

ture and penetrating study, which I believe merits the attention of Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this study, by Robert Yoshioka, Galen Fox, Stuart Kiang, John Goodbody, and Brian Lederer, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHAPTER I. FACTORS INFLUENCING RED CHINA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Physical factors

Communist China, including Manchuria, occupies 3,768,000 square miles in southeast Asia. On the east she is washed by the Pacific Ocean, on the west bounded by the high ranges of the Tien Shan, the Pamirs, and the Himalayas. On the north China is separated from Russia by wide desert and steppe terrain. Solely in the south, through the valleys leading to Indochina, Burma, and Thailand, has there been an opening for Chinese expansion. As the only strong Communist nation in southeast Asia, China serves as the Communist base in this area.

More than half of the Chinese land frontier lies along the borders of other Communist countries, principally Russia. This brings China into conflict with her northern neighbor, for, in her efforts to decrease the population problem in her central and southern provinces, Red China has been forced to increase colonization of her northern border areas, which have long been under Russian influence.¹ Across the Taiwan Straits lies Formosa, a constant source of irritation to Red China.

In addition to these geographic realities, the factor of Red China's population has a vital influence on her internal and foreign policy. Based on the 1954 figure of 583 million, and counting on an average increase of 12 to 13 million per year, the Chinese population now approximates 660 million.² According to the Peking People's Daily, this manpower is China's greatest natural resource.³ Under the Communists this population has been organized politically and economically.⁴ It provides them with a market and labor force of more than half a billion men. Moved by the million, they provide workers all over the country for farms, mines, and industrial concerns.⁵

Another significant advantage of this population is its immense military potential. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, in reviewing the military strength of the Communist bloc, states that the number of Chinese males alone fit for military action is more than 85 million,⁶ and Mao Tse-tung has said that China could outlast a nuclear war, as China's population could still furnish manpower of several hundred million to take over the world.⁷ However, this mass of humanity also poses problems for Red China. Foremost among them is overpopulation. In the cultivated areas the average density of population is 1,200 to the square mile. As a countermeasure, the Communists have recently advocated the universal use of contraceptives.⁸ Furthermore, this population has needs which China cannot adequately meet. There is a demand for more quanti-

ties of food than China can provide in one year.⁹ It is an axiom in history that where there is overpopulation and shortage of food, there is a desire for expansion. Red China is no exception to this rule.

Closely tied to China's population problem is her shortage of natural resources. In agriculture, the needs of the population have caused a scarcity of available farmland.¹⁰ Rationing has been in effect since 1954, and has become progressively more stringent.¹¹ While coal and iron deposits are adequate, China on the whole has few mineral resources. In particular, she depends on the Soviet Union for oil and gas, which must affect her foreign relations with her northern neighbor.

In addition, China is concerned with economic and technical development. Agriculture is the basis of the Chinese economy; however, because of China's lack of modern tools and materials, the chief target of the "Great Leap Forward" has been industry.¹² China is far behind Russia in this respect, and is dependent on Russia for heavy machinery of all types: It is evident that China needs to increase her agricultural as well as industrial production, and machinery is vital to both.

In her attempt to build up the economy, China is conducting a campaign to promote increasing self-sufficiency at home in order to lessen her dependence on foreign products. The recent crop failures throughout China have accentuated this need, and the communes have been placing emphasis on local self-sufficiency as well.¹³

Where imports are necessary, there is evidence of Red China's attempt not to rely on one nation—notably the Soviet Union—exclusively, but to include even Western nations among her import sources, in order to avoid the status of a satellite.¹⁴

China's geographic location, the size of her population, her economic needs and resources have a significant bearing on her foreign policy. The pressure of these factors must be kept in mind when considering her actions.

Ideological factors

The Chinese Communists themselves believe that thought determines action. Certainly ideology forms the basis or support for all of a nation's activities; it is the standard by which a nation governs itself.

China is now carrying out a massive program of thought reform—the ideological remodeling of 660 million people.¹⁵ Her leaders are attempting to install communism as the true ideology of the people. To accomplish this, they have found it necessary to attack the very basis of old China, the religions and the way of life that have existed for centuries. Thus, confucianism, taoism, and buddhism are being attacked and gradually replaced by communism, with its goal of world revolution. However, certain historical factors continue to have an effect on China's ideology as well as her foreign policy. They take the form of a Chinese nationalism based on two closely related aspects of Chinese history. One of these is the Chinese tradition of hegemony in Asia, indeed in the world.

"Complacent Westerners should not forget that, for many centuries before modern times, this giant nation—the middle kingdom—excelled all countries in cultural at-

tainments, political stability, military prowess, and economic wealth."¹⁶

Today, aware of their backwardness, the Chinese are anxious to regain their former position in the center of the world.

The other historical aspect of Chinese nationalism is a reaction of hostility toward and suspicion of the West as a result of nearly a century of exploitation by the Western Powers. Thus, Chinese nationalism expresses itself through a drive toward regaining her former position of preeminence in the world.

Hardened by the years spent in gaining control of China, the Communist leaders feel a strong sense of mission to speed up the course of an inevitable world revolution. In April 1960 the editors of Red Flag stated: "We are living in a great epoch in which the collapse of the imperialist system is being further accelerated."

The Chinese are doing all they can to speed up the course of the world revolution. They promote constant change with the hope that each change will further their long-term aims. Thus, they are willing to make temporary tactical retreats when necessary if these retreats will bring closer the world revolution. The Chinese are not concerned with freezing the status quo or stabilizing the situation. This indicates their desire of using every possible means, formal and informal, overt and covert, to influence social trends, political opinions, and economic conditions within foreign countries which will further revolutionary changes.¹⁷ As will be demonstrated, the Chinese use a variety of tools in the implementation of their aims abroad.

Chinese Communist doctrine is based on orthodox Leninism. The Chinese Communists attack the "modern revisionists" who hold that Leninism is outmoded. Building on the base of Marxism-Leninism, Mao Tse-tung has developed a philosophy adopting a more militant attitude toward the world struggle, as evinced by his statement:

"Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun; anything can grow out of the barrel of a gun."¹⁸

Along with his militant attitude, however, he advocates flexibility. In relation to the world struggle for Communist power, he refined and developed the Marxist doctrine of calculated periods of tension and relaxation. By this doctrine, Mao sets up a plan for retreat in order to make greater advances, steps a side to move further ahead.¹⁹ We see this doctrine employed in ideological as well as military warfare.

The Chinese see the world divided into three major groups of nations, to which Mao's principles are applied: The first group is the "socialist", or Communist bloc, China's ideological allies. The second group is the "imperialist" or capitalist bloc, and the third and largest group, consists of noncommitted colonial and semicolonial nations.²⁰ The entire foreign policy of Peking has but one overall objective: To increase the size and influence of China, culminating in the conquest of the world. The chief enemy of this goal is the Western bloc, represented most powerfully by the United States.²¹ For that reason the aims of Communist China are to expel America from her position of influence, to neutralize, infiltrate, and eventually take over the noncommitted nations within her

¹ Dr. A. S. Y. Chen, "Communist China: Military Aspects of World Political Geography," p. 426.

² Gyan Chand, "The New Economy of China," pp. 370-371.

³ "Jen-Min Jih-pao," Oct. 22, 1960.

⁴ "Hung-Ch'i," July 1960.

⁵ "Nan-Fang Jih-pao," Aug. 3, 1960.

⁶ Maxwell D. Taylor, "The Uncertain Trumpet," p. 51.

⁷ "The Challenge of China," speech by Dr. John Stoessinger, United Nations radio.

⁸ Chung-kuo Fu-nu, July 16, 1960.

⁹ Alfred Ravenholt, "Red China's Food Crisis," AUFIS report, January 1961.

¹⁰ Yuan-li Wu, "An Economic Survey of China," pp. 22-23.

¹¹ Ibid. pp. 171-172, cf. Ravenholt, op. cit.

¹² Nan-Fang Jih-pao, August 1960.

¹³ Jen-Min Jih-pao, Sept. 2, 1960.

¹⁴ "Nan-Fang Jih-pao," Aug. 3, 1960.

¹⁵ Harriet Mills, "Thought Reform: Ideological Remolding in China," the Atlantic, p. 71, December 1959.

¹⁶ Tillman Durdin, "The Communist Record," the Atlantic, December 1959, p. 39.

¹⁷ A. Doak Barnett, "Red China's Impact on Asia," the Atlantic, December 1959, p. 49.

¹⁸ Mao Tse-tung, "Selected Works," vol. I, p. 75.

¹⁹ Hon. Walter H. Judd, "The Basic Themes," Free World Forum, August 1960.

²⁰ Jen-Min Jih-pao, June 1958.

²¹ Interview with Kazushige Hirazawa, editor, Japan Times, on Feb. 24, 1961.

the pages which I have asked to be inserted in the RECORD. I would like to have the whole book appear in the RECORD, but it would be rather costly. If that is the desire of the Senate, I shall be glad to include the whole book in the RECORD at some later time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the book is there some statement made that, according to Mr. Welch, the late John Foster Dulles, one of our great Secretaries of State, and his brother, Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, were, likewise, agents or dupes of the Communists?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. I wish to read just one paragraph with reference to President Eisenhower. It is one that has not received much publicity. It appears on page 266 of the book:

For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own conviction that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I personally think that he has been sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life.

That is what he said about President Eisenhower.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think every American would consider as a slur on our entire country any imputation on the character of either former President Eisenhower or his brother Milton Eisenhower. The same would apply to the late great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and his brother, Allen Dulles.

It is my understanding that this society advocates, among other things, the impeachment of Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States; the repeal of all income taxes; vigorous opposition to the NATO alliance, and similar opposition to the United Nations—all this, and more, too.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a commentary from the Christian Science Monitor of recent date, under the title "State of the Nations; Far-Right Goals."

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

FAR-RIGHT GOALS

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—Some Americans are understandably concerned that the free world, particularly the United States, is not winning more immediate battles against communism. They may become even more worried before the rugged Lao crisis is resolved, though elsewhere new tactics and approaches by the United States—in Africa and Latin America, for instance—hold promise of halting the Communist inroads if everyone is resolute.

But a question is posed right here, as radical right-wing organizations such as the John Birch Society receive an unusual and perhaps unwarranted amount of publicity. This is whether the programs and prescriptions of the far right, which are billed as combating communism, really do this very effectively and safely.

Everyone must make up his own mind here. Is a program responsible and perceptive; or is it based on a dim comprehension of what is happening in the world and a

malaise which is, at base, a wish to be living in less demanding times?

The John Birch Society reportedly has several current aims as espoused by its founder. Among them, impeachment of Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States; repeal of the income tax; vigorous opposition to the NATO alliance; similar opposition to the United Nations.

What of the suggested fate for Mr. Chief Justice Warren? It springs from anger with the desegregation decision and rulings which have protected individual rights under the first amendment.

In part it discloses an unawareness that the Supreme Court, well before the desegregation decision, was moving specifically in that direction. The decision, no bolt from the blue, was foreshadowed in such a case as that which knocked down the "separate but equal doctrine" which required a Negro student to forgo attendance at a white law school.

As for Mr. Chief Justice Warren and the Bill of Rights, the denouncers disclose a careless unwillingness to honor the institution of the Court itself, its valid history in mitigating injustices, the vast esteem which the American Bill of Rights is accorded in free nations, and the certainty that as time passes the Court's pendulum of decision will swing away from any extremism, including extreme decisions by the tribunal itself.

But perhaps we should repeal the income tax? Nobody likes to pay taxes, especially when that April deadline approaches. But without income tax, how does Washington collect the revenues to run the Government? (Currently individual income taxes supply 52 percent of the Federal revenue.) The answer usually is, "Have much less government."

A noble idea indeed, until one analyzes, as some have not, the Federal budget (for 1961) and discovers that a whopping 57 percent of it goes for national security, 12 percent for merely paying interest on the national debt, and 7 percent for the veterans. That leaves just 24 percent of an \$80 billion budget that is reducible, unless, of course, someone wants to tackle the veterans or cut defense.

No doubt there is waste, and something could be pared from social security, hospitals, flood control, farm payments? But any expectation that the United States can return to budgets of 20 years ago is wishful thinking.

But how about quitting the NATO alliance? Here we really are talking about the shield of Free Europe, that which prevents Moscow from overrunning a vast industrial complex and subduing 200 million free people. It will become a device for sharing the foreign aid load and encouraging world trade. Why scuttle it?

Then perhaps we should get out of the United Nations? Would this be wise at just the moment when the U.N. is being forged into a promising instrument of executive action usable directly in a chaotic land such as the Congo or Angola?

