mills had completed the mapping of South Carolina in 1823 and sent a copy to Jackson.

On the map of the Lancaster District he had placed a star at the James Crawford plantation with the notation that this was "Gen'l A. Jackson's Birthplace." Jackson wrote Mills congratulating him on the accuracy of the map.

"A view of the map pointing to the spot which gave me birth," he wrote, "brings fresh to my memory many associations dear to my heart. Most of the names of the places are changed. The crossing of Waxhaw Creek, within 1 mile of which I was born, is still, however, I see, possessed by Dr. John Crawford, son of the owner who lived there while I was growing up and at school."

There is no mystery about the McKemey house being in South Carolina in 1767. An error in the original survey of the line between the two States placed both the McKemey house and that of James Crawford in North Carolina. But this error was discovered in 1764.

In an effort to clear land titles a compromise was reached in London in 1771 whereby South Carolina agreed to surrender the 11-mile strip of land below the 35th parallel in exchange for a strip of North Carolina above this parallel and west of the Catawba River. It is also a matter of history that the New Carolina Legislature refused to accept this compromise and would not take title to the Waxhaw strip until 1813. So, even if it could be proved that Jackson was born in the McKemey house he would still be a native South Carolinian.

*file*  
**House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, June 17, 1961]

HELP FOR CAPTIVES

As part of its forward strategy against communism, the U.S. House of Representatives should establish a Committee on the Captive Nations.

A House resolution to this effect has been submitted by U.S. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, one of the most active foes of communism in American Government.

Representative FLOOD's sound argument is that the Poles, the Hungarians, and many other peoples behind the Iron Curtain are a major free world asset. These people want

A5200

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 12

to throw off Communist tyranny. If the United States does not forget them, one day they will regain their independence. A special House committee that would keep in constant touch with developments in the captive nations would be an effective means of helping our secret allies.

The News and Courier hopes that South Carolina Members of the House will support the resolution for a Captive Nations Committee.

CLEVELAND, May 23, 1961.

DEAR SIR: You are to be warmly complimented for having drafted the resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I strongly support this resolution.

For the captive nations and us this committee is the basis of our living revolution toward freedom and peace with justice. It is the means for us to preserve our freedom; it is the means for them to regain it.

I hopefully will incite more support for this resolution.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN OLIJNYK.

BYELORUSSIAN YOUTH  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
Brooklyn, N.Y., May 15, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Byelorussian Youth Association of America, I wish to express our appreciation of the effort you have made in introducing the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Particularly at the present time, a wealth of facts is needed to counteract the hypocritical propaganda on colonialism and imperialism with which Soviet Russia saturates the world, with distressing success.

Armed with facts and data gathered by the permanent Committee on Captive Nations, the United States could, as the leader of the free world, immediately and effectively counter all Soviet falsehoods. It could expose Soviet Russia as an empire aimed at the conquest of the world through all means as, for example, by police state tyranny, through science, armed might, subversion, cultural exchanges, and economic maneuvering. At the same time, however, the facts gathered would present the Russian empire as a giant on clay feet; an empire, where the conquered non-Russian peoples constitute a majority of the population; an empire, whose mineral and agricultural resources are found largely in the captured lands; an empire, which can crumble, as past experience has shown, in the face of resolute action.

The committee could inform the world of the subjugation of the once free people of Byelorussia and many other countries by Soviet Russia; of the methods used toward this aim in the past, today, and likely to be used again in the future. It could show the main strength of Soviet Russia to be the unyielding pursuit of one goal—the conquest of the whole world—by any means and tactics. However, on the other hand, it could expose a mass of weaknesses, which could then be used as mighty weapons in the existing struggle.

Finally, the free do owe a moral obligation to those who were once free and desire to be so again. Let it not be the lack of information or shortness of memory on the part of the free people to cause their fellowmen to continue to suffer in captivity.

Respectfully yours,

ULADZIMIER DUNIEC,  
President.

CHICAGO, June 25, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, radio committee, wishes to congratulate

you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN SAMBOR,  
President.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

May 25, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You sent a resolution to the Committee on Rules to create a Special Committee on Captive Nations, the function of which would be to conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and the means by which the United States can assist them through peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedom.

I strongly support this resolution, House Resolution 211.

Very truly yours,

M. MOCIO.

NYACK, N.Y.,  
May 18, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am in full support of your House Resolution 211 on establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I am an American citizen of Tartar origin from Idel-Ural.

Your resolution, I think, has a very big political significance for the struggle against Communist aggression.

Respectfully,

ABDULLA WAFALI.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

May 22, 1961.

DEAR SIR: House Resolution 211, submitted by you to the House on March 8, 1961 deserves our serious attention.

It is very important at the present moment to study the true nature of our enemy and to gain help of our natural allies (subjugated nations) in our fight against Russian imperialism, the clever tool of which communism happens to be.

Therefore the new resolution, No. 211, should get the full support of the Congress.

Very truly yours,

ANDRIJ MOLYN.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,  
June 21, 1961.

HON. DANIEL FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I wish to wholeheartedly commend your resolution, House Resolution 211, regarding the rescue of captive countries behind the Iron Curtain. Our country must act as an aggressor for the rights and freedoms of all peoples, as we are the only country that can do it; and we must make up our minds to exercise the will to do it.

Sincerely,

CAROL RANSFORD.

CLEVELAND, May 22, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We congratulate you for drafting the resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I strongly support this resolution.

The existence of such a committee will have more concrete meaning and hope for the millions who are subjugated by the only real colonialism and imperialism existing in

the world today—as is communism—especially Russian.

Thank you.

Cordially yours,

STEPHAN KAWKA.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN YOUTH  
OF UKRAINIAN DESCENT, INC.,  
CHICAGO BRANCH,

June 22, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We, the members of Association of American Youth of Ukrainian Descent, Inc., wish to congratulate you on your move to introduce the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Those captive nations, who are working toward their independence from Russian slavery and despotism are willing to give the newly formed committee all weaknesses of Soviet Union (a nations' prison). Those Russian weaknesses will be important in making American foreign policy, in respect to the captive nations.

We are writing our Congressmen, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI, and EDWARD J. DERWINSKI asking them to support your resolution.

ALEX KONOWAL,  
President.

MARIA SZKREBEC,  
Secretary.

## Regional Planning for Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

## HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Housing Act of 1961 has given us, as President Kennedy said, a giant step forward in our national effort to make our metropolitan areas more livable now and in the future. Old programs have been broadened; new programs have been added. New emphasis has been given, too, to the concept and practice of regional planning and regional development.

Once again this year, the supporters of the bill made it quite clear that local interests are usually best served when they are seen within the context of a region. It would be foolish, for instance, for a municipality to develop a splendid program against air pollution, only to find that its neighbors had been less diligent.

Transit systems, too, cross many boundaries: municipal, county, and State. Unless representatives of those geographical units talk to each other and act together, their common transportation system may serve the region inequitably or not at all.

Many Federal programs will not have maximum effectiveness, therefore, unless local officials develop workable methods of regional cooperation. Without sacrificing local identity, community leaders can establish the ground rules for effective, full utilization of all resources at their command for the intelligent and comprehensive development of entire metropolitan areas.

Under such circumstances it is sometimes possible to compress in a poem a message that might otherwise require thousands of words.

I believe it is therefore fitting to reprint a poem, entitled "Why?" written by Julia Yohn Pickett, managing editor of the Baltimore Beacon, as a translation of Israel Schläffer's Hebraic poem: "For What Sins?" and published in the Baltimore Beacon of May 1961.

In the foreword to the poem, the editor's note states:

Worldwide attention is centered on the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem. The indictment: Crimes against the Jewish people and crimes against humanity. Complicity in the killing of millions of Jews in his capacity as the person responsible for the execution of the Nazi plan for the physical extermination of the Jews.

The poem is as follows:

WHY?

An eerie midnight hour tolls,  
And from their tomb emerges  
A ghostly horde of brooding souls,  
Grim echoing of purges.

The plaintive group stands silently,  
There is no anguished cry,  
In solemn unanimity  
They mutely question: "Why?"

As they return to endless sleep  
God humbly bows His head,  
And sad, the countless mourners weep—  
No answer for the dead.

### Appeasement: When Will It End?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in a couple of Memorial Day speeches delivered to my constituency over the last weekend I bore down heavily on the need for a forthright foreign policy and the end of what, in the minds of many of our citizens, is a policy of temporizing with—appeasing, if you will—a lot of pipsqueak dictators who have jubilantly joined in slapping Uncle Sam around.

The response to the position I took on the public platform was instantaneous and uniformly favorable. In addition my mail is becoming increasingly heavy with demands that we stop retreating all over the world and take a stand from which there will be no further withdrawal. To my publicly announced views on what I feel should be our foreign policy I have added the suggestion that the time is here when our President should talk tough and in effect say to Mr. Khrushchev and his ilk, "thus far and no farther—one more step and we'll clobber you," and then be prepared to do it.

The late John Foster Dulles proceeded on the theory that the Commies will always back up in the face of firm resistance and proved it at Suez, the Formosa Straits, in the Iran-Turkey imbroglio, and in Lebanon. In each of

those situations we took a firm stand and we were in each instance, unlike our shameful defection in the case of Cuba, prepared to take the second and vital step.

I am neither a jingoist nor a war-monger but I feel that firmness will pay big dividends both at home and abroad. Overseas our position should include a flat statement to our wishy-washy allies to either get all the way on our team or go peddle their individual fish, to the neutrals to make up their minds since in the life and death battle with communism there can be no middle ground, and to the recipients of our largess no more handouts to anyone who refuses allegiance to our cause. At home such a pronouncement will galvanize the American people as nothing else has done and the nervous nellys can be largely ignored since they seem to be never happier than when they are downgrading their own United States.

The latest insult which our Nation seems about to passively accept in this infamous tractor deal. This is blackmail in the extreme and what is even worse the Cubans are gleefully chortling over our apparent gullibility. A news item appearing in the May 26 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer sets forth that situation in all of its galling details and simply indicates how far our national integrity has declined. The article is included in full, as follows. Read it and fume as I have done:

[From the Philadelphia Inquire, May 26, 1961]

#### CASTRO'S BIG TRACTOR SWAP: CUBA JOKE BACKFIRES ON UNITED STATES

(By Zell Rabin)

HAVANA.—After a week's travel throughout Cuba, I have yet to find a person who took Premier Fidel Castro's offer to exchange tractors for prisoners seriously.

Western observers here regard Castro's offer as bizarre and are astonished by the American response to what everyone here felt was nothing more than a gigantic leg pull. They feel that by accepting the offer, the United States has blundered into a major propaganda defeat.

Many persons here are puzzled by the sentimentality and "do-goodism" that seemed to sweep the United States when the worst possible fate for the prisoners of the abortive invasion is a few years of forced cane cutting or trench digging.

SEEN AS JOKE

At first, everyone here regarded Castro's proposition as a huge joke. Indeed, so lighthearted was Castro's mood that with a chuckle he included all Spanish priests on the island in the exchange at no extra charge.

The day following Castro's offer, El Mundo, a government-controlled Havana newspaper, frontpaged a satirical article asking what would happen if the prisoners were again recruited, sent back to Guatemala, and invaded Cuba once more.