There is much unfinished business in this country. There are covenanted devices for handling it. The FBI keeps tabs on Communist subversion, and J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, has just warned against "vigilant action." One who wishes the political parties were meaningful should realize that both parties welcome dedicated helpers; indeed the Republicans are appealing urgently for able candidates and workers.

In all sincerity each person must ask himself: Are not groups which prefer harassing phone calls and infiltration to the established instruments of political action approaching a nihilist solution which would leave the Nation divided, suspicious, its leaders and its institutions maligned, worse off in the latter case than it was in the former?

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes, but I do not have the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it a fact that the John Birch Society is a secret organization; that it does not tell who runs it, or who its members are, and that it operates in a secret way?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. It so states in its literature. The names of the members of the society are not given to anybody. The members of one chapter do not know who the members of another chapter are.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator think we ought to introduce into the RECORD information which gives more publicity to this secret society, which advocates such extreme, ultra-right doctrines to which the Senator from Montana has referred?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to have the whole book printed in the RECORD if that were not so expensive, but the real reason why I am asking to have part of the book, "The Politician," printed in the RECORD, is that many members of the society do not believe this book was ever written. Mr. Welch himself admits writing it. Most people are not aware of the vicious charges he makes in the book. I think, for that reason, they should become public knowledge.

Mr. JAVITS. I am one of those who rather hopes that the whole society will be looked into carefully by one of the congressional committees, so the public may know more about it. If the Senator's intention, therefore, is that more light will be thrown on what the society is, I have no objection to his request.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mine has been mostly a defensive action. I never heard of the John Birch Society until it started attacking me in my State about 2 months ago. I have been doing what I think is necessary for my defense.

Mr. JAVITS. I would certainly like to hold up the Senator's hand in defense of himself against that kind of society.

RED CHINA'S DRIVE FOR WORLD POWER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Madam President, the new administration has stressed the important role that young men and women in America can play in securing world peace. Realizing that to be effective, students must be well grounded in fundamentals of international relations, the Honolulu Advertiser and the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council jointly sponsored the Hawaii World Forum.

The forum was enthusiastically supported by the community, and high schools in Hawaii contributed a team of five members to write a task force report on some problem of international relations.

The winning team, from Punahou School, wrote on "Red China's Drive for World Power." All of us in Hawaii are proud of the work that was done by these students. Their efforts produced a ma-

behind his investigation, might have been able to uncover the whole rotten story, and to show that the CIA is the most Communist-infested of all the agencies of our Government. But Eisenhower was able to instead turn the power of the U.S. Senate onto the destruction of McCarthy. And Allen Dulles still goes his slippery way.

11. Arthur F. Burns: Off-and-on economic adviser and superadviser to the President. Born and raised in Russia. Preferred by Eisenhower to an American adviser on the American economy. Typical of the kind of economic advice Burns hands out were his statements in 1955 that "our system of free and competitive enterprise is on trial" and that Government "must be ready to take vigorous steps to help maintain a stable prosperity." It is quite probable that the job of economic adviser has been merely a coverup for Burns' liaison work between Eisenhower and some of his Communist bosses.

12. John J. Corson: Appointed to head a panel of advisers to the President on higher education, especially as to recommendations to the President, for him in turn to make to Congress, on Federal aid to education. This appointment was not subject to approval by Congress, because the "briefing panel" was set up and paid under the President's "emergency funds," for which he does not have to account. Mr. Corson's general point of view can be shown by this paragraph from a paper which he wrote for "The Social Welfare Forum":

"As things stand today, Government alone can provide the security that families, churches, and charitable agencies did in the past. The pension programs provided by employers and labor will constitute nothing more than the frosting on the cake. Government must provide basic security, and this means a frank guarantee of a minimum of well-being for every individual, not alone for a fifth of the people at the bottom of the scale."

* * * * *

For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own conviction that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I personally think that he has been sympathetic, to ultimate Communist aims realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life.

The role he has played, as described above, would fit just as well into one theory as the other; that he is a mere stooge, or that he is a Communist assigned the specific job of being a political front man. In either case the Communists are so powerfully entrenched by now that, even if Eisenhower disappeared from the scene, all the momentum and strength of the forces we have seen at work would still have to be overcome before we would be reasonably out of danger. The firm grip on our Government, of the forces that have worked through Eisenhower, is more important than Eisenhower himself. And so long as I can make clear the power and pervasiveness of the conspiracy, as it reaches right inside the White House, I have no wish to quarrel with any reader who finds it easier to believe that Eisenhower is a more personable Harry Truman than that he is a more highly placed Alger Hiss. For such an interpretation of his conduct brings us out at almost exactly the same point as my own, so far as the disastrous effects on the present and future of our country are concerned.

At this stage of the manuscript, however, perhaps it is permissible for me to take just a couple of paragraphs to support my own belief. And it seems to me that the explanation of sheer political opportunism, to account for Eisenhower's Communist-aiding

career, stems merely from a deep-rooted aversion of any American to recognizing the horrible truth. Most of the doubters, who go all the way with me except to the final logical conclusion, appear to have no trouble whatever in suspecting that Milton Eisenhower is an outright Communist. Yet they draw back from attaching the same suspicion to his brother, for no other real reason than that one is a professor and the other a President. While I too think that Milton Eisenhower is a Communist, and has been for 30 years, this opinion is based largely on general circumstances of his conduct. But my firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy is based on an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to me to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt.

This inevitably prompts the third question, as to how a man born in the American Midwest, who went through the U.S. Military Academy, could ever become a convert to communism (or even to the service of communism for personal glory). The answer, of course, is that very few could, or do. That's why there are probably not more than 25,000 American-born actual Communist traitors in the United States today—out of a population of 160 million.

Those converts are most likely to occur among warped but brilliant minds, which have acquired either by inheritance or circumstances a mentality of fanaticism. And it should be no surprise to anybody that Eisenhower was raised with this mentality of fanaticism, for as recently as 1942 his mother was arrested for participating in a forbidden parade of Jehovah's witnesses. But whereas in most historical cases fanaticism takes the form of outspoken promotion of the fanatic's cause, at whatever personal cost, the Communists have sold their converts the fundamental principle that the goals of their fanaticism can best be achieved by cunning deception. Everything Eisenhower has done for the past 18 years can be fitted into the explanation based on that type of mentality. And I do not believe that the events of his personal story during those 18 years can be satisfactorily explained in any other way.

The Communists can now use all the power and prestige of the Presidency of the United States to implement their plans, just as fully and even openly as they dare. They have arrived at this point by three stages. In the first stage, Roosevelt thought he was using the Communists to promote his personal ambitions and grandiose schemes. Of course, instead, the Communists were using him; but without his knowledge or understanding of his place in their game. In the second stage, Truman was used by the Communists, with his knowledge and acquiescence, as the price he consciously paid for their making him President. In the third stage, in my own firm opinion, the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency. For this third man, Eisenhower, there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. That word is "treason."

* * * * *

The legislative branch of our Government has been brought so far in line that it will ratify an Austrian Peace Treaty without debate, approve the appointment of a Zellerbach without a question, and listen to the speech of a Sukarno with applause.

Our Supreme Court is now so strongly and almost completely under Communist influence that it shatters its own precedents and rips gaping holes in our Constitution, in order to favor Communist purposes. Its "Red Monday" decisions in 1957 were described by a notorious Communist in California as the greatest victory the Communist Party ever had. This gloating com-

ment may have been entirely correct. Just one result of those decisions was that more than 300 known Communists or Communist sympathizers were actually restored to their positions within our Federal Government. Other results were equally disastrous to the anti-Communist cause; and other decisions by the Supreme Court since then have been equally bad.

As to the executive department of our Government, it has become, to a large extent, an active agency for the promotion of Communist aims—as the preceding 200 pages of this book have tried to show. It is certain that the situation must grow worse, under present circumstances, even if and when Eisenhower ceases to be President, unless we can understand and undo so much that he has accomplished. There is one important reason for this which most Americans have not stopped to notice. We still see and read about hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, although so much of the steam has now been let out of their boilers. And we take for granted that these patriotic Legislators are looking for flagrantly dangerous Communists wherever they can find them. But this is not the case. They are looking for such Communists everywhere except in Government.

You may discover either committee investigating, or seeking to expose, Communists in labor, or in education, or in the entertainment world—though their efforts are pathetically small and brutally handicapped in proportion to the size and power of the enemy. But no longer do you ever see such a committee even questioning a suspected Communist in Government. For Eisenhower's gag rules have made the field of Government out of bounds to such committees, and have made utterly useless their even attempting to investigate Communists in Government agencies. In fact, these committees cannot even get answers from anybody inside Government to any questions they might ask concerning suspected Communists outside of Government. For those same gag rules, issued and enforced by Eisenhower, prohibit agencies of the executive branch from giving these congressional committees any information whatsoever, about anything. So both Communists and their activities, in Departments like State and Treasury and Commerce, are as free to multiply as rabbits on a farm grown to weeds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota said.

Did I understand him correctly to state that he was putting in the Record certain parts of a book known as "The Politician," which was supposedly either published or distributed to friends of Mr. Welch some years ago?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. The book was admittedly written by Mr. Welch. He admits this. The book was completed, as I understand, in 1956. It was written by him, but never published. Some copies were made available to certain interested members of the society, but most of them were withdrawn from circulation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was it in that book that statements were made relative to our great former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and his distinguished brother, Milton S. Eisenhower, being Communist agents, or Communist dupes, or something of that description?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. Those statements appear in

ber of the first meeting of the World Council of Churches, at Amsterdam in 1948, when that body officially declared capitalism to be just as bad as communism. Dulles neither protested nor disavowed the statement, which was fully in accord with his own expressed convictions, and which was given so much publicity in this country that I actually heard it, being loudly bleated over a radio from the clubhouse, while I was playing golf.

For many reasons and after a lot of study, I personally believe Dulles to be a Communist agent who has had one clearly defined role to play; namely, always to say the right things and always to do the wrong ones. The Japanese Peace Treaty, the Austrian Peace Treaty, and his very definite double-crossing of the British Government in the Suez affair are all cases in point. In speeches and public statements Dulles is always the proponent of the real American position, the man who announces the policies and intentions which the American people want to hear, and which they recognize as right. He thus serves to convince the American Congress and people that the administration is trying to do the right thing. Then Dulles backs down, or is overruled, or appears to be forced by circumstances and pressures he can't control to reverse himself; the Government does exactly the opposite of what he has said it would do; and the defeat of our side is worse than if he had never spoken at all. But the American people simply do not grasp that it was all planned that way in the first place.

Although it certainly will not strengthen my argument any, it may perhaps be worth while, just to give the reader a break from so much monotonously respectable language, to quote somebody else's summation of Dulles' character. Once, in a small group, I asked a good friend of mine and prominent American, whose name at least is well known to every reader of this document but who has never held any political office, what he thought of Dulles. After a moment of hesitation he replied, so that everybody could hear: "I think John Foster Dulles is a sanctimonious, psalm-singing hypocritical ———, and I know him very well." If Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, Nuri es-Said, and other real anti-Communists in the governments of our allies throughout the world, could be persuaded to voice their real thoughts, I am sure they would agree with that sentiment, if not with its phrasing. For it is certain beyond dispute that Dulles (or our State Department as run by Dulles), has been selling them and their countries down the river into Communist hands, as cleverly as he knew how and as rapidly as he dared.

4. Martin Durkin: First Secretary of Labor. Robert Taft said his appointment was incredible. It was—so incredible and so revealing that even Eisenhower couldn't make that one stick. But his aims are shown by the fact that he made it at all.

5. Theodore C. Streibert: First head of the newly independent U.S. Information Agency. Announced at the beginning of his term that under him the Voice of America would avoid "going violently anti-Soviet." It certainly has. He also stated that "where there are two sides to a question here we shall be sure to give both sides." Taking American taxpayers' money to present, to the people of the satellite nations, the Soviet side of the phony issues they stir up, would be bad enough. Streibert's choice of agents to present the American side, over Voice of America, has been even worse. Eisenhower could get away with so brazen an appointment even then, simply because it seemed to the American people too minor for them to give any of their attention.

6. Philip C. Jessup: Reappointed by Eisenhower as an Ambassador at Large. This is

the appointment, so early in Eisenhower's first administration, to which the adjective incredible really should have been applied. He was able to get away with it, even by the use of a great deal of White House pressure and insistence, only because the victory happy real Republicans, ecstatically gloating over their supposed return to power, were willing to look the other way while their new standard bearer indulged himself with what seemed to be a blind and peculiar vagary.

Philip C. Jessup had been one of the most important men in the IPR during all the years of its most important treasonous activities. Working hand in glove with his close friend, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, he had done everything he could to turn China over to the Communists and, after the mainland was lost, to see that both Korea and Formosa were abandoned to the Communists as well. Jessup had been officially listed as the sponsor of several Communist fronts. He was a protege of Dean Acheson. He was a great friend of Alger Hiss, and had appeared as a character witness for Hiss at Hiss' trial. He was a vigorous supporter of Owen Lattimore. In hearings before the McCarran committee, in November 1949, he had been caught deliberately lying under oath about his previous attitude toward our recognition of Red China. His reappointment by Truman, to represent the United States in the U.N. General Assembly, had been refused recommendation by the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, because of his Communist associations and leanings, less than 1 year before Eisenhower was elected.

The evidence of Jessup's pro-Communist sympathies, and of his unceasing and energetic efforts on behalf of the Communist cause, was—and is—overwhelming. Equally important for this discussion, those sympathies and actions were fully known to Eisenhower. But he brazened out the appointment, because he and his fellow Communists well knew the American people to be extremely short as to memory and long as to complacency.

7. Chester Bowles: Ambassador to India. This appointment was much easier for Eisenhower to get away with, because Bowles' sympathies had not been so well exposed. But it was equally revealing of Eisenhower's purposes, to anybody who really looked behind the scenes. Fortunately, we can put Bowles in his proper niche here with just one simple fact: He was one of the principal owners of the pro-Communist publication PM.

8. Charles E. Bohlen: Ambassador to Russia. This appointment, also made so early in the Eisenhower administration, was declared even then by a discerning few to be a portent of things to come. Senator McCarthy claimed that there were 16 pages of derogatory material about Bohlen in the FBI security file on him. Senator Wayne Morse, ardently pro-Bohlen, referred at first to "2 or 3," then to "6 or 7," and finally admitted 15 such derogatory reports.

Bohlen was a protege of Acheson, and another close friend of Alger Hiss. Even at the hearings on his confirmation he still brazenly supported the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences and agreements, in each of which he had participated in a minor capacity. He was vigorously endorsed by Senators HUMPHREY and Lehman. He was confirmed, despite his record, because most of the Republican Senators put peace in the Republican Party at this stage above an honest foreign affairs policy, and shared the feeling expressed by Senator Taft that the appointment of Bohlen was a relatively minor question, not worth fighting over. They were wrong. For Eisenhower was edging Communist sympathizers, right out of the old Acheson-Hiss coterie, into every position of importance that he dared. The total impact of this program was very important

indeed. And the total of these "relatively minor matters not worth fighting over" added up to a very clear revelation of the game Eisenhower was playing. But nobody, or very few indeed, even wanted to look.

9. Arthur H. Dean: Chief American negotiator in the truce with the Communists at Panmunjom. Already mentioned far earlier in these pages, so we'll add little more about him here. His sympathies can readily be seen from the fact that early in 1954 he stated publicly, with the prestige of an American "Ambassador," that we should take a "new look" at Red China and "be prepared to admit them to the family of nations." Had already given Red China at Panmunjom everything they could think of to ask for except the White House dome. Longtime law partner of John Foster Dulles. Arthur Dean was the one man who, more than any other, had blocked every effort to clean up the Institute of Pacific Relations from the inside, and had kept it firmly and aggressively on its pro-Communist course. In addition to all of which he is, right on the plain written record, one of the most brazen and incorrigible liars that ever competed in that category with Alger Hiss.

10. Allen W. Dulles: Head of the CIA. Brother of John Foster Dulles. (They have a sister in the State Department whose pro-Communist slant is less disguised). Law partner of Arthur Dean. Allen Dulles is the most protected and untouchable supporter of communism, next to Eisenhower himself, in Washington.

How many millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money Allen Dulles has turned over to Walter Reuther's stooge, Irving Brown, to promote communism in fact while pretending to fight it (through building up the leftwing labor unions of Europe), nobody will ever know. How many millions he has turned over to David Dubinsky and Jay Lovestone, both admitted Communists but claiming to be anti-Stalinist Communists, on the specious excuse that it is best to fight the Kremlin through such opponents, nobody will ever know. How many millions he has supplied to the NTS, the phony Russian refugee anti-Communist organization, to enable its worldwide branches to wreck real anti-Communist organizations, none of us will ever know. Nobody is allowed by the Eisenhower administration to get close enough even to ask. When a man as highly regarded and highly placed as Major General Trudeau, Director of Military Intelligence, even began to suggest that the CIA under Allen Dulles was of no help in safeguarding America against communism, Trudeau found himself quickly removed from office as head of Military Intelligence and sent to routine duty in the Far East. When Senator McCarthy, at the very height of his popularity with the American people, began casting even random glances at the CIA, his days were immediately numbered.

When a patriotic young American goes into intelligence work, especially against as ruthless an enemy as the Communists, he knows that he is risking his life. He knows that he must count on his own courage, skill, and resourcefulness. But he has every right to expect loyalty to America on the part of those above him in his own agency. One month before that shuttlecock defector, Otto John, went over to the East German Communists, however, he spent a whole day in Allen Dulles' headquarters in Washington. Then, immediately after John's defection, our agents in central Europe began losing their lives. The inside report is that more than 160 were exposed and killed within the next several weeks. The inference that Otto John took with him from Washington the information that made this possible is clear. Of course there is no way to prove it. McCarthy, if he had been given the full power of the U.S. Senate

John Birch Society pamphlet entitled, "appreciation and encouragement," which I quote: "Neither the list of our members of either local chapters or the home chapter, nor their number, is ever given out to anybody." This secret manner in which the John Birch Society operates makes it impossible to know who the members are. Most of the people who I believe are members of the organization are honestly and sincerely trying to combat the Communist menace—and it is a real one. I have only commendation for this objective.

You condemn me for inserting in the RECORD a sermon by the Reverend John A. Crane. This was a part of a series of articles printed in the Santa Barbara News-Press. I might say that the News-Press is not a left-wing publication. It is a very reputable newspaper. Incidentally, its managing editor, Mr. Veblen, is a former North Dakotan.

Your statement, "Wittingly or unwittingly you are serving the cause of communism" is typical of many of the letters I am receiving from people I suspect are members of the John Birch Society. Apparently this is part of your doctrine. You label everyone who disagrees with you on any subject a Communist or pro-Communist. Am I to believe that irresponsible accusations such as this are symbolic of the lofty objectives of the John Birch Society of more responsibility and a better world?

Very truly yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 8, 1961]
BIRCHERS "OUT OF FOCUS," CATHOLIC PAPER SAYS

BOSTON, April 7.—The Pilot, official organ of the Boston Roman Catholic Archdiocese, today said that the John Birch Society movement "with all kinds of good intentions allowed, is unbalanced, excited and definitely out of focus."

On page 1 of the same issue, the Pilot printed a story on Richard Cardinal Cushing's speech Wednesday at North Easton. At that time, the cardinal described Robert Welch, founder of the Birch Society, as "a sincere and dedicated man."

In its lead editorial, titled "The Unbalanced View," the newspaper said:

"In a world as complex as ours, simplification can be a vice and sincerity is no excuse for exaggeration. Nothing discredits a good cause quicker than supporting it by misrepresentation. When we feed the cause of genuine anticommunism with overstatement, we err just as badly as those who nourish communism itself by understatement * * *"

The Pilot said that the lessons that can be profitably drawn from such an endeavor—"a good thing gone wrong"—are many and should not be lost on thoughtful observers.

"In protecting ourselves against communism," the Pilot said, "We should be careful that we do not fall into evils almost as bad. It is possible to escape the dogs only to perish in the swamp."

"Moreover, we must remember that we cannot rewrite history; it is fatuous to speak of returning to the simplicity of earlier times or to suggest carrying out the responsibilities of present-day Government with the machinery of the 18th century."

"We live in a real world with real problems which we must meet realistically; there is no place for hysteria, exaggeration, accusation or misrepresentation in an authentic anti-Communist effort."

[From the Oregonian, Apr. 5, 1961]

THE AGAINSTERS

A nationwide organization whose members appear to have at least one thing in common—malcontent—has been receiving reams of publicity recently, probably much more than its significance warrants. Yet it is a

good thing that the American public be fully informed on the John Birch Society, just as it should be informed on the activities of all persons who, through concerted action, would work important changes in the life or government of the republic.

All we know about the John Birch Society is what we read in the papers. It is quite enough to draw some conclusions. It is quite enough to be reminded that a patent-medicine cure for evil can often be just about as bad as the evil itself. The founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch, of Belmont, Mass., quite candidly condones mean and dirty tactics in opposition to the mean and dirty Communists and presumably against all the other things the society and its members oppose.

These are the publicized characteristics of the John Birchers that strike us most forcibly: They are againsters, and they eschew the tools of reason and democracy in their assault on those things they are against.

Although Mr. Welch calls his society "monolithic," his againsters have their own peevish. All, by the very nature of their association, are against Communists—and, if that was as far as it went, the society would be the most popular in the country. But the record shows that they are also against those who just anybody says may be a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. They are against liberals. They are against taxes in any amount necessary to mount a real defense against the real Communists.

Some are against the public schools as being dominated by radicals. Some are against newspapers, the Communist press, to use a phrase popular among the John Birchers.

On the local front, some are against school consolidation. Some, not only in the South, are against integration of the races in the schools and elsewhere. Some are against textbooks that appear to them to be obscene or radical.

Most members, it appears, are against Republicans Dwight Eisenhower, Earl Warren, and Nelson Rockefeller, and against John Kennedy (Reuther's stooge) and Harry Truman.

We mean no blanket indictment of the John Birch Society. There is a place in our society for organizations that are against the things the John Birchers are against. There should be a place in such organizations for positive as well as negative principles.

The John Birch Society publicity will serve a good purpose if it alerts some of the society's members to the dangers of a program overburdened with ill will, and if it alerts men of good will to their own responsibilities for action on matters of public concern. The citizen who refuses to take an active role in determining the policies of his schools, his Government and other public affairs is in no position to be critical of the active role pursued by the extremists. It is no public service, for example, just to be against the John Birch Society.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest in the book entitled "The Politician," written by the head of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch, but never published. Copies of this book are very difficult to obtain. Very few members of the John Birch Society or others have ever read it. Some members of the society even doubt its existence.

Mr. President, because of the considerable interest in this book, I ask unanimous consent to have 13 of its pages printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks. These are the pages dealing primarily with accusations of commu-

nism against President Eisenhower and other great, patriotic leaders of our Nation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The political affiliations of some of Eisenhower's appointees, however, are as vague and mysterious as were his own. Also, the categories above do sometimes overlap with regard to a particular individual; that is, he may appear to be a leftwing Democrat, for instance, and actually be a Communist. So we are going to list below some 40 appointments made by Eisenhower, or which could not have been made by department heads under him, if he disapproved, without trying to separate them into the three classifications. But we shall try, in most cases, to make clear the place of the appointment in this whole story, by at least a brief word of comment.

1. Milton Eisenhower: Presidential adviser. At least in appearance. Had always been an ardent New Dealer, to put it mildly, and still is. Proof of at least pro-Communist leanings is implicit in his support of Owen Lattimore, and of others like him, at Johns Hopkins. In my opinion the chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the Communist Party. For one thing he is obviously a great deal smarter.

2. Maxwell E. Rabb: Presidential adviser, and assistant for relations with minority groups: First official title, "associate counsel" for the President; then "Secretary to the Cabinet." Now in private law practice. Drew a salary all during 1952, while helping to run the Eisenhower campaign, for a post he never filled with the Democratic-controlled Senate Judiciary Committee. The staff director of this committee did not even know him.

Max Rabb is a very clever and cagey man. Proof that he is a Communist would not be easy, except as a logical deduction from his overall actions and visible purposes. In masterminding the steal of the Republican nomination at Chicago in 1952, however, he followed so faithfully and cleverly the exact Communist technique, of always accusing your enemy, first and loudly, of the very crime which you yourself are committing, that the long arm of coincidence would be strained in reaching so far.

3. John Foster Dulles: Secretary of State. America's case against Secretary Dulles and company was presented by Senator William E. Jenner in an article in the April 1956 issue of the American Mercury. We covered a certain amount of additional ground on pages 23 to 28 of the June 1958 issue of American Opinion. We'll try to summarize these and other appraisals here as briefly as we can.

John Foster Dulles is the man who chiefly persuaded Thomas E. Dewey and the Republican opposition, in 1944 and 1948, to go along with, instead of fighting, the pro-Communist foreign policies of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Dulles has at all times been a close friend, admirer, associate, consultant, and political protege of Dean Acheson. Senator Jenner says that "Mr. Dulles is Mr. Acheson's identical twin." Dulles became officially a right-hand man of Acheson, in 1950; and was so completely a part of the Communist-dominated Truman foreign-policy managerie that he no longer gave Who's Who in America his address as 18 Wall Street, New York, which was his law office, but as "Office: Department of State, Washington."