It would follow, the paper said, that when they were captured a second time, the invaders would be worth more than 500 tractors because they were better trained and more experienced.

PARKING PROBLEM

On the second exchange deal with the United States, Castro could probably get 1,000 tractors for them. If this state of affairs continued, El Mundo added, it would soon cause serious tractor parking problem in Cuba.

Two days after the offer was made, Cubans were amazed to learn the Kennedy Administration was seriously considering it. Nobody is reported to have been more surprised or pleased than the "Maximum Leader" himself.

Western diplomats here were startled by the speed with which the offer was accepted in the United States when there was, in fact, no need for speed. At no time were the prisoners' lives endangered.

CRIMINALS IN DANGER

Castro announced three weeks ago that the only invaders who would be shot were those wanted for crimes during the Batista dictatorship, such as assistant police chief Ramon Calvino.

Diplomats also wondered why distinguished Americans should head a fund-raising committee when it would have been much wiser to have left it to prominent Cubans in exile.

Meanwhile, in Washington, resolutions were introduced Thursday asking Congress to go on record as opposed to the exchange.

One resolution would say the Senate felt contributions to the tractor fund are not tax exempt. Another would express "the sense of the House" that the Federal Government should prohibit any shipments of bulldozers or tractors to Cuba. Neither could bind the Administration.

RANSOM NOT READY

MIAMI, FLA., May 25 (UPI)—The ten paroled Cuban invaders, scheduled to return to Havana Friday still lacked a firm commitment on the tractors-for-prisoners exchange plan.

Despite increasing Congressional criticism, a privately-backed campaign continued—with President Kennedy's personal support—to raise an estimated \$15 million to pay for the equipment.

Unconfirmed reports circulated that the prisoners may seek an extension of their 1-week parole.

### House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly



the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the Record:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, May 16, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I have learned of your House Resolution 211, which you had introduced, in regard to the establishment of a permanent Committee of Captive Nations. I feel that this is a step forward in the struggle which our country is carrying on against the further expansion of communism throughout the world.

I feel that such a committee should be set up in order that we, in this country, are made to realize the dangerous and insidious nature of communism and its threat to the security of the United States.

It is my hope that your resolution is passed by the House of Representatives. I will write to the Congressman in my district urging him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. DEMER.

[From the Manion Forum]

#### FLOOD RESOLUTION MUST BE SUPPORTED

A rallying point for this activated American interest in these captive nations is House Resolution 211 introduced last March 8 by Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania. The resolution calls for the establishment of a special congressional committee to study the plight of all nations now in Communist captivity and explore the means by which the United States can assist these hundreds of millions of Communist-held slaves to regain their national and individual freedoms.

Immediate discussion and early passage of Congressman Flood's resolution would be excellent insurance against the disgrace of another appeasing summit spectacle featuring the bloody butcher of Budapest with the President of the United States.

It would likewise forestall the very real possibility that a rehabilitated Castro might be invited back for another triumphal appearance in the Harvard Stadium. Tell your Congressman to join Congressman FLOOD in the sponsorship of House Resolution 211.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO, May 17, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: My heartiest congratulations and thanks to you upon introducing the House Resolution 221 for the Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Such a committee could be very helpful in making the people of the United States aware of the threats of communism. As a small child of 7 and 8 years of age I experienced Communist tyranny in Estonia in 1940-41. My family and I fled in September 1944, having lived in United States since 1949. In the August 27, 1949 Saturday Evening Post there was an article about my family. You may find some excerpts of my letters there written in halting English, but 12 years later still hold true.

Thank you again for your resolution. I hope the above resolution will be passed by a great majority.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. LIA NOUKAS STAAF.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEFENSE OF  
FOUR FREEDOMS OF UKRAINE, INC.,  
Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your initiative work in the U.S. Congress to form a Committee on Captive Nations was received with enthusiasm and approval by all members of our organization. We believe that it is the right time for such a committee to look into modern 20th century slavery led by Moscow's arch-gangster Khrushchev and to awake people still free before it is too late. For this reason we wrote a letter to the honorable U.S. Congressman from Illinois, Mr. ELMER J. HOFFMAN, who is a member of the House Committee on Rules, to support your Resolution 211. We sincerely hope that he will do his part in helping you to form a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. We assure you that millions of freedom-hungry people behind the Iron Curtain thank you in their hearts, although they cannot express it openly.

We Americans of Ukrainian descent appreciate very much what you are doing for the cause of preserving justice for all mankind.

We remain with respect,

ROMAN KOBYLECKY,

Chairman.

WILLIAM HOLOD,

Secretary.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, May 22, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The House Resolution 211, submitted by you on March 8, 1961, deserves our serious attention. Its aim is to establish a special committee on Captive Nations, the function of which would be to conduct an inquiry into and a study of all captive non-Russian nations.

The existence of such a committee says that we Americans are aware that the cause of eventual liberation and independence of the captive nations is indispensable to our future as a free nation.

This will show that Russia without the Captive Nations is indeed only a third rate power.

Sincerely,

BOHDAN ROSHETSKY.

SUPREME COSSACK'S REPRESENTATION IN EXILE,  
New York, N.Y.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Supreme Cossack Representation in Exile, as the spokesman of all Cossacks living in the countries of the free world, is sincerely appreciative of your noble resolution H. Res. 211 about the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Most anxiously, we look forward to the passage of this measure by the House Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives and by the Congress of the United States.

Cossack organizations and the organizations of Americans of Cossack descent sent to all members of the House Rules Committee, calling for their support of the bill.

The Cossacks take the liberty to send you its heartiest and grateful thanks for your Resolution in which United States by the creation of a Special House Committee would make a permanent symbol and hope for the captive nations.

We are very happy to see that among various submerged nations by Communist

Russia, nations pointed in the Captive Nations Week Resolution include also, the Cossack nation and our homeland Cossackia.

With best wishes for your noble work,  
Sincerely yours,

W. G. GLASKOW,  
Chairman.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, May 22, 1961.

DEAR SIR: The House Resolution 211, submitted to the House by you deserves our serious attention because its aim is to establish a special committee on captive nations the functions of which would be to conduct an inquiry and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and the means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspirations to regain their national and individual freedom.

Therefore the new resolution 211 should get the full support of both the Congress and the Senate.

Sincerely,

ANDRIJ MOLYN.

UKRAINIAN ASSOCIATION OF VICTIMS OF RUSSIAN COMMUNIST TERROR,  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada, May 16, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our organization, consisting of 17 branches across Canada, observed its 10th anniversary at its national convention in 1960. Our chief aim is to combat Communist propaganda and its subversive penetration on this continent with our informative publications, public speeches and direct contacts with people.

Among our publications are the following books written by our members: "White Book About the Black Deeds of the Kremlin," "Islands of Death," "One of the Fifteen Million" (published in eight languages), "The Hunters and the Hunted" and others.

We, who have lived many years through hardship in the Russian Communist empire, who have been on the verge of death in Russian slave labor camps and in remote exile, appreciate your stand against the godless and subversive Communist ideology, your intelligent understanding and support of the problem of independence of Ukraine and other nations ensnared by the Red Russian colonialism.

Yours very respectfully,

NICHOLAS PRYCHODKO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

SIR: As a former member of a captive nation, Estonia, I thank you for presenting your Resolution 211 to the House of Representatives.

The need for the Special Committee on Captive Nations is most urgent.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER VELDI.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
May 22, 1961.

SIR: You are congratulated for drafting the resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The fact of the existence of such committee will have more concrete meaning and hope for millions who are subjected by the only real colonialism and imperialism existing in the world today—as is communism—especially Russian. This Committee is the basis of our living revolution toward freedom and peace with justice. It is the means for them to regain it.

Therefore the new Resolution No. 211 should get the full support of the Congress.

Yours truly,

LIDIA CZBANTUK.

A3136

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 4

**Buffalo Evening News Reporter Ed May  
Wins 1960 Pulitzer Prize**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that a member of the staff of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., has won a Pulitzer Prize.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial and article that appeared in the May 2, 1961, issue of the Buffalo Evening News:

**PULITZER FOR ED MAY**

Once again we have the pleasant opportunity to congratulate a fellow member of the News staff on the receipt of a Pulitzer Prize. Three years ago Bruce Shanks won the prize for editorial cartoons. Now Reporter Ed May has received an award for local reporting.

Mr. May's winning articles, "Our Costly Dilemma," represented as penetrating a study of public welfare problems as was ever attempted by an American newspaper. They were the product of 6 months of research and reporting, including 3 months' service by Mr. May as a caseworker for the Erie County Welfare Department.

The outstanding merit of "Our Costly Dilemma" won instant acclaim here and elsewhere in the Nation. The series triggered a comprehensive reform program that is still underway—and still bringing beneficial results—in the Erie County department. Other newspapers carried the articles through the Associated Press. The News has complied with hundreds of requests from welfare authorities and others for reprints. The series' findings and conclusions have had an impact and an influence on public welfare throughout New York State and beyond it to other parts of the country.

The Pulitzer Prizes have served for nearly half a century as a measure of merit for creative and cultural contributions in many fields. For newspapermen everywhere they are especially significant as a yardstick of journalistic skill, enterprise, and devotion to public service. We are proud of the professional craftsmanship and energy that has earned for Mr. May his richly deserved honor and has brought to the News, and all who contribute to its quality, the happy distinction of two Pulitzer Prizes within the brief space of 3 years.

**NEWS REPORTER ED MAY WINS 1960 PULITZER PRIZE—SECOND MEMBER OF STAFF IN 3 YEARS HONORED—WROTE SERIES OF ARTICLES ON WELFARE PROBLEM**

A 1960 Pulitzer Prize for excellence in journalism has been awarded to Edgar May, Buffalo Evening News general assignment reporter.

The award, announced Monday, was for local reporting and is in recognition of Mr. May's work on a critical series of articles on the public welfare program in Erie County and New York State.

It marks the second time in 3 years a member of the Buffalo Evening News staff has won a Pulitzer prize—most coveted honor in journalism.

Bruce M. Shanks, News editorial page cartoonist, won a Pulitzer Prize for 1957. His cartoon, "The Thinker," was published on August 20 of that year. The cartoon pointed up the problem of labor racketeering.

Mr. May's articles were published in the News last summer under the series title, "Our Costly Dilemma."

**WAS UNDERCOVER MAN**

The 31-year-old reporter, who joined the News staff April 7, 1958, served as an undercover man to do the basic research that made the welfare series possible. He ostensibly left the News staff and took a job as a caseworker for the Erie County Department of Social Welfare.

Using his personal experience as a caseworker and facts uncovered during 6 months of research by News staffs in Buffalo and its Albany and Washington bureaus, Mr. May also interviewed recognized welfare authorities and made a careful study of private surveys of welfare agencies of the State.

The purpose of the series was announced at the outset as being to direct community thinking toward shortcomings of the welfare system and generate a grassroots demand that welfare be confined to the needy and dispensed with greater concern for the taxpayer.

**NEWS CITED BY AP**

That it achieved this purpose was evident even before the final article in the series was published.

Schools giving courses in social welfare and the welfare departments of various political subdivisions as far away as Texas requested reprints of the articles, which were made available by the News in convenient form.