Certainly his appointment was a strange and disillusioning one to be made by the kind of Republican which President Eisenhower was pretending to be in 1952. Among other visible parts of his record, Dulles had been a prominent and much publicized mem-

"There are about 200,000 ministers, and only about 7,000 of them could be called 'comsymps.'"

"Nobody is accusing the other 97 percent of anything except the gullibility and apathy with which Americans as a whole are afflicted."

He defined a "comsymp" as a "Communist or a sympathizer with Communist purposes."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, for many weeks I have been receiving a considerable number of letters condemning me for being opposed to the John Birch Society. Since it is a secret organization, there is no way to know for certain whether the writers of these letters are members of the John Birch Society. A small percentage will admit they are members. Most of the letters follow the same pattern, however, that is, if one is opposed to anything the head of this organization, Mr. Welch, does or says, one is assumed to be some kind of a Communist or Communist dupe.

Typical of the type of letters I am receiving is one from Mr. Thomas E. Woods, an attorney from Wichita, Kans. In his letter, he states:

Wittingly or unwittingly you are serving the cause of communism.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as parts of my remarks, the letter from Mr. Woods, and my reply to his letter; an article entitled "Birchers 'Out of Focus' Catholic Paper Says," published in the Washington Post for April 8, 1961, and based on an editorial appearing in the Pilot, the official organ of the Boston Roman Catholic archdiocese; and an editorial entitled "The Againers," published in the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., of April 5, 1961.

There being no objection, the letters, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., April 6, 1961.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: For many years it has been my privilege to receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Over the years I have experienced humor, pleasure, displeasure, and the whole gamut of emotions concerning the contents thereof. Of course I can appreciate that all Congressmen are politicians, and perhaps it is sometimes with tongue in cheek that certain activities, letters, and articles are included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, recently I am appalled at what I read. I have reference to the items you have chosen to place in the RECORD regarding the John Birch Society.

Lest there be any misunderstanding let me say that I am a member of the John Birch Society—and proud to be one. Of course I did not join the society until I had satisfied all my doubts regarding its purpose, scope, and the dedication of the members I knew. Of course this is not a problem for anyone having the slightest interest in the organization either with a view of joining or out of curiosity. We have open meetings and all of our material is available at the city library.

Apparently it is the purpose of the society, its increasing membership, and effectiveness which is causing the press to rise in anguish and question everything about us. Of course there is no such anguished beating of breasts over the continuing Communist success throughout the world. And it is apparently due to our increasing effectiveness against Communist subversion that has

caused the homegrown Communists to honor us with the proclamation that the John Birch Society must be destroyed at all costs. Wittingly or unwittingly you are serving the cause of communism.

Please do not misunderstand me. It is not my purpose to attempt to prevent your criticism of the society—provided it is valid. That is your privilege and mine as citizens of this great country to express our opinions on any and all subjects, subject only to the legal rights of others.

The misinformed and the uninformed are the greatest dangers that any society faces. With all the marvelous means of communication, transportation, and the masses of information available to us today we must be even more vigilant. And here is where I take issue with you. It is my opinion that if you had a sincere interest in the society and it's purpose, you would not have adopted the course you have.

Perhaps you are not aware of the fact that the article in Time magazine which you read into the RECORD on March 8, 1961, is largely based on an article in the Peoples World, dated February 25, 1961. For your information the Peoples World is a publication of the Communist Party U.S.A. as listed by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Another facet to this whole matter that disturbs me is the fact that among the items placed in the RECORD on March 20, 1961, is a sermon by John A. Crane, a Unitarian minister. Coincidentally, a John A. Crane, who is also a Unitarian minister, is one of the signers of an appeal for the recognition of Red China in the Worker dated December 8, 1957, at paragraph four and nine. Do you not make any independent investigation of the items you read into the RECORD?

The attacks on the society seem to be largely based on the fact that we are a secret organization, whatever that means. There is no question about it—we are a private organization. But so are the Knights of Columbus, Masons, Elks, etc. Does this fact in and of itself militate against us?

Another fact that seems to concern many is that Robert Welch has said or written many things about Eisenhower, Dulles, etc. I am not familiar with any of the material he has allegedly written for it is not a part of the society material. Reference is made to a letter he wrote 4 years or so before the society was organized. The contents of this letter, if it did exist, were never published until the society started to become effective and then our critics started the publication of this alleged letter. Also for whatever it may be worth, you might examine into the fact that the ghostwriter for Eisenhower's book was identified by Louis Budenz, Chambers, and others, as a Communist. I do not imply that the general knew this at the time the book was written, but it is a fact nevertheless.

Needless to say this letter will probably have little effect on your future activity, but as a representative of the people it would seem that you might make a little investigation into the facts before you place articles such as you have in the RECORD. And even a little investigation would have given you all the information you were looking for—if that was the purpose of the insertion of the articles in the RECORD.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS E. WOODS.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
April 11, 1961.

MR. THOMAS E. WOODS,
Attorney at Law,
Wichita, Kans.

DEAR MR. WOODS: This will acknowledge your letter of April 6.

Your letter is typical of what is wrong with the John Birch Society. Your leader,

Robert Welch, is unwilling or does not have the decency to apologize for the Communist accusations he leveled against President Eisenhower and a host of other patriotic American leaders. If I were to make such charges as this, I certainly would have been run out of the Republican Party and probably out of my State.

All through Mr. Welch's book, "The Politician," he accuses President Eisenhower, his brother Milton Eisenhower, Allen Dulles, Director of the CIA, and many others of being Communists or following the Communist line. On page 267 of "The Politician," Mr. Welch states "that Milton Eisenhower is a Communist, and has been for 30 years." On page 210 he also says of Milton Eisenhower, "In my opinion the chances are very strong that Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the Communist Party."

One of the most damnable of all his accusations against President Eisenhower—and one that has not been carried in the newspapers—appears on page 266 of "The Politician:" "For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own convictions that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I personally think that he has been sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life." If perchance you should call yourself a Republican and are a member of the John Birch Society, whose leader has made such outrageous charges and is unwilling to either retract them or apologize for them, then you are not my kind of a Republican.

It is understandable why you folks in the organization are doing nothing about these charges. You probably don't dare. In your application for membership in the John Birch Society, you "agree that my membership may be revoked at anytime, by a duly appointed officer of the society, without the reason being stated, on refund of the pro rata part of my dues paid in advance."

This means that Mr. Welch can remain the head of the John Birch Society so long as he desires, regardless of his beliefs, accusations, or conduct. If any effort ever should be made to depose Mr. Welch as head of this organization, the membership of such individuals, chapters, or even the entire State organization could be revoked by Mr. Welch without the reason being stated.

In the February 29, 1960, bulletin for March written by Robert Welch and sent to all members of the John Birch Society, and contained in the white book of the John Birch Society for 1960, there is this statement: "Report to me all of the horrible things you will increasingly be hearing about your founder, if you think it is worthwhile, but put no credence in them, no matter the source from which they come—or resign from the society if you do." There is nothing very democratic about such a procedure. No wonder Mr. Welch calls democracy "a perennial fraud."

You state that the organization is no more secret than the Knights of Columbus, Masons, Elks, or others. Many organizations refuse to give a list of their membership to any agency or other persons for various reasons, but mainly because they do not like to have them become subjected to promiscuous mailings by oftentimes disreputable sources. You can go into any community in the United States, however, and contact the heads of these organizations and I think you will find that invariably they will tell you who their members are. Certainly no person who is a member of the organizations you mentioned will ever deny such membership. Usually they are very proud of their membership. They have no provision such as the one appearing in the

be full exploration of the potential use of a wide variety of modern teaching aides and rapid teacher training programs.

PEACE CORPS

The new Peace Corps can play a very important part in meeting the need for primary education in the newly developing nations.

Peace Corps members can perform vitally needed education functions, developing and introducing new teaching systems, and training the teachers who will teach millions of new rural school-teachers.

I believe that other countries have the right and the duty to develop their own education systems, according to their own national needs and their own national goals—without outside interference.

But I also believe that American support for education in these lands—whether through the Peace Corps or through such private efforts as the literacy campaign of Dr. Frank Laubach—can make a powerful contribution to peaceful transformation and modernization in the emerging countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

I am not suggesting that education for peace efforts must come only from our Federal Government.

WIDE SUPPORT NEEDED

On the contrary, I believe this effort must have the support of many different groups. We must enlist the support of the general public, the great educational institutions of America, and the experience, the advice, and the support of American teachers and those who are experimenting with new teaching techniques.

The dramatic, enthusiastic response of the American people to the Peace Corps proposal gives convincing evidence that our people are eager to extend a helping hand in a spirit of brotherhood to conquer those ancient enemies—poverty, hunger, disease, ignorance, and illiteracy.

As the world-famous historian, Arnold Toynbee, points out:

The Peace Corps can give America a chance to recapture her birthright—nothing less than the leadership of the world revolution that she started in April 1776 when her embattled farmers fired the shot heard round the world.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In line with this spirit, a growing number of responsible people believe that an opportunity for a significant new foreign policy initiative is to be found in a program for cooperation with other nations in the field of education. The President's recent message on foreign aid supports this view. As the President noted:

A large infusion of development capital cannot now be absorbed by many nations newly emerging from a wholly underdeveloped condition. Their primary need at first will be the development of human resources, education, technical assistance, and the groundwork of basic facilities and institutions necessary for further growth.

To speed this development, to help establish this groundwork, I am submitting a concurrent resolution designed to

create an International Educational Development Foundation.

VALUE OF PROGRAM

Such a program for educational cooperation with other countries through this foundation would have several important values.

First, it would help restore the image of America with respect for intellectual and cultural values. It would symbolize our dedication to the development of the individual human personality.

Second, newly emerging independent nations will see tangible symbols of friendship and progress, symbols of America's goodwill, in the schools, universities, libraries and laboratories, which we help establish through this foundation.

Third, the importance of educational development to longrun economic development is increasingly clear. The lack of literate, educated manpower is a major obstacle to effective use of available capital and technology in the emerging underdeveloped nations.

And fourth, a major effort to speed international educational development can help to counteract and overcome the lure of rapid progress in education within the Sino-Soviet Communist world. Educational development in the free world is essential to create the conditions for progress and to maintain the opportunities for freedom.

Thus, educational development in the free world will serve our national interests and the objectives of our foreign policy. Furthermore, it serves deeper spiritual purposes. It indicates the American belief in universal education as a fundamental condition of personal liberty, representative government, and a democratic way of life.

The concurrent resolution which I am submitting today is a statement of intention that our Government should launch a full-scale program of cooperation with other nations to develop their educational resources.

FOOD FOR PEACE AID

This resolution also expresses the hope that suitable organizational machinery will be established to assure vigorous leadership and coordination for international educational activities by our Government as well as help and support for private efforts in the field of international education.

As to financing educational cooperation with other countries, we should look to the great pool of local foreign currencies—more than \$2 billion—owned or controlled by the United States and accumulated largely through sales of agricultural surpluses under Public Law 480.

I am convinced that our food for peace program can furnish sound, continuing financing procedures for American participation in this education-for-peace program.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

The revolution of rising expectations is under way. We have an opportunity to help guide this revolution in the emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America into the paths of peaceful progress which enhance personal free-

dom and human dignity. I am confident that America will rise to this opportunity.

Madam President, I submit my education-for-peace concurrent resolution for appropriate reference.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the American people believe that sound education is a fundamental condition of personal liberty, representative government and a democratic way of life; and

Whereas, in an age of science and technology, education, especially higher education, is essential to social progress; and

Whereas education and training of talented individuals is indispensable to the economic development of underdeveloped countries, whose chief resource is human beings; and

Whereas education and truth, its vital spirit, are powerful instruments of international understanding and peace; and

Whereas the exchange of students and teachers under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts has demonstrated the value of international cooperation in educational matters to friendly relations between the United States and other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it shall be the policy of the United States to assist other nations to establish, improve, and develop their educational systems, to assist in bringing the benefits of education to all their citizens, and to encourage and help make possible higher education and advanced training for deserving students; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Congress recognizes and affirms the inalienable right of other nations to establish their educational institutions in accordance with their own national aspirations and cultural heritage, and pledges itself to adopt suitable measures to assist other nations which seek the aid of the United States to establish or improve their educational systems according to their own values and traditions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress hereby encourages the enlistment of all appropriate agencies for this purpose, including United States educational institutions, corporations, foundations, and other private organizations, departments and agencies of United States Government, and the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies; and, more specifically, be it further

Resolved, That the United States stands ready—

(1) to assist other nations in the efforts they are making to improve their own educational system by enabling them to train teachers and instructors and by assisting them to obtain teachers and instructors from other countries; by helping them to obtain books, materials and equipment essential to education, training, and research; by assisting them to establish, enlarge, or alter physical facilities for education, training, and research; by encouraging and assisting them to obtain expert guidance with respect to modern methods of educational development and administration;

(2) to encourage and support measures to bring the benefits of higher education and advanced training within the reach of qualified and deserving students of other countries without regard to their personal economic condition;

(3) to promote mutual assistance among nations in matters of education, training, and research;

(4) to help remove barriers to, and to encourage and support, the free exchange of

educational, scientific, and cultural materials, and the interchange among nations of students, teachers, and persons of special skills and learning; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that there should be established in the executive branch of the Government an International Educational Development Foundation, or other suitable organizational entity, with sufficient stature and independent authority to assure a vigorous program to accomplish the purposes of this resolution and to coordinate the international educational activities of the United States Government, and the Congress declares its willingness to provide suitable financing for the accomplishment of this program, including but not limited to provisions for the use of foreign currencies available to the United States for such purposes.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY AND S. 1084 AND S. 1176

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on S. 1084 and S. 1176, dealing with Government patent policy, to commence on Tuesday, April 18, 1961.

The hearings, set for 10 a.m., are to be held in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the Senate Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee, room 349A, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., telephone CA 4-3121 or Government Code 180, extension 2268.

The subcommittee consists of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Anton T. Skoro, of Idaho, to be U.S. marshal, district of Idaho, term of 4 years, vice Saul H. Clark.

Paul D. Sossamon, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal, western district of North Carolina, term of 4 years, vice Roy A. Harmon.

E. Herman Burrows, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of North Carolina, term of 4 years, vice James H. Somers.

James J. P. McShane, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, term of 4 years, vice Dudley G. Skinker.

Lawrence M. Henry, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney, district of Colorado, term of 4 years, vice Donald G. Brotzman.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the Committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, April 19, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Jefferson-Jackson Day address delivered by the Vice President, at Nashville, Tenn., on April 8, 1961.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

Statement entitled "Canada and the United States—A Traditional Friendship," prepared by him.

By Mr. METCALF:

Address by Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, delivered before the National Water Research Symposium, Washington, D.C., on March 29, 1961.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Address delivered by Dore Schary on the subject of standards for movies.

Article entitled "What's Wrong With Urban Renewal?" written by James William Gaynor, New York State housing commissioner, and published in the Mortgage Banker for March 1961.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Article entitled "The Sod-Busting Senator," written by Lew Muenz and published in the 1961 spring issue of the Co-op Grain Quarterly of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Keynote address delivered by Bob Ruddy at the 1961 annual State convention of the South Dakota Young GOP College Federation.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Editorial entitled "We Knock Ourselves Out," written by Eugene C. Pulliam and published in the Indianapolis Star of April 9, 1961, relating to United Nations military aggression against the Katanga state government in the Congo.

Editorial entitled "We Arm Our Enemies," written by Eugene C. Pulliam and published in the Indianapolis Star of April 9, 1961.

Article entitled "A Special Report on Railroad Mergers," being an excerpt from the New York Central 1960 annual report.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Article entitled "You're Richer Than You Think," written by Sylvia Porter and published in a recent issue of Vogue magazine.

Article entitled "There Is an Empty Space in the Gallery," written by Ed Koterba and published in the Washington Daily News of April 4, 1961.

Article entitled "Wisconsin Backs Resources Plan," written by Austin C. Wehrwein and published in the New York Times of April 2, 1961.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Article entitled "Michael J. Wargovich—Noted American Slovak Fraternalist," written by John C. Sciranka and published in the Good Shepherd, official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "Bober Discusses Future Role of Agriculture," being excerpts from an address delivered by Sam H. Bober on March

23, 1961, at the Soil Conservation Award Dinner in Buffalo, N.Y.

By Mr. KEATING:

Article entitled "A New Rule for Investigating Committees?" written by Ralph DeTolovano and published by King Features Syndicate on March 31, 1961.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Food To Save 300,000 Sent Congo by United States," published in the Washington Post of April 10, 1961.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Letter dated March 15, 1961, from D. L. Feathers, vice president-secretary, the Bunker Hill Co., to Senator Church relating to the proposed transfer of silver bullion from the U.S. Treasury to private users.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I wish to refer to a news-ticker item in regard to a speech delivered last night, in Los Angeles, by Robert Welch, of the John Birch Society. According to the news ticker, Mr. Welch said in the course of that speech:

Protestant ministers do not become Communists—but Communists do become Protestant ministers.

Madam President, that is another kind of reckless slur and smear that this man and the spokesmen for this slurring society are visiting upon various respectable sentiments of American society. Nothing could be more ridiculous than to believe that the students of theology, the ministers of the Gospel, could be handmaidens of the cause of the Communists, who believe in anything but God; and I suggest that nothing could suit the Communists purpose more completely than the suggestion that the Protestant ministry is being infiltrated by communism.

Furthermore, I raise serious question about the motives of Mr. Welch and whatever inspires those who join his society, if they attack with that kind of invective the segments of our own communities.

I believe it is time that we bring squarely to the mat the issues between our society and these twisted, distorted, sick people who seek to charge with conspiracy all who differ with them.

These people are afraid of trusting others, they are afraid of America, and they are afraid of freedom; and for that reason they seek to pull down those around them by using the smear and the invective in which Mr. Welch has once again indulged in the course of his speech in Los Angeles.

I ask unanimous consent that the item from the news ticker be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LOS ANGELES.—Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, says:

"Protestant ministers do not become Communists—but Communists do become Protestant ministers."

He told a capacity audience of 6,000 at the Shrine Auditorium last night that Communists and their sympathizers are infiltrating the Protestant ministry—because it is the last place where Americans would expect to find them. However, he added:

Inasmuch as it appears you are anti-anti-Communist, the natural conclusion is that you are pro-Communist and a Soviet sympathizer.

Part of our activities are those of keeping files on such people in case of an attack on this country by the Soviet; a list of potentially dangerous people who may collaborate with the enemy.

With the above in mind we would appreciate a statement of your position if you care to make it. Otherwise the classification will be made on the basis of the data we have.

Yours very truly,

GEO. E. DEATHERAGE,
Director.

LONGVIEW, TEX., March 30, 1961.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to write this letter concerning your stand on the John Birch Society. Many people have said we are subversive. We will be subversive when a dog becomes president. We are fighting for the principles that made our country great. We have done this in the past and will do it in the future.

Several people have Mr. Welch called Eisenhower a Communist. In all the official publications I have received he has never said this. He has said the last three presidents were deceived by the Communists. In closing I would like to assure you we are a patriotic group, doing things that would help our country. Thank you.

Sincerely,

LEE SHIVLEY, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Representative HENRY S. REUSS,
Congressman, Fifth Congressional District,
State of Wisconsin, Washington, D.C.

MR. REUSS: As one of your constituents, let me say that I am not a member of the John Birch Society, but I heartily endorse its program. Maybe a verbal war such as they are waging [sic] will serve to make people aware of what really has downgraded America in the last half century. President Wilson (at the suggestion of Paul Warburg, who was probably a Communist) started the decline of this country's position by establishing the Federal Reserve which took the right to coin the peoples' money away from the people (their representatives in Congress), and gave that right to a private corporation which was controlled by foreigners. Paul Warburg was an Eastern European.

If we in this country ever have a run on the banks, I will do my best to gather all the \$ bills [sic] that I can, because they are silver certificates with silver to back them up. Federal Reserve money is a figment of someone's imagination, because nothing exists to back it up except "the credit of the United States" upon which a bunch of foreigners [sic] could foreclose (and our own laws would protect them).

I heartily urge the repeal of our Federal income tax and urge the restoration of government under our Constitution in fact, instead of just supposedly.

MADISON, WIS., April 3, 1961.

Mr. HENRY REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. REUSS: Dismal failure of the Kremlin-motivated project for destruction of HCUAA (often improperly designated as HUAC) has been followed by frenzied efforts to deactivate one of the House committee's most sturdy and effective supporters, The John Birch Society.

Zany statements besmirching the society and its founder have gushed forth in dizzy torrents from pens and tongues of Comanchean commentators, ignoble idlers, pot-

bellied politicians, pacifist preachers, adulated professors and all the rest of that sorry clique which responds so supinely to demands of the enemy.

Your statement * * * tops all efforts of those seeking to curry Kremlin favor through utterances of puerile pettishness and pturid pettifoggery. Moreover, you display abysmal ignorance of the form and nature of the Federal Government and the Constitution which it operates. * * *

By your asinine remarks you have shamed the loyal citizens of Wisconsin, and most particularly the citizens of the district who elected you to represent them. I am sure that only a tiny fraction of them wish to be represented by a man who rushes too quickly to obey Communists pleasure that he does not stop to take time to read the Constitution, and who is willing to vilify those of this constituents and all other Americans who seek to repeal the advance of our enemy, the Communist hordes.

Very sincerely,

VERNE P. KAUB.

I have attempted to outline, Mr. Speaker, what I consider to be the seven deadly parallels between the Nazi movement and the John Birch Society. I have shown that:

First, both detest the principles and institutions of democracy;

Second, both seek to destroy the established government, by fraud if possible, by force if necessary;

Third, both espouse the Fuehrerprinzip, whereby total control is exercised by the leader;

Fourth, both rely for their primary organization on a small elite corps of zealots;

Fifth, both use front organizations to augment their strength with persons interested in limited parts of their program but who could not swallow the whole thing;

Sixth, both draw significant support from wealthy industrialists who should know better; and

Seventh, both profess militant anti-communism, but they adopt with relish the dirty methods of the Communists.

Let me be very clear. I would not for one moment restrict in any way the right of the John Birch Society to its freedom of speech. Nor would I allow the plotting of these pipsqueak Hitlers to make us hysterical.

But the Birch Society cannot be laughed out of existence nor ignored out of existence. Its organized propaganda must be challenged, fairly and vigorously, wherever it appears.

MICHIGAN'S REPUBLICAN PARTY NOT QUITE DESTITUTE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in Sunday's issue of the Detroit Free Press, Judd Arnett recalls he "wrote a piece pointing out the Democratic Party of Michigan is loaded with 'charmers,'" thus leaving the impression that, to win an election, Republicans of Michigan must come up with candidates who have "charm."

He further comments that, "Once again the Republicans have snatched defeat out of the jaws of victory."

Michigan taxpayers do recall the Democrats' chief charmer, Soapy Williams, who more recently has been holding forth in Africa. Nor have they forgotten that, while Soapy was a real charmer, Walter Reuther and Emil Mazey, using union money illegally, did finally leave Michigan bankrupt, many unemployed, and several so-called distressed areas.

It is quite true that Republicans in Michigan, defeated at several elections, have lost control of the State and that, under the leadership and direction of Soapy, and the policies of Reuther and Mazey and their political union aides, we have unemployment and distressed areas, and the Democrats are now begging the taxpayers to bail them out.

However, Republicans were defeated, Democrats won, not necessarily because of the charmers, but because, lacking in political honesty many candidates promised more for nothing than did the Republicans who, strange as it may be in this day and age, seemed to have a sense of honesty and responsibility.

Unfortunately, Michigan's voters are now learning the hard way and ultimately will accept the truth that even rich as is Michigan, it cannot forever yield to the demands of any special pressure group without bringing hardship to the majority.

Fortunately, the Republican Party not only has a few charmers of its own, but, in addition to the charm, these gentlemen have ability, integrity, and a realization of their responsibility to all of the people of the State, wear no man's collar, serve exclusively no particular interest, have in mind the welfare of the State as a whole.

The Free Press prints a likeness of one of Michigan's outstanding charmers who possesses in ample measure the qualities which go into the makeup of a statesman and a patriot, our colleague from the Fifth District, JERRY FORD, who, because of his outstanding ability and industry, has won the respect and admiration of House Members.

Arnett's piece reads:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 9, 1961]

GOP GLAMOR

A few days ago I wrote a piece pointing out the Democratic Party of Michigan is loaded with "charmers," not the least of whom are Gov. John Swainson, Senator PHIL HART and Highway Commissioner John Mackle.

It was suggested that the Republicans had better groom a few "glamor boys" if they want to get back into serious contention. (What was it someone said after Monday's election? "Once again the Republicans have snatched defeat out of the jaws of victory * * *")

Anyhow, since then there have been letters and calls, with rather indignant partisans contending that the Grand Old Party already has some handsome, uppen atem young stalwarts.

Advanced were such names as Thomas B. Adams, the Detroit advertising executive; Jack McDonald, elected supervisor of Medford Township; and John S. Pingel, also of the world of advertising, who ran well but fell short of election to the Michigan State University Board of Trustees.