The Associated Press awarded a citation to the News for making available for general distribution a five-part condensation of the series and praised the thoughtful, probing stories that won prominent display in newspapers throughout the State.

Letters praising the series were received from editors, State legislators, welfare officials and workers and from citizens in all parts of the State.

**STUDIED BY COMMISSIONER**

They contained such phrases as "a splendid job; a fine piece of work; admirable thoroughness; purposeful job of reporting; real public service; well documented and very revealing; outstanding service in presenting in an unbiased manner so many facets of this problem."

The Erie County citizens welfare advisory committee noted that the articles had been of great value to it because of factual content and practical presentation.

After a careful study of the articles, Erie County welfare commissioner Paul F. Burke submitted to the county board of social welfare a comprehensive 34-point plan for operation of his department.

**CASELOAD DROPPED**

Subsequently more caseworkers were added to the departmental staff, salaries were increased in amounts up to \$300, and there was a general awakening of public interest in the welfare operations.

Although the series was not directed in the first instance at fraud, more vigorous prosecution of cases of welfare fraud and a general tightening of regulations were collateral results of the series. The welfare caseload dropped to the lowest point in 2 years.

Mr. May was born in Zurich, Switzerland. He was graduated from Northwestern University with the degree of bachelor of science, journalism, in 1957. Previously he had worked as a reporter on the Bellows Falls, Vt., Weekly Times and the Fitchburg, Mass., Sentinel.

**WON PREVIOUS AWARDS**

He served 6 months in the infantry and 18 months in the Public Information Office of 5th Army Headquarters, Chicago, 1953-55. He is a member of the American Newspaper Guild and Kappa Tau Alpha, Journalism honorary society.

In 1951, Mr. May won an award from the New England Weekly Press Association for the best feature story. In the following

year, he won from the same organization awards for the best news story and the second best news feature.

As acting editor of the Bellows Weekly Times in 1952, he received an award for the best weekly paper in New England. In 1959 he won the Walter O. Bingham Award of the Buffalo Newspaper Guild.

His mother is Mrs. Renee May of Pittsfield, Mass. A sister, Mrs. Arthur Kunin, lives in Burlington, Vt.

**House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I request that the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HENRY REGNERY Co.,

Chicago, Ill., April 26, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I understand that you have introduced a resolution creating a special House Committee on Captive Nations. As chairman of the Chicago Committee for Captive Nations Week, may I commend you for introducing this legislation, and take this opportunity to express the hope that the committee is established.

It seems to me to be clear that our best allies are the people of the captive nations, and that the best way to bring this fact home to the American people, and to let

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPEND X

A3135

events, and forget that there are higher values in our lives. And we forget too, that these values must be cared for or we will lose them. As has been said so often and so well, "Vigilance is the price of liberty."

We know that today two ideologies stand face to face; each waiting for the other to fall before it. On the one side is the democratic ideal of individual freedom sustained by a government of laws. On the other, the totalitarian and godless political and economic system which we identify with the name of "communism."

We of the free world have made every effort, in good conscience, to live in peace with the Communist world. We have made mistakes in our dealings with that world. But, believe me, our mistakes were due largely to our good will. But also, and this is very important, neither have we understood the true nature of the Communist system. Especially, we have not understood that communism has never changed and will never change its ultimate objective, which is to remake the world into one Communist state.

Forty-two years ago Lenin said that Communist and Democratic countries could not exist side by side. One or the other must be overcome. He then put forth a plan for world revolution which to this very day has not changed in its basic objectives.

It is to this plan for world conquest that we can trace most of the troubles occurring in the new nations of Africa and Asia and the Caribbean.

While it is true that the appearance of communism seems to change almost from day to day, its substance does not change.

Communist leaders have said clearly enough that they will do anything to further their cause, even to making a show of friendship to democracy. They change their tactics to meet changing situations, they call for peaceful coexistence, they make friendly gestures. But we must not be fooled. Communism does not change; it cannot change without destroying itself. And the objective remains to conquer the whole world; by any means available.

We find subversion and Communist Parties in all countries. We find that these are controlled from Moscow. We find communism infiltrated into labor and industry, education, communications media, armed services and government, and, eventually, we see the attempt to destroy constitutional liberties.

These things have been accomplished successfully in many countries in Europe, Asia, and South America. We may rest assured that the Government and people of the United States are no less a target. Let us not forget that they promised to bury us.

As long as we remember these things we can hope to remain unconquered and free.

However, knowledge and the determination to resist the Communist ideology are only the necessary starting point. We must give deep and careful consideration to the fact that Russia and her satellites are strongly armed with the most modern weapons of war; that the economy of these nations is directed primarily to building up and maintaining armies, navies, and air forces.

At the present time they do not choose to use all-out war to extend their conquest of the world. They are doing well enough through subversion, infiltration, and localized fighting such as we have presently in Laos.

There is a good reason for this choice. The United States is too strong for them to attempt an all-out war. The odds are still not entirely in their favor.

It is self-evident that the people of the United States are a peace-loving people. We have extended the hand of friendship to all

nations—even our former enemies—and still extend it.

You will pardon me if, with some pride, I declare that the men and women of the Armed Forces are doing more than any other segment of the American people to maintain the peace. I know that theirs is a constant endeavor toward this end. I know of no one in uniform who desires to achieve national objectives by means of war.

As I indicated a moment ago, the cold war continues cold because America and the free nations cannot be safely attacked—they are too strong right now.

The lesson is obvious. We must maintain our Armed Forces at a peak of strength and efficiency, armed with the latest and best in weapons systems and backed by a trained and ready Reserve, until the normal and peaceful methods of diplomacy can attain a reasonable degree of lasting peace and security among nations.

So long as the Communist bloc of nations, under the leadership of Moscow, maintain their policies of hate and their belligerent attitudes toward the free world, so long as subversion and infiltration threaten our liberties, so long must we maintain strong military forces in being.

But, military strength alone is not sufficient. Indeed it can lead to a dangerous state of complacency. How well we remember France's Maginot line. It could not be breached, it was impregnable, it was to be the salvation of France.

It was breached however, and overrun, and France fell to a conqueror because that military might was not backed by people who wanted freedom hard enough to sacrifice for it. They left their defenses to a wall of concrete and metal and to soldiers who had neither inspiration nor will to fight. And the same will happen to any military force not backed by the spiritual and moral strength of the people.

This is the lesson of the Americanization observance of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It reminds us that we have responsibilities which we cannot throw off to someone else. It reminds us that the enemy we face is fighting God and the goodness of His creation.

There is nothing new or radical in this observance. It serves to recall to our minds our national heritage of fraternal good will and dependency on God and that there are values above the personal, the material and the economic, which we call morality, patriotism, dedication to principle.

Our Founding Fathers knew this. They established this "Nation under God" and they acknowledged that our rights come from Him and not from a government or political ideology.

As a member of the Armed Forces, I can give you but one thought to carry with you. Our soldiers and sailors and airmen cannot be stronger than the people from whom they are drawn. If the people are strong in their convictions, individually and collectively, the Armed Forces will be strong, too. The strength of weapons united to the strength of character in each individual will maintain our country free, and, with her, the people of all other nations who want and appreciate freedom and peace.

Thank you.

ADDRESS OF REAR ADM. FREDERICK L. HETTER, S.C., U.S. NAVY, COMMANDING OFFICER, NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT, BAYONNE, N.J.

It is always a pleasure to join in the observance of Americanization Day.

When you think of it, you realize that we are all honoring our forefathers. The original inhabitants of this country were the Indians. All others are either immigrants, the sons and daughters of immigrants or descendants of immigrants.

If you give a lot of thought to the matter, you will realize that this country is so great simply because of immigrants.

It takes a considerable amount of determination, courage and character for an individual or a family to leave the land of its birth, and set out across the ocean for a strange country where the people speak a different language.

These people were strong. They were not content to ride along on the tide in their native lands. They knew what they wanted, and went after it despite knowing that the road would be very rough.

Youngsters growing up today in America are in about the same position as their immigrant forefathers, except in a different line.

Our country is being challenged daily by a foreign power that regiments its schoolchildren. Courses of study are set up and the children must apply themselves. In that way, the state plans years ahead on the number of physicists it will have, the number of chemists, engineers, and others.

Perhaps some of the chemistry students would rather be studying engineering. But they have no choice.

Here things are different. A boy or a girl can become almost anything that they wish if they try hard enough. It is easy for a youngster to quit before he starts. There are many excuses available: not enough money at home; no time for study; difficulties of gaining entrance to schools, and many more.

But these are just excuses. They are not valid reasons why any youngster must miss out on a good education.

If you want an education strongly enough you will get it.

Your forebears could have stayed in their native lands. They could have found suitable excuses for staying. But they were not looking for excuses. They wanted to live in a free country where an individual's only limit was himself.

That is why this country is so great. We got the best.

It is now the duty of the descendants of these great immigrants to make themselves the best in the world.

We live in an age of science, space travel, automation.

I am sure that a very high percentage of our grammar school pupils would like to work on rockets and missiles. This requires a scientific background.

But I wonder how many of them are willing to put in the many hard hours of study in mathematics, physics, and related subjects. Much of this study is drudgery. But it is necessary. It is the foundation of careers that are adventurous and fascinating.

Do you youngsters have the determination to plow through the difficult and dull? Do they want to be leaders?

I know that most of our young people are interested in space travel. That evidence is too well publicized to be missed. A glance into the front window of a toy shop shows that interest in space starts very early. Also, high school science fairs produce more exhibits connected with space than most other fields.

These facts prove that our younger people have the interest. The important thing is: Do they have the determination?

We need trained minds to keep this country great. It is the duty of our younger generations to improve themselves. Make themselves the best anywhere. In doing this they carry on the noble example of their courageous predecessors, many of whom arrived with all their possessions carried in a paper bag.

They may have arrived steerage class, but they have been first class ever since.

Let's all travel first class.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3137

the captive peoples know that they have not been forgotten is through such a committee as you have proposed.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY REGNERY,  
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE  
OF AMERICA, ELMIRA BRANCH,  
Horseheads, N.Y., March 25, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Elmira branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America wishes to congratulate you on your move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

These nations constitute a perennial weakness in the Soviet Union. It is to our advantage to know these weaknesses and work to multiply them.

We are writing our Congressman and Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING asking them to support your resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER PETRIWSKY,  
Chairman.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN  
ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Hawthorne, Calif., April 26, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The membership of this organization and myself wish to express our wholehearted support for your proposal to form a House of Representatives Committee on Captive Nations which we consider to be a right step in dramatizing the situation of national slavery and colonial oppression and exploitation of the various peoples under Soviet domination. We believe that the committee will serve a good purpose by collecting and presenting to the American people and the whole of mankind the abundant evidence that the Soviet Union is practicing the crudest kind of colonialism in regard to all non-Russian peoples of the Soviet empire and the satellite countries.

Our reasons for supporting the proposal are as follows:

1. While the West is breaking up empires, giving freedom to more and more peoples, the Russian Communists are building one, reaching out for more and more, right to our doorstep.