Perhaps significantly, every caller and writer mentioned one other Republican, Representative JERRY FORD of the Grand Rapids district.

keep strict and careful control on what every chapter is doing, and even every member of every chapter so far as the effective work of the John Birch Society is concerned ("Blue Book," p. 165).

Continuous control is necessary according to Welch because:

The biggest of all organizational mistakes is to set up a local group for some continuing purpose, exhort them to do a good job, and then leave them alone to do it ("Blue Book," p. 86).

Welch makes it abundantly clear that the "information" received by local chapters, the orders that they will be required to act upon, and the views that they will be expected to express, will all reflect the views of the leader:

Only if the members of these groups declared allegiance to, came to feel an unshakable loyalty for, and thus accepted direction from, a dynamic personal leader; only under these conditions would there be any possibility of the members of these groups, and of all other Americans who feel basically as they do, supplying what is needed ("Blue Book," pp. 115-116).

4. THEY BOTH RELY FOR THEIR PRIMARY ORGANIZATION ON A SMALL ELITE CORPS OF ZEALOTS

In "Mein Kampf," book 2, chapter 11, Hitler states that propaganda attempts to influence a whole people, while the party organization is designed to incorporate only a small portion of the more militant members of the total public. He distinguishes between the "radical people" who were capable of accepting the rigorous demands of membership in the party, and the thousands of sympathizers who were "too cowardly" to make the required sacrifices.

Hitler's belief that a minority comprised the elite formation of the party organization, is paralleled by Welch in his discussions in the Blue Book of the Birch Society's membership:

And while there will be some of us, an increasing number, but still a small minority, who will actually be giving practically the whole of our lives to this cause, we neither ask nor expect so much from the vast majority of our members. I think that a million members is all we would want, at least in the United States. For we need disciplined pullers at the oars, and not passengers in the boat ("Blue Book," pp. 165, 166).

Welch also emphasizes the demands that will be made on members:

Let me point out and emphasize that we are expecting far more work and dedication, and far more sacrifice of other interests, on the part of those who do become members of the John Birch Society, than you ever thought of giving to any other organization which you joined or even considered joining ("Blue Book," p. 166).

5. THEY BOTH USE FRONT ORGANIZATIONS TO INVOLVE PERSONS INTERESTED IN LIMITED PARTS OF THEIR PROGRAM, BUT WHO COULD NOT SWALLOW THE WHOLE THING

One of the unique organizational devices of the Nazi movement was the "front" organization. Hitler discovered the value of creating such "fronts," realizing that they could serve a dual purpose. They provided a mechanism through which the Nazi movement could attract sympathizers and supporters among the public, and at the same time, limit the number of active, participating members. Secondly, they acted as a buffer between the public and the

membership, protecting the party itself from attack, and at the same time disseminating its views.

Welch also makes use of front organizations:

We would organize fronts—little fronts, big fronts, temporary fronts, permanent fronts, all kinds of fronts. One of the greatest weaknesses and mistakes on the conservative side has been that almost all of the organizations, real ones or just letterhead outfits, have been put together for general purposes. The Communists have been far smarter. They would never think of setting up publicly, for instance, a committee to promote communism.

It is too general. Yet we have several leagues against communism, and others just as vague in the fronts they present.

The most effective fronts, on either side, are ad hoc committees, aimed to accomplish, or at least publicize, one particular purpose.

Of course fronts alone aren't going to stop the Communists either. But enough of them being constantly organized—for this purpose, that purpose, and every kind of purpose—some fading out and new ones coming in all of the time, can bother the Communists, can occasionally put them on the defensive, can bring more of the uninformed and previously indifferent but patriotic Americans into the fight, and can help our cause in many ways. Again, let me try to make my point clearer, and to make it more easily, by suggesting a few examples.

With such fronts as "A Petition To Impinch Earl Warren" (and I think we could get the names of a hundred outstanding leaders from the South and many from the North on the letterhead right now); a "Committee To Investigate Communist Influences At Vassar College" (headed by Vassar graduates, of course); and "Women Against Labor Union Hoodlumism" (which would pick up the individual stories of husbands injured, cars wrecked, houses damaged, families terrified, in the strike at Kohler and others like it, tell those stories from the women's point of view and show the suffering they caused wives and mothers); with these and dozens of new fronts popping up to attack the Communists—or persons, institutions, and movements giving aid and comfort to the Communists—we can certainly keep this whole front operation from being so one-sided, as it has been. We can stop letting the Communists have the whole effective use of this weapon practically by default, and what's more, we can use the noise and turmoil to help to wake up a lot of people to the fact that there is a deadly fight going on of which they had been blissfully unaware ("Blue Book," pp. 86-91.)

6. THEY BOTH DRAW SIGNIFICANT SUPPORT FROM WEALTHY INDUSTRIALISTS WHO SHOULD KNOW BETTER

Hitler's principal sources of funds for his drive to power in the period 1930-33 were such leading industrialists as Fritz Thyssen of steel, Emil Kirdorf of coal, Von Schnitzler of the chemical industry, and Von Schroeder of banking.

Similarly playing on fears of communism, the Birch Society has studied its ranks with corporation presidents, board chairmen, and two past presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers. To its credit, the National Association of Manufacturers has officially repudiated the Birch Society.

7. THEY BOTH PROFESS MILITANT ANTI-COMMUNISM, BUT THEY ADOPT WITH RELISH THE DIRTY METHODS OF THE COMMUNISTS

In his drive to attain power in Germany Hitler followed a policy that the end justifies the means. The big lie, the use of scapegoats, smear campaigns,

witch hunts, and total disregard for fair play were synonymous with nazism.

So it is with the Birch Society members are "to play rough":

It isn't numbers we have to worry about in this connection, but the courage on the part of our followers to stick their necks out and play rough—the same as the Communists do all of the time—and that courage will come too with gathering strength ("Blue Book," p. 97).

Letterwriting is encouraged:

Letterwriting of a different order of planned continuity and volume than anything attempted before—except on a somewhat more sporadic scale by the Communists themselves—letterwriting of the kind that builds opinion exactly the way single grains of sand build a whole barricade; this is only one, but a still important one, of the disciplined activities by which we would keep a million men working every day, adding small increments of strength to the anti-Communist side, for every bit of the time and energy they could devote to the cause ("Blue Book," p. 87).

The Communists boast that they can now land 50,000 individually written letters in Washington, on either side of any subject, within 72 hours. Actually that is not too startling an accomplishment. We could make it look like peanuts, with the million truly dedicated and controlled supporters who constitute the hypothesis—though merely a hypothesis—of this part of this discussion. There should be a continuous overwhelming flood of letters, not just to legislators or the executive departments in Washington, but to newspaper editors, television and radio sponsors, educators, lecturers, State legislators and politicians, foundation heads and everybody else whose opinions, actions, and decisions count for anything in the ultimate total actions and decisions. Such an outpouring of mail would give more courage to a lot of people who would prefer to be more clearly on our side, and would at least slow down the brazen advance of some of those on the other side. Let me give you an illustration.

A few months ago United Airlines started a movement, which could have had tremendous psychological and propaganda value for the internationalist leftwingers, by putting the insignia of the United Nations on their planes, with the words "We believe" under the insignia. And in this case a spontaneous letterwriting campaign, with the only organization or inspiration of the campaign coming without any coordination whatsoever from a few small rightwing groups and individuals, was able to force United Airlines to back down completely and publicly admit that they had made a mistake. This in itself would have been significant enough, but there was one angle to it, completely unpublicized, which made the results more striking. This was that United Airlines backed down, and took the U.N. insignia off their planes, despite the fact that Paul Hoffman, Gardiner Cowles, and Eric Johnston are all members of United Airlines board of directors. This shows what letterwriting can do, even against determined and entrenched opposition ("Blue Book," pp. 84-85).

Since making public my criticism of the Birch Society, I have been receiving a swarm of letters which bear the earmarks of society tactics. For example:

AMERICA FIRST,
April 1, 1961.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have noted your activities in attacking the ultraconservative and anti-Communist John Birch Society.

the idea of a majority, but upon the idea of a single personality.

During the years that followed he brutally attacked democracy and the Weimar Republic in general, and the Republic's office holders in particular.

Although the antidemocratic ideas propounded by the Birch Society are somewhat obscured by its fervent and vitriolic attacks on individuals who are alleged to be Communists, its philosophy, as recorded in the speech delivered by its founder Robert Welch, Jr., in Indianapolis in 1958, parrots Hitler's disdain for the principles and institutions of democracy:

A Republican form of government * * * lends itself too readily to infiltration, distortion, and disruption. And democracy, of course, is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud ("Blue Book," p. 159).

Welch aims his attack not only at the Government in general, but at all three of its branches and the individuals in them.

First. Of the Supreme Court he says:

It is now so strongly and almost completely under Communist influence that it shatters its own precedents and rips gaping holes in our Constitution in order to favor Communist purposes ("Politician," pp. 272-273).

And, of course, the drive to impeach Chief Justice Warren is one of the Society's main aims.

Second. Of the Congress Welch says:

The legislative branch of our Government has been brought so far in line (with Communist objectives) that it will ratify an Austrian peace treaty without debate, approve the appointment of a Zellerbach without a question, and listen to the speech of a Sukarno with applause ("Politician," p. 272).

Third. Of the executive branch, Welch says:

The executive department of our Government * * * has become * * * to a large extent, an active agency for the promotion of Communist aims ("Politician," p. 273).

He called former President Eisenhower an agent of the Communist Party and accuses him of being guilty of treason:

My firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy is based upon an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to me to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt ("Politician," p. 267).

There is only one possible word to describe his purposes and actions. That word is "treason" ("Politician," p. 210).

Further:

The Communists are so firmly entrenched by now, that even if Eisenhower disappeared from the scene all the momentum and strength of the forces we have seen at work would still have to be overcome. * * * The firm grip on our Government of the forces that have worked through Eisenhower is more important than Eisenhower himself ("Politician," p. 266).

There has been some disposition for the leaders of the Birch Society to disavow these statements of Welch on the ground that they were in a private "letter." I have seen the "letter," Mr. Speaker. It is a black, paperbound, loose-leaf book of 302 pages, reproduced by photo offset.

Since Robert Welch demands that his members "accept direction from their leader"—"Blue Book," page 116—it is hard to see how the word from Welch can be anything other than John Birch Society doctrine.

2. BOTH SEEK TO DESTROY THE ESTABLISHED GOVERNMENT, BY FRAUD IF POSSIBLE, BY FORCE IF NECESSARY

While still in prison in 1924, Hitler said:

When I resume active work it will be necessary to pursue a new policy. Instead of working to achieve power by armed coup, we shall have to hold our noses and enter the Reichstag against the Catholic and Marxist deputies. If outvoting them takes longer than outshooting them, at least the result will be guaranteed by their own constitution. Any lawful process is slow * * *. Sooner or later we shall have a majority—and after that, Germany.

However, on February 27, 1925, after identifying the republican regime as the enemy to be defeated, he shouted:

To this struggle of ours there are only two possible issues: either the enemy passes over our bodies or we pass over theirs (William L. Shirer, "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," p. 119).

Like Hitler, the Birch Society recognizes the convenience of seizing power through established constitutional procedure:

We would put our weight into the political scales in this country just as fast and far as we could. For unless we can eventually, and in time, reverse by political action the gradual surrender of the United States to communism, the ultimate alternative of reversal by military uprising is fearful to contemplate ("Blue Book," p. 111).

I would like to emphasize this point, Mr. Speaker. It is among the views of this organization that a change in the existing order by military uprising is an acceptable—even if fearful—alternative.

Fortunately, the war that the Birchites are fighting, is, as they see it, "still political and educational rather than military"—"Blue Book" page 76—but in appraising the danger which this society presents we must consider what they view as the immediate manifestations of the "surrender of the United States to communism": social security, foreign aid, income taxes, American participation in the United Nations and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These are the things which the Birch Society seeks to reverse. Since such a reversal by conventional political action seems most unlikely, how long must we wait for the "reversal by military uprising" which they accept as "the ultimate alternative"?

The Birch Society might also be described, as was the Nazi Party, as a "secret society established in broad daylight." Unlike the traditional secret society which operated in a wholly conspiratorial manner in its effort to "overthrow" the established government, the Nazi Party and the Birch Society established themselves openly. Both groups contended that the established government was in the hands of conspirators who could be routed out only by a counterconspiracy.

Thus the Birch Society was founded in December 1958, openly, by Robert Welch and 11 other men whose identi-

ties have not been revealed. The society does not disclose the size of its total membership. It closely guards the names of its members. It does not make public the source or the extent of its financial support. It does not reveal how its funds are used. All of the ritual of the secret society is observed, even though the necessity for secrecy is obviated by the fact that their "subversive" purpose is openly proclaimed:

Our determination to overthrow an entrenched tyranny is the very stuff of which revolutions are made ("Blue Book," p. 169).

3. BOTH ESPOUSE THE FUHRERPRINZIP, WHEREBY TOTAL CONTROL IS EXERCISED BY THE LEADER

Hitler adopted the principle that the will of the leader is law, stating:

I alone lead the movement and no one can impose conditions on me so long as I personally bear the responsibility for everything that occurs in the movement.

Welch expresses similar views in the Blue Book where he states:

The men who join the Birch Society * * * will be doing so primarily because they believe in me and what I am doing and are willing to accept my leadership anyway. Whenever that loyalty ceases to be sufficient to keep some fragment in line, we are not going to be in the position of having the society's work weakened by raging debates. We are not going to have factions developing on the two-sides-to-every question theme ("Blue Book," p. 161).

The intricate party organization that Hitler built consisted in party chapters corresponding to the political and geographic subdivisions of Germany, with chapter leaders appointed by and wholly responsible to Hitler himself.

The actual structure of the Birch Society closely parallels this. Although in the "Blue Book," Welch suggests that the organization which he proposes to establish, will be of "an entirely different nature from anything that the word [organization] might bring to mind"—"Blue Book," page 157—as soon as he begins to describe the structure of this wholly "different" organization it becomes very clear that, while it is certainly unlike any organization existing in the pluralistic society of a democratic country, it is not unlike the complex network of organizations that brought Adolf Hitler into power.

As set up by Welch:

The John Birch Society will function almost entirely through small local chapters, usually of from 10 to 20 dedicated patriots, although some chapters may occasionally, and for a while, be larger. Each will have a chapter leader, appointed by headquarters, which is in Belmont, Mass., or appointed through officers of the society, in the field, who have themselves been duly appointed by headquarters ("Blue Book," p. 163).

According to Welch, he expects:

The chapter leader to be in practically continuous contact with his or her members to whatever extent may be necessary in order to pass on or receive information and to carry out various concerted efforts as requested from headquarters ("Blue Book," p. 164).

Coordinators at every local level, and supervisors or "major coordinators" above them, police a system designed to—

bankers, university professors, and representatives of foundations," and a Presidential pressure group in Congress, and again, if this is the result of super intelligence and high level brainpower, then I confess to being devoid of both.

file
NOTHING FUNNY ABOUT THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, like many Members, I have been disturbed by the activities of the so-called John Birch Society. What the Society is up to sounds ominously like what the Nazis once were up to in Germany.

As Thomas Jefferson said in his first inaugural, "Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." But for reason to take hold, the people need to know the facts.

THE PUBLIC NEEDS THE FACTS

The press, the other means of communication, and men in public life such as Members of Congress, share the responsibility to making these facts known to the public.

Under the allocation of congressional functions to committees made by the House rules, it seemed to me that the activities of the John Birch Society were a proper concern of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Rule 17(b) authorizes the committee:

To make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; and (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

Propaganda, whether it came from the Communist left or the totalitarian right, seemed to me within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This view is supported by the document, "Preliminary Report on Neo-Fascist and Hate Groups," December 7, 1954, by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee's discussion of the danger exerted by the radical right on the institutions of our democracy seemed applicable to the John Birch Society:

THE 1954 REPORT

Communism's present threat to the very survival of the United States and the rest of the free world has placed heavy burdens on the defenders of human freedom and dignity. The Committee on Un-American Activities is concerned to observe that this burden is being aggravated by certain individuals and organizations unscrupulously exploiting the menace of communism to promote other activities equally subversive and equally un-American. Such activities would destroy the very foundation work of the American Republic, if permitted to operate unnoticed or unchallenged.

Despite the similarities between communism and fascism—so dramatically demonstrated to the world during the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939-41—their propa-

ganda to the effect that each is the foremost opponent of the other is undoubtedly a major contributor to whatever support each has been able to muster in our population.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities warned in 1940 that the danger to American democracy lay not so much in frontal attack by Fascists and Communists in our midst, as in "the much greater chance that each extreme totalitarian group seeking by deception to advance its own cause and pad its ranks will succeed in convincing a really substantial number of people that their only defense against violence from the opposite extreme is to accept the violence of the one they find least objectionable."

This committee is agreed that subversion cannot be combated by subversion. Those who would support the extreme right today do as great a violence to our national institutions as do those on the extreme left. Furthermore, the appearance of neo-Fascist organizations and methods in the postwar period serve only to impede the intelligent, united effort necessary in the current life and death struggle with communism.

The hate groups appeal to the unwary by a cynical use of concepts having a deep emotional appeal to the majority of decent citizens—love of God, country, home; or antipathy to communism * * *. They use the divisive tactics of the Communists whom they deplore. Depending upon the type of audience to be reached, this propaganda is couched in language ranging from violent vituperation to subtle innuendoes.

The committee is continuing its investigation and exposure of Communist conspirators wherever they may be found. The committee is convinced, however, that there is a concurrent need for continuous investigation, exposure, and, where necessary, prosecution, to the end that no activity of a pro-Fascist nature will ever be permitted to gain substantial stature or influence in the United States.

Accordingly, on March 21, 1961, I addressed the following letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

MARCH 21, 1961.

Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Un-American Activities Committee,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Recently my office has been flooded with letters from throughout the country suggesting that Chief Justice Warren is a traitor and demanding his impeachment. Many of the letters are mimeographed, are similarly worded or bear other evidence of an organized campaign.

Matter recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] (Mar. 8, pp. 3214 et seq., Mar. 20, pp. 4017 et seq.) indicates that these activities may be conducted by an organization known as the John Birch Society, which is reported to have stigmatized as Communists such patriotic Americans as former President Eisenhower, former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and Central Intelligence Agency Director Allen Dulles.

It would be hard to imagine more un-American propaganda activities than these which are directly attacking both the executive and the judicial branches of our Government.

I call these propaganda activities to your attention in the hope that they will be the subject of a thoroughgoing investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Propaganda organizations have the right to free speech and the right to have any investigation of their activities conducted with due process of law and full regard for fairplay, but the public has the right to

know who is behind these activities, how they are financed, and how they are carried on.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

On March 28, 1961, I received this reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
March 28, 1961.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is in reply to your letter of March 21, 1961.

The committee has received numerous letters regarding the John Birch Society. Most of them contain the general complaint that the organization is "un-American" and the specific complaint that the leader of the society has made charges impugning the patriotism and loyalty of certain individuals.

As to the general complaint, we have received no material information which indicates that an investigation of the subject organization should, or could, be made by us under existing statute defining the authority of the committee. The specific complaint alleges wrongs against individuals—whose recourse would be action in the civil courts.

The press indicates that a State group is calling for an investigation by the U.S. Attorney General. Perhaps this will result in some official statement clarifying the matter. Incidentally, I note that the society itself is reportedly demanding an immediate investigation. It is not the function of this committee, of course, to serve as a "sounding board"—either for an organization against individuals, or for individuals against an organization.

With very best regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Thus, apparently, there is to be no investigation of the John Birch Society by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

But as an individual Member of the House, Mr. Speaker, I believe it my responsibility to call the public's attention to what I believe are the real dangers of the John Birch Society.

An official of the West German Government was recently reported as deeply concerned over the activities of the Birch Society, suggesting that "it was in somewhat the same manner that national socialism came into being" in Germany. As I recall the history of the Nazi movement on its way to power, and as I read the John Birch Society literature—the "Blue Book" and the "Politician"—I am struck at the deadly parallel between the two.

Let me document the parallel between the two movements:

1. BOTH DETEST THE PRINCIPLES AND INSTITUTIONS OF DEMOCRACY

Adolf Hitler forthrightly attacked the general principles of democratic government, the institutions formed to implement the principles, and the office holders in those institutions. From his prison cell in 1924, Hitler wrote in "Mein Kampf," favoring:

A philosophy which endeavors to reject the democratic idea, which builds not upon

viled by some members of this organization.

There are many good but mistaken people who belong to the John Birch Society, but there are some others who are neither good nor mistaken, and they are its leaders. Speaking for myself, I suggest to the Senate that a proper function of the Senate Government Operations Committee would be to call before it Mr. Welch of Massachusetts and ask him the basis upon which he makes these fantastic charges. Since he will be unable to document them, he should be made to apologize in public not alone to Eisenhower, not alone to Warren, but also to the people of the country.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kind comments concerning me made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut with respect to the John Birch Society and charges which have been leveled against me by its members.

I have been the subject of a barrage of letters written to every newspaper in my State which will carry them, which insinuate, at times, that I may be opposed to any movement which would contain communism and which charge me with all manner of things.

I believe that in my State the great majority of the members of the society are very good people, but they have been unaware of the type of person they have as a leader and the accusations he has been making. No one knows for sure exactly who are the members of the society; that is one of the difficult things in dealing with the organization. I do not know of more than a half dozen people in my State who will admit they belong to the organization.

Those who are members of the organization, for the most part, are very fine people. I believe they are honestly and sincerely trying to combat communism, and that one day they will repudiate the charges made by their leader, Robert Welch, against President Eisenhower and other fine patriotic citizens and leaders of our Nation.

HURRICANE MESA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in the special message on the defense budget which President Kennedy submitted to the Congress Tuesday, the President announced that he had directed the Secretary of Defense to take steps to inactivate and discontinue 21 overseas bases and 52 military installations in the United States, thought by the new administration to be excess to the defense needs of our country. Although not on the official list, one of the facilities to be closed by the Kennedy administration is the Hurricane supersonic research site, located at Hurricane, Utah. This is an Air Force installation operated under contract by the Coleman Engineering Co., Inc., of Torrance, Calif. At this site, high speed rocket sled tests and aircraft crew escape systems are tested under the direction of the Air Force Flight Test Center, Air Research Development Command, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

The Hurricane test track is a comparatively new installation, first activated in 1954 and formerly referred to by the Air Force as Project Smart. The track is unique in many ways. It is located on a high plateau in southwestern Utah near Zion National Park and approximately 75 miles north of Grand Canyon National Park. HSRs provides the only known facility in the world on which a test item can be guided at supersonic speed over a 12,000-foot track, launched from a precipice 1,500 feet above the surrounding terrain, and then closely observed through a relatively horizontal free-flight path. The Air Force has two other test tracks, one at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., and one at Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., and the Navy operates a track at the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif. All three of these installations have flat tracks, whereas the facility at Hurricane has the only elevated launch track.

The concept of an elevated launch facility was originated by the Wright Air Development Division as a means to provide an extended period of free-flight testing for aircraft escape systems. A comparable period of free flight before ground impact is not available to test items launched upwards from moving vehicles on flat tracks. Flight characteristics can be more fully studied at the Hurricane track, because the free-flight feature provides designers and engineers time to study and evaluate stabilization and parachute recovery systems under conditions similar to those experienced in actual flight.

The Hurricane track was designed and originally constructed at a cost of \$2.4 million. The present value of facilities and equipment at HSRs is \$5.6 million. Approximately 3,508 acres have been utilized for this test facility. Of this total 2,851 acres were obtained under permit from the Department of Interior, 643 acres were leased from the State of Utah and 14 acres were leased from private individuals.

Mr. President, the Air Force has stated its reason for discontinuance of the Hurricane Track, as follows:

The Hurricane Supersonic Research Site (HSRS) was constructed primarily to test aircraft crew escape systems. At the present time the major use of this facility is divided between tests of conventional aircraft escape systems and aircraft capsule escape systems. With the decline of emphasis on new manned aircraft, the requirement for escape systems tests has accordingly been diminishing. We have recently completed a study of our requirements for future sled track operations, and have considered in this study a request by the Atomic Energy Commission to conduct certain tests on Air Force tracks. We have concluded that Air Force and AEC testing can be accomplished on two tracks instead of three. Accordingly, we plan to discontinue operations at Hurricane Mesa at the expiration of the present contract on June 30, 1961.

I cannot quarrel with the principle of economy and the need for elimination of duplication wherever it may exist in our Defense Departments or other governmental agencies. However, I do ques-

tion whether the correct decision has been made as to which track should be discontinued and which kept in operation. It is significant that the Hurricane Track has unique features not available at any of the other tracks and that future testing of aircraft escape systems will be seriously hampered by the closing of HSRs. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the end of my speech, five communications testifying as to the continuing need for the Hurricane facility and showing that this track has particular advantages over the flat tracks which will be kept in operation. These communications are as follows: Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Vought Aeronautics, Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Convair, Department of Navy Airborne Division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, another significant fact which I think should be taken into account is that the Hurricane Track is the only one of the four now in operation which is operated by a private company under an Air Force contract. The decision to close this track is another body blow at private industry and runs contrary to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission of getting the Government out of all business-type activities. In this regard, this project is of particular importance to Washington County, Utah, because it constitutes the only industrial type activity in this area of the State. At present there are 65 permanently employed technicians at the site and the annual payroll is approximately half a million dollars. Although this may appear to be an insignificant amount, it is of major importance to this remote area of Utah, and its closing will create a real hardship, because there is no other industry to provide jobs or take up the slack when the testing track is closed.