2. While posing themselves as champions of all colonial and semicolonial peoples under Western domination and hypocritically preaching freedom and self-determination for these peoples, the Russian Communists are hard at work in trying to deprive the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet empire, which became victims of Russian imperialist conquests, of their national identities and finally to wipe them off the map as national entities.

3. While accusing this country of warmongering and imperialism, Khrushchev shamelessly calls for "liberation wars" and claims the right for the Soviet Union to assist (and stir up, of course) any uprising anywhere in the world, which might advance supremacy of Russian communism.

This country, unfortunately, has not come up with a solution for stemming this Russian tide. The Congress made a good start in 1959 by passing a resolution Captive Nations Week. Khrushchev's reaction to this resolution has showed that the captive nations are a weak and vulnerable spot in the structure of the Soviet empire. (Captive nations are a weak spot in any empire; that is what causes empires to disintegrate as history has proved it so many times.) But

Western cold war strategists, for some obscure reasons, refuse to exploit this Soviet weakness. By exposing the Soviets for what they are, much of the wind will be taken out of the Soviet sails. The proposed committee could do a lot in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. ARCIUCH,  
President.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF  
UKRAINIAN ORGANIZATION,  
Brooklyn, N.Y.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization wishes to congratulate you on your bold and farsighted move in introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Needless to say, such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many nations and peoples. These nations are ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism.

A committee on the Captive Nations would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations. We are writing our Congressman, Mr. ANFUSO, asking him to support your resolution.

Respectfully yours,

PETER DUBORVEKI,  
President.  
JOHN MAKAR,  
Secretary.

APRIL 25, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have recently noticed that your resolution, House Resolution 211, which calls for the creation of a Captive Nations Committee, is presently before the Rules Committee. I wish to express my full support of this resolution.

I believe your resolution is a step in the right direction in overcoming the evils of communism and helping the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. I believe this resolution will have the full support of the American people.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. MANLEY.

AMERICAN-UKRAINIAN CITIZENS CLUB,  
Stamford, Conn., April 12, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, the American-Ukrainian Citizens Club of Stamford, Conn., wishes to express our congratulations to you. We are glad to know that you were farsighted and bold enough to introduce the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We hope that this resolution will be acted upon due to your efforts.

We believe that such a committee would do much for all freedom-loving people that are enslaved, especially those behind the Iron Curtain. This committee would also help to keep Americans informed of the plight of these people and countries.

Again you are to be congratulated on your farsightedness and wish you luck with it. We are writing our Congressman SIBAL, expressing our views and asking for his support of this resolution.

Very truly yours,

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY,  
Milwaukee, Wis., April 26, 1961.  
Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The Slavic Institute of Marquette University wholeheartedly endorses House Resolution 211 dealing with the establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Our institute has championed the cause of the captive nations since its organization 11 years ago and feels honored that the idea has been dignified by your resolution.

We hope that the bill will meet with the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely yours,

ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI,  
Director.  
ALFRED J. SOKOLNICKI,  
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL HOME,  
Willimantic, Conn., March 29, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The members of the Ukrainian National Home of Willimantic, Conn., in the name of their president, wish to congratulate you on your presentation of a resolution to the House of Representatives, calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

A Committee on the Captive Nations would furnish basic information and data on the various nations in the U.S.S.R. It would inform the world at large and the American people on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and aid the Government in forming its policies with respect to these nations.

We are writing to the State of Connecticut's own Congressman KOWALSKI, asking him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH RUDKO,  
President.

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN  
ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
New Brunswick, N.J., April 24, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Byelorussian-American Association in New Jersey I wish to express sincere congratulations on your introduction of the resolution for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The Soviet Union's goal is to dominate the world, and Americans shall know it because Soviet Russia has become a great imperialist peril which threatens all free nations and particularly our country—the United States of America.

Your resolution to create a committee is a great step in the right direction. It would serve as an information center on the enslaved peoples in the U.S.S.R. Our Government needs this information in making proper policies with respect to the captive nations and with respect to the security of the United States.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SERGIS HUTYRCZYK,  
President.

WILLIMANTIC, CONN., April 3, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
New House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Our organization, the Ukrainian Youth Association of Willimantic, Conn., wish to congratulate

you on your introducing the resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We have also contacted our Congressman, Mr. KOWALSKI by letter, and asked him to support your resolution.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE TUSKIEWICZ,  
President.

**A Look at John Birch**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many news sources have not objectively reported the facts concerning the John Birch Society. As a member of the society, I am anxious that it receive a fair and just hearing before the American public. I think the following editorial from the San Marino Tribune, the leading newspaper of San Marino, Calif., will interest those among us who want to know the truth about the society. Under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

**A LOOK AT JOHN BIRCH**

Why is it that patriotism is put on the defensive in the eyes of good Americans? Why do Americans question the motives or tactics of those whose only objective is the scourging of Communist influence from the American scene? Who turns American against American when the success of world-wide communism is concerned?

Is this attack on patriotism foreshadowing the day when patriots will be called conspirators against their own government, and placed under some sort of custody?

In every country where communism has taken over, the patriots were first considered controversial and later banded as conspirators against their government as it fell under the control of Reds. It happened in Cuba, which isn't very far away, and it could happen in America.

A favorite and effective tactic is to aim a smear campaign at anyone who is anti-Communist—discredit his political stand by lies or distortions, and destroy him by public censure. Those who use this tactic never answer this man's initial charges, nor do they ever replace him with another effective anti-Communist program. Their program is to smear and destroy.

The John Birch Society is getting a healthy start throughout the Southland and throughout the foothills. A program of positive, patriotic action, it has already attracted the usual smear. Some people who who have never tried to oppose the Communist threat, and some who have never recognized the Communist threat that now stands at their doorstep, are trying to discredit this group without knowing of its intents, its purposes, its methods. Some of them are becoming the unthinking tools of forces who oppose the John Birch movement because it is anti-Communist—a sobering thought.

The John Birch Society is a challenge to Americans. It shows them through films and speeches what the advance of communism has been. It recalls to their minds what they already knew but have forgotten—the events of recent history that have led America to the brink of disaster. It invites

Americans to join in an effort to turn the tide.

There is no coercion in this movement; there couldn't be.

There are two forces operating in our world today, capitalism and communism. The John Birch Society is on the side of capitalism. It is frankly pro-American, pro-capitalist, and anti-Communist. There isn't the slightest doubt of its position. Lined up against the society and others like it are the Communists, the pro-Communists, the "do-nothings," the "let's-don't-rock-the-boaters," the "surrender is better than death" tub thumpers, and the anti-anti-Communists. This is quite a group; its program for anti-Communist action is no action at all; their syllabus could have been written by Lenin.

The John Birch Society has one more theory that its detractors refuse to recognize: They feel that the ordinary American has enough sense to make up his own mind.

Before you allow yourself to be stampeded by the critics, investigate the John Birch Society. A growing number of Americans have done so, and a growing number have joined its movement toward fundamental American constitutional government. The fact that they are under fire, is proof of their effectiveness.

**Crop of Confusion**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial published in the April 18 issue of the Burlington (N.C.) Daily Times-News.

This editorial indicates that the activities of the Department of Agriculture are not escaping attention of the folks down home:

**CROP OF CONFUSION**

President Kennedy remarked the other day that he hoped farmers would join up with his new voluntary feed grain plan, thus assuring themselves of a good support price and enabling the Government to save money on the farm program.

But the Department of Agriculture isn't content merely to hope that farmers will volunteer. The Commodity Credit Corporation (a Government arm) has been busily dumping corn on the market to drive the price down and frighten farmers into volunteering. This brought about "the sharpest March decline in 13 years," the Wall Street Journal reported.

Thus the farmer is warned to sign up for supports at \$1.20 and for acreage curtailment or try to survive in a market where the CCC has proved it can keep the price of corn down around \$1.05.

Already, about 80 percent of Illinois farmers and about 60 percent of Iowa farmers have seen the handwriting on the crib wall and signed. What else could they do?

But how about the second part of the administration plan—reducing the cost of the farm program to the Government?

The administration's March revision of the budget ups the spending of the Agriculture Department by \$658-million—the largest increase outside the Defense Department.

Meanwhile, the National Farmers Organization is in the midst of a drive to hold

cattle off the market to drive prices up, and it claims some success.

If the meatpackers were to do the same thing, they'd be in line for prosecution under the antitrust laws.

Those who profess to see silver linings in the cloudy farm policy picture today must be overlooking some of the realities.

**Poland's Constitution Day**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention that these remarks commemorating Poland's Constitution Day be included in the RECORD on the appropriate anniversary day which was yesterday, May 3. Unfortunately, I was called away from the floor before I had an opportunity to include them. It does not lessen my appreciation of Poland's continual fight for freedom.

In the lives of all nations there is always one day that more than any other symbolizes the national spirit. For Poland it is her Constitution Day, celebrated on May 3 for 170 years this year.

Poland's Constitution Day commemorates the Constitution of 1791. In that year Poland made a great, almost convulsive effort to free herself from an outmoded political and social system. The "4 years' sejm" or Parliament, led by men of great force of character and capacity, adopted the Constitution we celebrate today. It converted Poland into a limited constitutional monarchy, with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Invidious class distinctions were abolished. The humble townsman might now own land, or enter the ranks of state or church, privileges formerly open only to the gentry. The protection of law was extended to the peasants, and serfdom was mitigated with a view to its eventual abolition. Absolute religious toleration was proclaimed, and provisions for periodical reform by subsequent parliaments were also embodied in this Constitution.

But this most liberal and progressive document was to be short lived. Some magnates who could not accept the new order of things sought Russian assistance, and Catherine the Great was only too happy to oblige. Prussia, a supposed ally, left Poland in the lurch. Betrayed but not broken, the tiny Polish Army put up a spirited resistance, but eventually the struggle was lost, and the second partition of Poland took place.

But neither that partition nor the subsequent travails through which Poland was to pass have ever been able to kill the spirit of liberty which lives in Polish hearts. That historic truth is being rediscovered by Poland's Communist masters today. Poland's Government may be 100 percent Communist, Poland's people are not. Poland's Government may adopt policies hostile to the United States, but Poland's people are friendly.



1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3037

every Federal dollar. The remainder will be available as follows: \$5,690,000 to provide technical assistance, consulting services to States, expenses of the National Office of Vital Statistics, international health activities, demonstrations, training activities, and operational expenses; \$2 million for grants to schools or direct traineeship awards to individuals for training of professional public health personnel; \$1 million for grants to schools of public health; and \$1,430,000 (authorized by Public Law 86-720, 86th Cong.) for project grants for graduate public health training.

Environment health..... \$27,640,000  
Last year..... 15,640,000

This program is made up of six activities as follows: air pollution control, \$5,921,000; water supply and water pollution control, \$9,892,000; radiological health activities, \$6,719,000; milk, food, and general sanitation activities, \$1,855,000; occupational health activities, \$1,877,000; and accident prevention activities, \$1,376,000.

Tuberculosis control..... \$6,430,000  
Last year..... 6,452,000

Grants to States for diagnostic and treatment clinics, mass case-finding and follow-up services account for \$4 million, all of which has to be matched equally by the States. The remainder is for direct operations of Public Health Service.

Communicable disease activities..... \$14,116,000  
Last year..... 13,415,000

This appropriation is used for direct activities of the PHS Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga. (and its affiliated operations), and for the Arctic Health Research Center in Anchorage, Alaska. The Communicable Disease Center carries on studies in epidemiology, furnishes laboratory diagnostic services, and sponsors special projects to assist States. The Arctic Health Research Center conducts studies on health problems in low temperature areas. Of the total of \$5,700,000 for control of venereal disease, \$2,400,000 goes for direct grants to States for venereal disease detection, treatment, and control on a special-need basis. Most of the remainder is spent for technical assistance to the States, including funds to pay 351 Federal employees, the majority of whom are assigned to State health departments.

Office of the Surgeon General... \$6,900,000  
Last year..... 5,816,000

For administrative expenses of this Office, including all housekeeping services, evaluation of public health needs, and personnel training. Included also is approximately \$2,156,725 for administration of the National Health Survey Act authorized by Public Law 652 (84th Cong.).

Foreign quarantine activities... \$4,931,000  
Last year..... 4,685,800

This service operates 319 medical quarantine stations on borders of the United States. It also operates 23 medical examination stations on foreign soil for the examination of aliens seeking visas to enter the United States. Inspections are made of all seagoing vessels and aircraft entering the United States. It is estimated that the service will examine more than 3,150,000 aliens in this country and 165,000 abroad.

National Library of Medicine, operating expenses..... \$1,662,000  
Last year..... 1,566,000

Under Public Law 940 (84th Cong.), the Armed Forces Medical Library was renamed the National Library of Medicine and transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A new structure

has been authorized to house the Library and \$6,950,000 in construction funds was appropriated for 1959. The new Library is now under construction on the southeast corner of the NIH reservation at Bethesda.

Buildings and facilities,  
PHS..... (new) -- \$3,470,000

This appropriation would be divided as follows: \$600,000 to survey and acquire a site for quartering animals and for construction of additional office, laboratory, and service space at the Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta; \$785,000 for planning for an environmental health center; and \$2,085,000 for construction of research and other facilities for National Institutes of Health, the bulk of which would be for equipping and renovating of animal quarters, a permanent animal research building for the addiction center at Lexington, Ky., and for initial development of facilities for large animals on the site purchased with funds provided in 1960.

Reimbursable health programs for other governmental agencies.... \$691,000  
Last year..... 623,000

This represents the cost of services expected to be advanced to Public Health Service by other governmental agencies for establishing and operating on-the-job clinics. Public Health Service deals largely with Washington, D.C., personnel; whereas, 90 percent of the total number of Government's employees are located outside the Washington area.

St. Elizabeths Hospital..... \$26,380,000  
Last year..... 18,817,725

St. Elizabeths provides treatment for several classes of mentally ill persons, including those residing in the District of Columbia, beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, beneficiaries of Public Health Service, insane persons charged with or convicted of crimes in U.S. courts (including the court of the District of Columbia), certain American citizens found insane in Canada, the Panama Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands, certain foreign service personnel, and members of the military services admitted to the hospital prior to July 16, 1946. Congress appropriated \$4,491,000 to this institution for operational expenses, \$345,000 for major repairs, and \$4,994,000 for construction of new buildings or expansion of present buildings. Reimbursements from other agencies will approximate \$16,550,000. This hospital has an average daily patient load of 7,000.

Freedmen's Hospital..... \$3,294,600  
Last year..... 3,190,000

This institution with an average patient load of 326, plus 36 new-borns is a medical teaching facility and general hospital. Its patients are chiefly drawn from the District of Columbia and the adjoining area. The hospital is utilized for training of interns and residents, many of whom are graduates of Howard University, and it has a nurses' training school. A total of \$5,050,515 is authorized for operating costs. All in excess of \$3,294,600 (appropriated for fiscal 1961) are expected reimbursements from charges made to patients and payments made by the District of Columbia and other Federal agencies and from the counties surrounding Washington who utilize these facilities for welfare patients. Some supervisory functions over this program are vested in the Public Health Service.

Howard University..... \$1,481,000  
Last year..... 1,296,000

This university is jointly supported by congressional appropriations and private funds and offers instruction in ten schools and colleges, including colleges of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy. This year the uni-

versity's total operational budget is in excess of \$9,300,000. Of this amount, the Federal Government will contribute \$5,490,000 toward operational expenses, \$225,000 for plans for construction, and \$1,433,000 for completion of a home economics building and power plant facilities. The combined budgets for the colleges of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy will require approximately 24.9 percent of the university's budget for educational and general expense. The entire student body of the university for 1960-61 will be approximately 6,778. There are 385 students enrolled in the college of medicine, 336 in the college of dentistry, and 169 in the college of pharmacy. The Federal contribution for direct current operations in the colleges of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy is estimated, to be \$1,481,000 for 1961.

Bureau of Public Assistance, medical payments..... \$350,000,000  
Last year..... 254,000,000

Out of a total budget of approximately \$3½ billion (Federal, State and local funds) for categorical public assistance payments, officials of the Social Security Administration estimate that approximately \$675 million or about 19 percent is now being devoted for medical and health needs of categorical assistance recipients this fiscal year. About \$585 million will be paid to vendors of medical care, such as physicians, hospitals, pharmacists, nursing homes, etc., and about \$90 million directly to recipients to enable them to meet their medical care needs. The Federal share of combined medical payments to vendors and to recipients will be about \$350 million. Reflected in the increase are funds for the expanded old age assistance medical care program and the medical assistance for the aged program under Public Law 86-778, the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Children's Bureau..... \$39,110,000  
Last year..... 34,420,000

Operating under the Social Security Administration, the Children's Bureau administers grants to States for maternal and child health, and crippled children's and child welfare services. This year grant money totals \$51,833,000 divided as follows: \$18,167,000 for maternal and child health work; \$20 million for crippled children's services; and \$13,666,000 for child welfare services. However, this last item has no medical significance and, therefore, it is not reflected in the total of \$39,110,000. One-half of the Federal funds for maternal and child health and crippled children's services is required to be matched dollar for dollar by the States. In addition, the Children's Bureau has \$2,360,000 to finance investigating and reporting activities and to administer all investigating and reporting activities and to administer all the grants. About 40 percent of this amount is chargeable to the health and related activities of the Children's Bureau which include administration of grants for maternal and child health and crippled children's services and consultative services to State agencies and other public and voluntary agencies and organizations engaged in the provision of maternal and child health services.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation..... \$73,501,000  
Last year..... 66,338,000

Grants to the States (same as Hill-Burton formula) are provided for: (a) Support of basic rehabilitation services, including medical examinations, surgical, and therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, prostheses, occupational tools, and aids, vending stands, rehabilitation facilities, vocational training, and funds for maintenance, \$54,700,000; and (b) extension and improvement of State

programs, \$1,500,000. Appropriations for research and training are divided as follows: (a) Special grants to States or nonprofit organizations for projects designed to expand the rehabilitation program (2-1 Federal-States matching), \$8,074,000; and (b) for training of rehabilitation personnel, including physicians, therapists, psychologists, counselors, medical, and psychiatric social workers, \$7,206,000. In addition, \$2,021,000 is available for Federal administration costs

Rehabilitation activities over-sea (new)----- \$930,000

This appropriation provides for the purchase, mainly from the Treasury, of U.S.-owned local currencies of foreign countries for the conduct of research and training in rehabilitation in those countries under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), as amended.

Food and Drug Administration.. \$19,654,000  
Last year----- 15,512,000

Of the total, \$18,052,000 will be used for the enforcement of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which includes: The inspection of manufacturers and examination of samples of all foods, drugs and cosmetics in interstate commerce to see that they are safe, pure, honestly labeled and packaged, and bear adequate warnings and directions for use; combating medical, nutritional and mechanical quackery through court actions; premarketing safety clearance of new drugs and food additives; requiring appropriate labeling of household products containing hazardous ingredients; pretesting of all color additives. \$1,602,000 will be used to certify the strength, purity and other requisites of certain antibiotic drugs and their derivatives, insulin and its derivatives, the establishment of tolerances for pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural products, and certification of batches and establishment of tolerances for all colors used in or on food, drugs and cosmetics.

U.S. Office of Education----- \$4,000,000  
Last year----- 4,000,000

For a number of years the Office of Education has been making grants to States chiefly for vocational education. During the last fiscal year approximately \$4 million was made available as grants to aid the States in the training of practical nurses. For this year, the Office of Education has available approximately \$34 million for grants to States, of which \$4 million is again earmarked for the practical nurse training program.

Federal surplus property donation program, approximate... \$47,260,336  
Last year----- 38,405,000

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has authority to make donations of personal property and transfer of real property declared surplus by Federal agencies for health needs. In the case of real property, conditional title is vested in the transferee and then after a number of years of utilization of the property in accordance with imposed conditions the property can become absolutely vested. Recipients of personal property may be medical institutions, health centers, hospitals and clinics. Eligible donees of real property may be any institutions organized for health purposes, including those engaging in medical research. It is difficult to determine the exact value of property donated and transferred since accounting is on the basis of acquisition cost. Last year approximately \$40,066,069 of personal property (acquisition cost) was allocated for health purposes. During the same period, approximately \$23,355,370 of real property (acquisition cost) was transferred with a fair market value

of \$7,194,867. It is expected that the level of donations and transfers for the current fiscal year will be in line or slightly in excess of last year's totals.

*file*  
**The Captive Nations and the Freedom of Europe**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assembly of Captive European Nations is made up of representatives of the democratic and anti-Communist forces in the nations of central and Eastern Europe which have been taken over by the Russian Communists and which are conducted as satellites of the Soviet Union. The Assembly comprises distinguished exiles from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Some of these men were once in coalition governments with the Communists and discovered how faithless and brutal the latter are in their relentless drive for power.

The Assembly has prepared an excellent memorandum on the "Captive Nations and the Freedom of Europe," and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from it, together with this statement, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

**THE CAPTIVE NATIONS AND THE FREEDOM OF EUROPE**

(A memorandum)

The Assembly of Captive European Nations considers itself in duty bound to reaffirm, at this time of searching reassessment of American foreign policy, its conviction that Europe is and will remain in the decisive arena in the global struggle between freedom and Communist totalitarianism; that the people of Eastern Europe are in a position to play, both as a factor of deterrence, and, if deterrence failed, as allies of the free nations, a very significant role in this struggle; that a lasting and secure peace will remain beyond reach as long as Soviet power is poised in the geographical center of Europe, and that to serve both the immediate and longer term requirements of a free Europe, it is incumbent upon the Western Powers to demonstrate by words and deeds their vital stake in the freedom of the eastern half of Europe and their unswerving resolve to help the captive peoples recover the exercise of their right of self-determination.

The subjugation of nine, once free and independent European nations by Soviet Russia constitutes a legal and moral issue solidly founded on the war-time and post-war agreements to which both the Western Powers and the Soviet Union were parties, as well as on the now universally recognized right of self-determination. Its major political consequences has been the failure to establish in Europe a dependable and durable peace, that is, a peace with freedom and justice. In the considered judgment of the Assembly, failure to recognize the vital im-

portance of Eastern Europe and to pursue policies designed to link effectively the struggle for the preservation of freedom and for the recovery of freedom in Europe would have most serious consequences. It would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the United States "to steer a course between the Scylla of universal annihilation and the Charybdis of universal enslavement" which, in the expressive words of an American statesman, is the basic requirement of U.S. foreign policy in the sixties. The assembly, therefore, feels enjoined (i) to examine the currently most widespread Western views on, and policies with respect to, the captive countries; (ii) to submit its own views on the present stake of the Western Powers in the captive nations, and (iii) to suggest measures apt to promote the common interests of the free nations and their silent allies in Eastern Europe.

I

Any attempt to bring into discussion the problem of the freedom and independence of the captive nations of central and eastern Europe has lately been hurting itself against the theory that the situation in Europe was now stabilized—economically, politically, and militarily, and it could only be changed, one way or the other, at the price of a major war, that is, at a price unacceptable to both sides. The arena of contest between the forces of freedom and communism, continues the theory, has moved to the so-called uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa. These nations hold the balance of power. With Latin America, they constitute the only active fronts and, therefore, claim the undivided attention of the Western Powers. However desirable it would be to have in central and eastern Europe truly independent nations, under freely elected governments, this can no longer be a practical goal of Western policy. To pretend otherwise would mean engaging in the irresponsible action of inciting people to futile uprisings. The best the West can do for the captive nations, concludes the theory, is to preserve the hope in their ultimate delivery by refusing to give formal sanction to the political status quo in Europe and to help them improve their lot under the present dispensations by practical measures—designed to foster evolution toward more internal freedom and less subordination to Soviet Russia. This theory does not resist a closer examination.

The argument of a fully stabilized European situation is not borne out by the facts. The countries of Western Europe have achieved indeed a very high degree of internal political stability and a remarkable economic growth and prosperity. They failed, however, to develop the third essential element of strength: adequate military power. During the many years of American nuclear supremacy their security was practically absolute. But their continued dependence on the strategic nuclear deterrent renders them increasingly vulnerable to Soviet intimidation and blackmail.

There can be little doubt that the Soviet rulers are not only intent upon changing the situation in Europe to their advantage, but also believe they can accomplish this without the mortal risks involved for them in a major war. The basic premise of Soviet political strategy toward Western Europe is that the Soviet advances in nuclear striking power have or are about to neutralize the strategic nuclear power of the United States. As a consequence of such neutralization, the balance of power in Europe is shifting to the overwhelming advantage of the Soviet Union, whose ground forces will acquire a new freedom of action. In the words of a report prepared last year for the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate by a Columbia-Harvard research group: "With the strategic nuclear weapons neutralized, Soviet superi-

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3039

ority in other forms of military power becomes of greater significance, both militarily and politically. This superiority of military power in the various categories would mean not necessarily that the Soviet leadership would choose to attack, but that it could bring about political changes in one part of the world or another without having to attack. As Mr. Khrushchev sees it, what remains is for the Western nations to be realistic about adjusting their positions abroad to a weaker power relationship." This interpretation of Soviet policies fully tallies with the forward strategy set forth with ostentatious confidence in the statement issued last December in Moscow following the conference of 81 Communist parties and in the speech delivered on January 6, 1961, by Nikita Khrushchev. It is, furthermore, confirmed by the renewed emphasis placed in the communique issued on March 30, 1961, following the Moscow meeting of the rulers of the countries of the so-called Warsaw Pact on the urgent necessity of concluding a peace treaty with "both German states" and on converting West Berlin into a "demilitarized free city."

The arena of contest has indeed been broadened. In 1955 it was extended to Africa. In 1959 Latin America, too, became an active front. But geography, experience, skill, population and resources make Europe the major target of Soviet efforts and, therefore, the principal front. Communist victories in other continents may help Soviet strategy in Europe. But such victories would not be necessarily decisive, whereas failure of the forces of freedom to make a stand in Europe will seal the fate of at least Africa and the Middle East. The uncommitted nations are and will remain in the foreseeable future so weak that they will mirror rather than determine the balance of power. It is in Europe, therefore, that the balance of power can be disrupted with decisive consequences.

The argument that the freedom of the captive countries can no longer be a practical goal of Western policy overlooks an essential factor. As long as the strategic nuclear deterrent was unquestionably effective, the captive countries may have been of little strategic interest for the West. However, with the increasing neutralization of the strategic deterrence and the ensuing effort to build up an alternative deterrence, the captive countries become a potentially vital element of Western European security. Whether the Soviet rulers must or not reckon in their strategic calculations with a high coefficient of risk in the captive countries, which lie athwart their lines of communication, may make, in the coming years, all the difference between acceptable and unacceptable risks for the Soviet Union, that is, between effective deterrence or no deterrence at all.

Soviet diplomacy persistently seeks to wrest from the Western Powers the express or at least tacit admission that the political status quo in East-Central Europe is permanent. In turn, Soviet propaganda tirelessly strives to convince the respective peoples that the world balance of power has tipped decisively in favor of the Communist camp. Both efforts prove that the Soviet rulers are aware of their vulnerability in the captive area and are intent upon promoting there a spirit of hopelessness, leading to passivity and resignation. For this alone would permit them to discount the likelihood of active resistance in all circumstances.

It follows, that in order to mobilize all the forces which are needed to counter effectively the effort of Soviet Russia to change the situation in Europe in her favor, by means of pressures, intimidation and blackmail rather than war, the Western Powers must commit themselves, in turn, to the purpose of changing the status quo in their own favor. To this end, they must pursue un-

remittingly and consistently, policies aimed at extending the area of freedom in Europe. The fear that such a commitment and policy would stir up undue expectations in the captive countries and might eventually lead to futile uprisings appears at present entirely unwarranted. After the tragic experience of the Hungarian revolution, neither statements of purposes, even if confirmed by political and diplomatic actions, nor the most inflammatory kind of propaganda can bring any of the captive peoples to the boiling point. The best a Western policy of active concern can accomplish is to keep them at a simmering point, that is, with hope in eventual delivery and confidence in the West alive. Uprisings and revolutions on the Hungarian pattern appear today conceivable only if Soviet military power were neutralized, as a result of an internal crisis in the Soviet Union, or effectively engaged by Western forces (in the event of an open Soviet aggression). Still, the possibility of violent popular outbreaks, born of sheer despair, cannot be entirely discounted.

A policy that would avoid a commitment to the clear goal of freedom and independence for the nations of East-Central Europe and would aim, instead, at fostering ameliorations under the present dispensations could hardly bring into accord the interest of the free and the captive nations. By its standoffish cautiousness, such a policy could not fail to undermine the spirit of resistance in the captive lands and, with it, squander away a deterrent factor of vital significance for the survival of freedom in any part of Europe. This is not to say that the captive peoples would not welcome a less repressive internal regime, less subordination to Soviet Russia, some economic amelioration and more contacts and cultural exchanges with the West. It means, however, that nations deeply rooted in history, as are the captive nations, will never settle for such marginal gains at the price of their inalienable rights.

In practical terms, the main question is whether even at the price of sacrificing the goal of full freedom and independence, Western policy could generate or only stimulate an evolution towards more, though limited, freedom and independence. In other words, the question is whether the Yugoslav or Polish situations represent patterns that could be duplicated elsewhere.

Titolsm was the product of a unique combination of geographical and historical factors. These factors have all along been lacking in the other captive countries. Since the Hungarian revolution, which has shown to all satellite rulers the risk of finding themselves face to face with their own people, none of those rulers even dreams of letting himself be weaned away from Moscow—the only dependable source of his power and privileges.

As for the so-called Polish pattern of a less repressive, more tolerable internal regime, three main factors combined in 1956 to bring it about: (1) the Soviet fear of an international conflict at a time when the balance of power was distinctly favorable to the United States; (2) the internal tensions in the Soviet Union, due to the then still unresolved struggle for power in the Kremlin and the ensuing impairment of the decisionmaking process, and, most important of all (3) the pressure of the Polish people and the resulting fear of an explosion that would spread to the whole captive area. All these factors have lost their effectiveness since 1956. The balance of power is now more favorable to the Soviets. The struggle for supreme power in the Soviet Communist Party was won by Khrushchev, and the captive nations were discouraged both by the fate of the Hungarian revolution and by the general trend of Western policies. Events have since demonstrated that, for the Communists, the Polish October was a mere tac-

tical retreat at a time when concessions remained the only way to avoid an explosion. In the years which have lapsed since 1956, most of the gains made by the Polish people have been gradually nibbled away. The process is still in progress against mute but stubborn popular resistance, and it goes hand in hand with an increasingly repressive trend all over Eastern Europe.

It would appear, therefore, that the outlook for duplicating the so-called Yugoslav pattern is practically nil. As regards the so-called Polish pattern, it could conceivably be repeated in circumstances comparable to those prevailing in Poland, in October 1956. But since pressure from below was one of the main factors at that time, it can hardly be imagined how this can be generated by a Western policy of friendliness toward the Communist regimes. This applies, of course, to the concept of economic aid, the only exception being Poland where such aid may contribute to slowing down the process of gradual retreat from the gains of October 1956.

II

The assembly of captive European nations holds that the captive nations of Europe are of vital significance to the United States and its allies on at least four counts:

1. They are an essential part of the alternative deterrent the West is endeavoring to create in Europe.
2. Their issue can help the West in establishing a balance of pressures in negotiations, in United Nations debates and in the propaganda war.
3. They enable the West effectively to undermine the claim that the emancipation of colonial peoples is a Western ruse confirming the inevitability of the worldwide victory of communism.
4. They represent the key to a strong and self-reliant Europe and thus to a dependable peace.

III

A program of measures designed to stimulate hope and faith in the captive countries can only fulfill the previously listed immediate and long-range purposes if the present image of an irresistible Soviet momentum is replaced by the impression that the tide has turned, or is about to turn in favor of the West. This can be accomplished only by a measurable, territorial advance of freedom against communism anywhere in the world. There is a further condition of success for such a program. It should not appear motivated by either generosity or selfish interest. It should rather suggest that the free world has come to realize the strength of the bonds of mutual interest between the two parts of Europe; it is fully aware of its vital stake in the freedom and independence of the east-central European nations and is, therefore, prepared both as a matter of principle and self-interest, to do something about it.

Specifically, in the view of the Assembly of Captive European Nations the morale of the captive peoples of Central and Eastern Europe and their faith in the West will be sustained, the long and short-term interest of both free and captive nations served and a useful balance of pressures established if the Government of the United States of America were to—

1. Reaffirm the validity of the wartime and postwar legal commitments and pledges with respect to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania, and its continued determination to seek the observance of these obligations by all concerned;
2. Insist firmly in any diplomatic parleys or conferences on European problems with the rulers of the Soviet on the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents from the territories of the above nine captive countries, as well as on the holding in these

May 3

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3040

countries of free elections under international supervision.

3. Inscribe on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly the question of the denial of self-determination to the above nine captive countries and press for a debate and investigation of this charge.

4. Work out with the European partners of the United States in the summit conferences and promote by all appropriate means a plan for an overall European settlement based on the principle of self-determination.

5. Insist on the inclusion of the Hungarian question on the agenda of each yearly session of the United Nations General Assembly, and propose, regardless of the prospect of such proposals being adopted, (a) the rejection of the credentials issued by the Kadar regime, and (b) measures of enforcement.

6. Promote a worldwide movement against Soviet colonialism.

There are other practical measures and attitudes which could be taken to good avail for the same ends. Among these the following may be worthy of consideration:

(a) To downgrade the present diplomatic missions to the satellite governments.

(b) To desist from actions and moves which give respectability to the satellite regimes and compound the effect of past acts of recognition.

(c) To challenge in the United Nations on all appropriate occasions the qualification of the satellite delegates to speak on human rights and expose systematically the record of denial of human rights in their respective countries.

(d) To call for a United Nations investigation of conditions in prisons and forced labor camps in the captive countries, as well as for the release of all prisoners detained because of their convictions or past political affiliations.

(e) Invigorate radio propaganda to Eastern Europe.

(f) Seek full reciprocity in all cultural exchange programs, and warn American participants against letting themselves be exploited for political propaganda purposes by the Communist rulers or their agents.

(g) To call for the abolition of the almost prohibitive restrictions imposed by the satellite regimes on the sending of individual food, medicine, and clothing packages from the free world to relatives and friends in the captive countries.

(h) To sustain the organizations established in the free world for the purpose of voicing the political aspirations of the captive nations, and preserving their cultural heritage.

iv

The Assembly of Captive European Nations believes that the struggle to prevent any further extension of Soviet power in Europe and in other parts of the world cannot be separated from the struggle for the recovery of freedom wherever it has been suppressed by communism. Denying to the Soviet Union external successes is in itself productive of internal stresses. It gives the lie to the Soviet claim about the inevitability of the worldwide victory of communism and is thereby a powerful antidote to resignation and apathy among those held captive. Carrying the struggle to the enemy-controlled territory is apt to deliver a serious blow to the most important weapon of communism against the free world and particularly against the politically unstable, economically and socially underdeveloped and militarily feeble countries; the impression that communism is irresistibly moving toward its goal.

Against an enemy irrevocably committed to one world, his own, there is no safeguard in a search for mere survival by means of accommodations and static defense. The way

to survival is a firm commitment to a paramount purpose—a world of freedom under law, a dynamic, worldwide challenge of communism.

## Latin American Aid

SPEECH  
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for his usual masterful presentation on the Latin American assistance program. His able analysis of foreign aid bills is always most helpful and his remarks today, as usual, provide wise guidance for the House.

There is no question that an effective program of aid to Latin America, despite the many widely scattered contributions we have made in the past, is long overdue, one that is specifically designed to assist our friends in this part of the world.

Attention has been directed to lack of full information from the agencies concerned about the scope and extent of specific projects to justify the appropriations requested in this bill. In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues and those agency officials concerned to a most worthy project which deserves the type of assistance we seek to provide in the Latin American assistance program.

I speak of the recently instituted Ciudad de los Niños or Boys Town, at San José, in the friendly, neighboring Republic of Costa Rica.

To my mind, this project is particularly deserving of assistance because it appears to fit quite naturally within the framework of the program outlined recently by the President for Inter-American cooperation.

Ciudad de los Niños is only a few months old and already it has taken to its care 64 Costa Rican boys, ranging from 12 to 18 years of age, orphans or the victims of broken homes and, some, graduates of reformatories.

It is the purpose of this institution, much as with our well known and famed Boys Town in Nebraska, not only to harbor such unfortunate boys, but to impart to them the essential education and training they need to become useful citizens.

I am advised that Ciudad de los Niños has the official sanction of the Government of Costa Rica and that a special Costa Rican commemorative stamp has been issued to signalize its establish-

ment. I am also informed that need for such an institution is so great that plans are already underway for the establishment within the near future of a physical plant capable of taking care of 2,000 boys. At this time, work is proceeding on the erection of housing facilities to accommodate 150 boys by the first of next year.

Notice of this activity has come to my attention through friends of the Assumption Fathers who have been entrusted with the development and direction of Ciudad de los Niños. This most versatile and enterprising order of Catholic priests, founded over 100 years ago in France, carries on a wide variety of activities, largely in the field of education, throughout the world, including that unique educational institution in this country, Assumption College, located in Worcester, Mass.

Many young men from my district attend Assumption, which is especially dedicated to the liberal arts, to French and religious culture, and to international relations. Over the years, like many others, I have respected and admired the magnificent works of the Assumption Fathers and many of us in this House will long remember the truly heroic work of this dedicated order in rebuilding, as a preparatory school, their combined preparatory school and college facilities which were devastated by the Worcester tornado of June 1953. Now the Assumption Fathers have established a fine, new Assumption College campus, also in Worcester, devoted entirely to the college department.

Ciudad de los Niños is a practical, humane undertaking of the Assumption Fathers which could well have a strong and favorable impact on our international relations. It is an undertaking which offers this Nation a fine opportunity to lend a timely helping hand in the true spirit of inter-American good neighbor cooperation. It is my understanding that, in order to keep pace with the opportunities it has to accomplish good, Ciudad de los Niños is urgently in need of long-term financing which would permit it to go ahead with the building of an adequate physical plant. I hope that under the regulations worked out by the Inter-American Development Bank that deserving projects like this will receive just and sympathetic consideration of their needs.

It would appear that here at Ciudad de los Niños we have a pilot venture which should be encouraged by those agencies responsible for the development of the Latin American aid program. What could more aptly portray to our fellow American Republics the deep humanitarian motives of the United States of America than to extend to a particularly unfortunate segment of the youth of Costa Rica the friendly hand of friendship within the spirit of the President's cooperative program?

The long-term benefits of such a gesture can readily be seen. They are eloquently expressed by an Assumption father, a product of Assumption College, newly assigned to Ciudad de los Niños who writes to a good friend:

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> Session

# H. R. 8599

## A BILL

To amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD

August 9, 1961

Referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy



87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 8599

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 9, 1961

Mr. HOLIFIELD introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Joint  
Committee on Atomic Energy

---

## A BILL

To amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That there is hereby retroceded to the State of California the  
4 exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired from the State of  
5 California by the United States of America over the follow-  
6 ing land of the United States Atomic Energy Commission  
7 located in Alameda County, State of California, and within  
8 the boundaries of the Commission's Livermore site:

9 Beginning at a post marked L.P. XII, in the exterior  
10 boundary line of the Rancho Las Positas, set at the south-

1 east corner of subdivision numbered 6 of plot J, of said  
2 rancho, as said plot is described in the decree of partition of  
3 said rancho rendered June 18, 1873, in case 2798, Aur-  
4 recoechea against Mahoney, certified copy of which decree  
5 was recorded December 13, 1873, in book 95 of deeds at  
6 page 206, Alameda County Records, and as said subdivision  
7 is shown on the map hereinafter referred to; and running  
8 thence west along the southern boundary line of said plot J  
9 79.28 chains to a post marked L.P. XI, set at the south-  
10 west corner of subdivision numbered 5 of said plot J, as  
11 said subdivision numbered 5 is shown on said map; and  
12 thence north along the western boundary line of said sub-  
13 division numbered 5 and along the western boundary line of  
14 subdivision numbered 8, as said subdivision numbered 8 is  
15 shown on said map, 79.46 chains to a post set at the north-  
16 west corner of said subdivision numbered 8; thence east  
17 along the northern boundary line of said subdivision num-  
18 bered 8 and subdivision numbered 7 as shown on said map,  
19 79 chains to a post marked L.P. XIII; and thence south  
20 along the eastern boundary line of subdivision numbered 7,  
21 as said subdivision numbered 7 is shown on said map,  
22 and along the eastern boundary line of said subdivision num-  
23 bered 6 of said plot J to the point of beginning.

24 Being a portion of said plot J of said rancho, as shown

1 upon a certain map of a portion of the Rancho Las Positas  
2 surveyed for J. Aurrecoechea, August 1876, by Luis Cas-  
3 tro, county surveyor, and also known as subdivisions 5, 6,  
4 7, and 8 in the official map of the county of Alameda, State  
5 of California, made by George L. Nusbaumer and W. F.  
6 Boardman, adopted by the supervisors of said county, Sep-  
7 tember 24, 1888, and issued May 1, 1889.

8 Beginning at northeast corner of the northwest quarter  
9 of section 13, township 3 south, range 2 east, Mount Diablo  
10 base and meridian, being also the northeast corner of the  
11 160 acre tract owned by Louis Madsen, thence south 2,640  
12 feet, more or less, along the east line of said quarter sec-  
13 tion and along the east boundary fence of said 160 acre  
14 tract to the southeast corner of said northwest quarter of  
15 said section 13, being the southeast corner of said 160 acre  
16 tract and the northeast corner of a 30.66 acre tract owned  
17 by John and Dora Bargman; thence south 506 feet, more  
18 or less, to the southeast corner of said 30.66 acre tract;  
19 thence south 965 feet, more or less, along the east fence  
20 of a 129.34 acre tract owned by Charles M. and Sue I. G.  
21 Nissen to a fence running east and west through said 129.34  
22 acre parcel; thence west 500 feet along said fence through  
23 said 129.34 acre tract; thence north, parallel to the east  
24 line of the northwest quarter of said section 13, 4,111 feet,

1 more or less, to north boundary of said section 13; thence  
2 east 500 feet to the point of beginning, containing 47.175  
3 acres, more or less.

4 Beginning at a point 30 feet east of the northeast corner  
5 of the northwest quarter of said section 13; thence due south,  
6 4,111 feet, more or less, to a point 30 feet due east of the  
7 end of a fence across the 129.34 acre tract owned by Charles  
8 M. and Sue I. G. Nissen; thence west 30 feet; thence north  
9 4,111 feet, more or less, to the northeast corner of the north-  
10 west quarter of said section 13; thence due east 30 feet to  
11 the point of beginning, containing 2.83 acres, more or less.

12 This retrocession of jurisdiction shall take effect upon  
13 acceptance by the State of California.

14 SEC. 2. Subsection 11 b. of the Atomic Energy Act of  
15 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

16 "b. The term 'agreement for cooperation' means any  
17 agreement with another nation or regional defense organiza-  
18 tion authorized or permitted by sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 91  
19 c., 103, 104, or 144, and made pursuant to section 123."

20 SEC. 3. Subsection 11 u. of the Atomic Energy Act of  
21 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

22 "u. The term 'public liability' means any legal liability  
23 arising out of or resulting from a nuclear incident, except:  
24 (i) claims under State or Federal workmen's compensation  
25 acts of employees of persons indemnified who are employed

1 at the site of and in connection with the activity where the  
2 nuclear incident occurs; (ii) claims arising out of an act of  
3 war; and (iii) whenever used in subsections 170 a., c., and  
4 k., claims for loss of, or damage to, or loss of use of property  
5 which is located at the site of and used in connection with the  
6 licensed activity where the nuclear incident occurs. 'Public  
7 liability' also includes damage to property of persons in-  
8 demnified: *Provided*, That such property is covered under  
9 the terms of the financial protection required, except prop-  
10 erty which is located at the site of and used in connection  
11 with the activity where the nuclear incident occurs."

12 SEC. 4. Section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
13 as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "five  
14 thousand kilograms of contained uranium 235" the following  
15 "five hundred grams of uranium 233 and three kilograms of  
16 plutonium".

17 SEC. 5. Section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
18 as amended, is amended by striking out "subsection 145 b."  
19 and adding in lieu thereof "subsections 145 b. and 145 c."

20 SEC. 6. Section 145 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
21 as amended, is amended by deleting subsections d., e., and  
22 f., redesignating subsection "c." as subsection "d." and  
23 subsection "g." as subsection "h." and adding the follow-  
24 ing subsections:

25 "c. In lieu of the investigation and report to be made



1 by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to subsection b.  
2 of this section, the Commission may accept an investiga-  
3 tion and report on the character, associations, and loyalty  
4 of an individual made by another Government agency which  
5 conducts personnel security investigations, provided that a  
6 security clearance has been granted to such individual by  
7 another Government agency based on such investigation and  
8 report.

9 "e. If the President deems it to be in the national inter-  
10 est he may from time to time determine that investigations  
11 of any group or class which are required by subsections a.,  
12 b., and c. of this section be made by the Federal Bureau  
13 of Investigation.

14 "f. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections a., b.,  
15 and c. of this section, a majority of the members of the  
16 Commission shall certify those specific positions which are  
17 of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such  
18 certification, the investigation, and reports required by such  
19 provisions shall be made by the Federal Bureau of  
20 Investigation.

21 "g. The Commission shall establish standards and  
22 specifications in writing as to the scope and extent of in-  
23 vestigations, the reports of which will be utilized by the  
24 Commission in making the determination, pursuant to sub-  
25 sections a., b., and c. of this section, that permitting a

1 person access to restricted data will not endanger the com-  
2 mon defense and security. Such standards and specifications  
3 shall be based on the location and class or kind of work to  
4 be done, and shall, among other considerations, take into  
5 account the degree of importance to the common defense and  
6 security of the restricted data to which access will be  
7 permitted.”

8 SEC. 7. Section 151 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
9 as amended, is amended by deleting in the descriptive title  
10 the words “MILITARY UTILIZATION,” and inserting in lieu  
11 thereof “INVENTIONS RELATING TO ATOMIC WEAPONS,  
12 AND FILING OF REPORTS.”

13 SEC. 8. Subsection c. of section 151 of the Atomic  
14 Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as  
15 follows:

16 “c. Any person who has made or hereafter makes any  
17 invention or discovery useful in the production or utilization  
18 of special nuclear material or atomic energy, shall file with  
19 the Commission a report containing a complete description  
20 thereof unless such invention or discovery is described in an  
21 application for a patent filed with the Commissioner of  
22 Patents by such person within the time required for the  
23 filing of such report. The report covering any such invention  
24 or discovery shall be filed on or before the one hundred and  
25 eightieth day after such person first discovers or first has

1 reason to believe that such invention or discovery is useful  
2 in such production or utilization.”

3 SEC. 9. Section 151 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
4 as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the  
5 following new subsection:

6 “e. Reports filed pursuant to subsection c. of this sec-  
7 tion, and applications to which access is provided under  
8 subsection d. of this section, shall be kept in confidence by  
9 the Commission, and no information concerning the same  
10 given without authority of the inventor or owner unless  
11 necessary to carry out the provisions of any Act of Congress  
12 or in such special circumstances as may be determined by  
13 the Commission.”

14 SEC. 10. Section 152 of the Atomic Energy Act of  
15 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

16 “SEC. 152. INVENTIONS MADE OR CONCEIVED DUR-  
17 ING COMMISSION CONTRACTS.—Any invention or discov-  
18 ery, useful in the production or utilization of special nuclear  
19 material or atomic energy, made or conceived in the course  
20 of or under any contract, subcontract, or arrangement  
21 entered into with or for the benefit of the Commission, re-  
22 gardless of whether the contract, subcontract, or arrange-  
23 ment involved the expenditure of funds by the Commission,  
24 shall be vested in, and be the property of, the Commission,  
25 except that the Commission may waive its claim to any

1 such invention or discovery under such circumstances as  
2 the Commission may deem appropriate, consistent with the  
3 policy of this section. No patent for any invention or dis-  
4 covery, useful in the production or utilization of special  
5 nuclear material or atomic energy, shall be issued unless  
6 the applicant files with the application, or within thirty  
7 days after request therefor by the Commissioner of Patents  
8 (unless the Commission advises the Commissioner of  
9 Patents that its rights have been determined and that ac-  
10 cordingly no statement is necessary) a statement under  
11 oath setting forth the full facts surrounding the making or  
12 conception of the invention or discovery described in the  
13 application and whether the invention or discovery was  
14 made or conceived in the course of or under any contract,  
15 subcontract, or arrangement entered into with or for the  
16 benefit of the Commission, regardless of whether the con-  
17 tract, subcontract, or arrangement involved the expenditure  
18 of funds by the Commission. The Commissioner of Pat-  
19 ents shall as soon as the application is otherwise in condi-  
20 tion for allowances forward copies of the application and the  
21 statement to the Commission.

22 “The Commissioner of Patents may proceed with the  
23 application and issue the patent to the applicant (if the in-  
24 vention or discovery is otherwise patentable) unless the  
25 Commission, within 90 days after receipt of copies of the ap-

1 plication and statement, directs the Commissioner of Patents  
2 to issue the patent to the Commission (if the invention or  
3 discovery is otherwise patentable) to be held by the Com-  
4 mission as the agent of and on behalf of the United States.

5 “If the Commission files such a direction with the Com-  
6 missioner of Patents, and if the applicant’s statement claims,  
7 and the applicant still believes, that the invention or dis-  
8 covery was not made or conceived in the course of or  
9 under any contract, subcontract or arrangement entered  
10 into with or for the benefit of the Commission entitling  
11 the Commission to the title to the application or the pat-  
12 ent the applicant may, within 30 days after notification of  
13 the filing of such a direction, request a hearing before a  
14 Board of Patent Interferences. The Board shall have the  
15 power to hear and determine whether the Commission was  
16 entitled to the direction filed with the Commissioner of  
17 Patents. The Board shall follow the rules and procedures  
18 established for interference cases and an appeal may be  
19 taken by either the applicant or the Commission from the  
20 final order of the Board to the Court of Customs and Pat-  
21 ent Appeals in accordance with the procedures governing  
22 the appeals from the Board of Patent Interferences.

23 “If the statement filed by the applicant should there-  
24 after be found to contain false material statements any noti-  
25 fication by the Commission that it has no objections to the



1 issuance of a patent to the applicant shall not be deemed in  
2 any respect to constitute a waiver of the provisions of this  
3 section or of any applicable civil or criminal statute, and the  
4 Commission may have the title to the patent transferred to  
5 the Commission on the records of the Commissioner of  
6 Patents in accordance with the provisions of this section. A  
7 determination of rights by the Commission pursuant to a con-  
8 tractual provision or other arrangement prior to the request  
9 of the Commissioner of Patents for the statement, shall be  
10 final in the absence of false material statements or nondis-  
11 closure of material facts by the applicant.”

12 SEC. 11. Section 157 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
13 as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the  
14 following new subsection:

15 “d. PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS.—Every application under  
16 this section shall be barred unless filed within six years after  
17 the date on which first accrues the right to such reasonable  
18 royalty fee, just compensation, or award for which such  
19 application is filed.”

20 SEC. 12. The second sentence of section 158 of the  
21 Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to  
22 read as follows: “If the court, at its discretion, deems that  
23 such licensee shall pay a reasonable royalty to the owner of  
24 the patent, the reasonable royalty shall be determined in  
25 accordance with section 157.”

1       SEC. 13. Subsections 161 t., u., and v. of the Atomic  
2 Energy Act of 1954, as amended, are hereby redesignated  
3 respectively as subsections 161 s., t., and u.

4       SEC. 14. Section 167 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,  
5 as amended, is amended to read as follows:

6       “SEC. 167. CLAIMS SETTLEMENTS.—The Commission,  
7 acting on behalf of the United States, is authorized to con-  
8 sider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay, any claim  
9 for money damage of \$5,000 or less against the United  
10 States for bodily injury, death, or damage to or loss of real  
11 or personal property resulting from any detonation, explo-  
12 sion, or radiation produced in the conduct of any program  
13 undertaken by the Commission involving the detonation of  
14 an explosive device, where such claim is presented to the  
15 Commission in writing within one year after the accident  
16 or incident out of which the claim arises: *Provided, how-*  
17 *ever,* That the damage to or loss of property, or bodily injury  
18 or death, shall not have been caused in whole or in part by  
19 any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant,  
20 his agents, or employees. Any such settlement under the  
21 authority of this section shall be final and conclusive for all  
22 purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the  
23 contrary. If the Commission considers that a claim in ex-  
24 cess of \$5,000 is meritorious and would otherwise be cov-  
25 ered by this section, the Commission may report the facts

1 and circumstances thereof to the Congress for its considera-  
2 tion.”

3       SEC. 15. Subsection d. of section 170 of the Atomic  
4 Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding  
5 at the end thereof the following new sentence: “A contractor  
6 with whom an agreement of indemnification has been exe-  
7 cuted and who is engaged in activities connected with the  
8 underground detonation of a nuclear explosive device shall  
9 be liable, to the extent so indemnified under this section,  
10 for injuries or damage sustained as a result of such detonation  
11 in the same manner and to the same extent as would a private  
12 person acting as principal, and no immunity or defense  
13 founded in the Federal, State, or municipal character of the  
14 contractor or of the work to be performed under the contract  
15 shall be effective to bar such liability.”

16       SEC. 16. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended,  
17 is amended by adding thereto the following new section:

18       “SEC. 190. LICENSEE INCIDENT REPORTS.—No report  
19 by any licensee of any incident arising out of or in connec-  
20 tion with a licensed activity made pursuant to any require-  
21 ment of the Commission shall be admitted as evidence in any  
22 suit or action for damages growing out of any matter men-  
23 tioned in such report.”

24       SEC. 17. The second sentence of section 202 of the  
25 Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by

1 striking out the word "sixty" and adding in lieu thereof  
2 the word "ninety".

3 SEC. 18. Section 4 (c) of the EURATOM Cooperation  
4 Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

5 "SEC. 4. (c) The Commission shall establish and pub-  
6 lish criteria for computing the maximum fuel element charge  
7 and minimum fuel element life to be guaranteed by the manu-  
8 facturer as a basis for inviting and evaluating proposals."

9 SEC. 19. Section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act  
10 of 1958 is amended in the following particulars:

11 (a) by deleting the words "One kilogram" and  
12 substituting the words "Nine kilograms" immediately  
13 following "Thirty thousand kilograms of contained  
14 uranium 235",

15 (b) by adding the words "Thirty kilograms of  
16 uranium 233" as an additional item immediately follow-  
17 ing "Nine kilograms of plutonium", and

18 (c) by adding the words "or agreements" immedi-  
19 ately following the words "an agreement".

20 SEC. 20. Section 7 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act  
21 of 1958 is amended by deleting the period after the word  
22 "amended" and inserting thereafter the following: "*And*  
23 *provided further*, That nothing in this section shall apply  
24 to arrangements made by the Commission under a research  
25 and development program authorized in section 3."