Mr. President, I have sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, asking that the Preparedness Subcommittee make a thorough study of the four existing tracks to determine whether, in the best interest of our Nation's defenses, the Hurricane Track should be kept on operational status.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 16, 1961.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I am writing to request that the Senate Armed Services Committee make an investigation into the administration and operation of the four existing supersonic research track sites presently being operated by the Defense Establishment. Of the four, three are so-called flat tracks, the first at the Air Force Flight Test Center, Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.; the second at the Air Force

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is unfortunate for our society that opinions about communism frequently tend to polarize to extreme positions.

On the one hand, there have always been naive or softheaded people, ultraliberals who refuse to believe that communism can be all evil; who insist that the Communists are like ourselves and that, if we are prepared to be reasonable, coexistence with them is possible; who close their eyes to all the massive evidence that communism is an international conspiracy committed to the destruction of freedom and religion; who cry "witch-hunt" or McCarthyism at every effort to investigate Communist front operations and Communist infiltration of government positions; who are not pro-Communist, but react with far greater emotion against every manifestation of anticommunism than they ever seem capable of displaying against communism.

At the other extreme, there are those who are sincerely anti-Communist but who believe that everyone who disagrees with them is either a Communist or a dupe of the Communists, that every political figure who has been guilty of an error in judgment or a policy that failed, is ipso facto, a member of the Communist conspiracy.

These extreme positions beget and encourage each other. The ultraliberal extremist becomes more extreme every time he is presented with evidence that someone has been the target of unjust or exaggerated accusations.

The ultraconservative extremist becomes more extreme, more set in his views, with every new manifestation of ultraliberal tolerance toward Communist and Communist-front operations.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota performed a real service when he brought certain facts about the John Birch Society to the attention of this body on March 8.

Here is an organization which many thousands of sincere, dedicated citizens have joined because they are concerned over the Communist successes in recent years and would like to know more and to do something about it.

The evidence, however, suggests that many of those who joined the John Birch Society did so in ignorance of the real views of the leadership of the organization.

Mr. Robert Welch, the head of the John Birch Society, is certainly opposed to communism. But how does he oppose communism? Approximately 4 years ago he brought out a book entitled "The Politician," which was given limited circulation. In this book, Mr. Welch assailed Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower, the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Mr. Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, Chief Justice Warren, Dr. Milton Eisenhower and many others, as Communists or Communist agents.

To accuse people like President Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles and the others of being Communist agents is an

affront to both decency and intelligence. It brings our leaders and our institutions into disrepute, it sows division, it makes it easier for the Communists and the ultraliberals to equate opposition to communism with political lunacy.

I believe, Mr. President, that the extreme views of Mr. Welch are not shared by the great majority of the sincere Americans who have joined the John Birch Society because of their genuine concern over communism. But these views cannot be dismissed out of hand as the individual views of one man. Mr. Welch happens to be the head of the organization. The views in question moreover are recent views, which Mr. Welch has never repudiated.

Quite inevitably, Mr. Welch's extremism has infected some of his more impressionable followers. It has come to my attention, for example, that the senior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from California have been the targets of vicious, organized campaigns of letterwriting. The gist of these letters, some of them addressed directly to the Senators, some of them sent to local newspapers, is that the Senators in question are soft on communism or are dupes of the Communists. Sometimes these charges are made openly; sometimes they are made by innuendo and implication. The people who write these letters do not identify themselves as members of the John Birch Society, but no knowledgeable person has any doubts about the origins of this despicable campaign of harassment.

But I want to tell the people of America and, in particular, I want to tell the members of the John Birch Society, that there are no more staunch anti-Communists in our country than the senior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from California. I consider the attacks on them to be beneath contempt.

I agree with the opinion expressed by the conservative Los Angeles Times in its editorial of March 12:

If the John Birchers follow the program of their leader, they will bring our institutions into question exactly as the Communists try to do. They will sow distrust, and aggravate disputes, and they will weaken the very strong case for conservatism.

I believe that it weakens the anti-Communist cause and it plays into the hands of the Communists, when anti-communism can be associated with this kind of sweeping, irresponsible, and repugnant charges made against so many distinguished Americans.

Few men have held high public office without committing their quotas of blunders and miscalculations. For my own part, I believe that the free world has been guilty of many grave blunders in the postwar period—blunders committed because we failed to understand the true nature of communism. But it is the worst kind of madness to charge that all of these blunders were perpetrated under the direction of the Communist conspiracy by men who hold or have held the highest offices our country has to offer.

I want to commend the American press for bringing this situation to light. I

welcome this evidence of vigor and initiative on the part of the press.

The press has a tremendous weapon for public good in the power of exposure. It has used it effectively in the case of the John Birch Society. But for some reason which I cannot understand it has not used this weapon anywhere near as effectively against the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the various offshoots of the Communist peace offensive, and the other Communist-front operations in this country.

There is a job of political balancing to be done. For my own part, I would be more than satisfied if our press devoted as much column space in coming months to exposing the subterranean operations of the Communist Party in this country as they have in recent weeks to exposing the excesses of the John Birch Society.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am more grateful than I can say for the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

Mr. President, international communism has been and will continue to be an evil, dangerous worldwide conspiracy. Its intent continues to be to destroy freedom. It is the very antithesis of freedom. Everything which Americans hold dear is directly, completely opposite to international communism.

This country, under Democratic administrations and under Republican administrations, has demonstrated a courage and a zeal to maintain freedom, to deter Communist aggression, and, if necessary, to combat it.

We have in this country, regrettably, some few people who are guilty of treason. I suppose that is always the case in any society. There are some who would pull down the pillars and try to destroy the very freedom under which they are able to engage in their kind of ugly and reprehensible activity.

But there is an equal danger in this country from those who take shocking and unbelievable positions, who continue an extreme philosophy of objecting to every kind of progress, who point the finger at those who disagree with them, and say, "There walks a Communist."

It is a fantastic and incredible libel upon one of the world's great exponents of freedom when the head of this society accuses Dwight Eisenhower of being "a card-carrying Communist." Should the American people and the American Government let that kind of vile spleen be poured upon one who has given his whole life to dedicated service to America, through participation in the world's greatest war, as the top commander, in which his armies emerged victorious, and through 8 years of unselfishly serving the American people as their Chief Executive?

Mr. President, I denounce anyone who makes that kind of false and contemptible charge.

Across the street sits the Chief Justice of the United States, another great American. People in this society besmirch his character.

Many of us in Government have been denounced and our names have been re-

However, there is no inherent inconsistency between demanding competition and prescribing the rules by which it may be conducted. It is true that some antitrust laws forbid the use of certain competitive weapons and techniques. This does not, however, indicate that these laws require what their detractors derisively call "soft competition," or, indeed, that they are in any degree anticompetitive. There is no sport or contest conducted in civilized society without its rules. These rules invariably permit certain forms of rivalry and prohibit certain other types of action as means of winning the sport, game, or contest. Of course, there are always those who decry any limitation on the mayhem or bloodshed that is permitted by the prevailing rules of organized sport. The Marquis of Queensbury rules, I am informed, were once regarded as wholly destroying the noble sport of manly combat in the ring. There will always be those who proclaim that any new rule takes all the fun and most of the competition out of a game. However, civilized society lives by its laws, and competition within civilized society is always inhibited by authoritative standards of acceptable social behavior. Were it otherwise, we would not have civilization but anarchy, and life would be quite intolerable.

There may well be reasonable debate as to whether or not a particular rule is desirable in organized sports, other games or contests, or in application to the economy by the antitrust laws. However, such an issue cannot be determined by the dogmatic assertion that all regulatory rules are inconsistent with the basic principle of competition. It is not necessary to hit below the belt in order to fight as hard as you can. The rules that prescribe the mode and weapons of competition are not anticompetitive, but, on the contrary, are quite consistent with free and vigorous competition in a civilized society.

Finally, let me express my profound conviction that competition is neither incompatible with nor a limitation upon efficiency. Indeed, competition is likely to be the stimulus which engenders efficiency. It is significant that the greatest industrial and economic development has taken place in those countries which have had the greatest degree of economic freedom and competition. Although there is not the time to offer the evidence now, I believe that an analysis of history suggests that the antitrust laws have not only permitted but have substantially contributed to the tremendous economic and political development of the United States. However, we must now bear in mind that the future is not foreordained; and that it will be determined not by our past history but by our present character and future conduct.

The great issue of this age is whether this Nation, or any nation, can achieve full economic development, the satisfaction of all material needs, and the provision of adequate economic opportunities for all, together with political and civil liberty. We believe that these goals are compatible, and that the method by which they will be achieved is by observance of the principles embodied in the antitrust laws. The diffusion of economic power and the freedom which engenders competition are expressions in the economic realm of the basic faith of our culture that the individual human spirit represents the highest social value. Thus, we in the Antitrust Division are and will be dedicated to the faith that liberty, equality, and prosperity are consistent social objectives. We are and will be devoted to the effort to achieve these goals by a vigorous and uncompromising enforcement of the laws prescribing competition as our basic economic condition that we may protect and preserve economic freedom in this country.

Hospital Ship "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a privately sponsored humanitarian effort of the American people that has had altogether too little publicity in relation to its accomplishments is Project Hope.

Hope means Health Opportunity for People Everywhere. Its chief instrument is a floating medical training center, the SS *Hope I*, a 15,000-ton vessel owned and loaned by the U.S. Government. Primarily a teaching program, Project Hope combines both instruction and treatment in countries visited by SS *Hope I*.

Project Hope as a mercy mission is not a governmental operation. In fact, the Government does nothing more than lend the ship. It is a free expression of a free people. It should be encouraged, and, since it is financed by contributions from private individuals and groups, it deserves general public support.

An article on this subject by Charles J. Munzinger appeared on April 6 in the *Oakland Bulletin*, the *Pompton Bulletin*, the *Riverdale Bulletin*, and the *Lincoln Park Herald*.

The story of Project Hope follows:

HOSPITAL SHIP "HOPE"

(By Charles J. Munzinger)

The following is a brief background on Project Hope.

This is a privately sponsored program of help and relief to share our country's modern medical knowledge and skills with all those in need throughout the world. It is a floating medical training center for Southeast Asia, and is on loan from the U.S. Government.

Project Hope has the most modern medical equipment and supplies, together with training aids. This ship, formerly the SS *Consolation*, is a 15,000-ton vessel, with 230 beds, constructed during World War II.

The permanent medical staff on this vessel includes 15 physicians, two dentists, 25 nurses, and 30 auxiliary personnel. Volunteer teams of up to 35 physicians will be flown to the ship on a rotating basis for tours of 4 months. The medical staff includes top specialists in the key fields of medicine.

Hope is essentially a teaching program, although necessarily there will be treatment involved. American members of the medical staff will be assigned to work in small teams with their local counterparts. This will enable the American staff to pass along modern techniques and the latest medical knowledge under working conditions.

Part of the medical staff will work on shipboard; part will be in mobile units, on duty inland. They will work with specialists, nurses, midwives, and technicians. Training will also be conducted through classroom lectures and discussions, movies and film strips.

Teaching is stressed because this will enable Hope to have a more enduring effect on local health conditions, than would attempts at widespread treatment. Concentration on training will enable Hope to help upgrade the local medical staff in their

ability to diagnose and treat. In this way, these people will in turn be able to teach others. Thus, Hope's impact will grow and spread.

The SS *Hope* will visit only those countries to which it has been invited by the local medical professions. It is just completing a 6 months stay at Indonesia. Vietnam will be next, for a stay of 4 months, after which *Hope* will return to the United States. Invitations have also been received from Korea, Okinawa and Pakistan.

Hope's program is geared to the specific needs of the countries visited. Activities are worked out in advance with local doctors. This will enable *Hope* to concentrate on the most serious and pressing problems of each country.

A recent study conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shows that the construction costs of a 260-bed hospital total \$5,720,000, while annual operating costs amount to \$2,982,700, for a total of \$8,702,700.

In comparison, the total cost of operating the 15,000-ton, 230-bed SS *Hope* as a medical training center and hospital will come to less than \$3.5 million a year.

The funds to operate *Hope* are coming from private contributions, also from business, industry, labor unions, and other private groups and individual contributions. The government's only role in this endeavor is the loan of the hospital ship.

Support for Project *Hope* is widespread. It has been endorsed by the American Medical and Dental Associations, and many other medical agencies. It had the personal backing of ex-President Eisenhower and has the wholehearted support of President Kennedy.

The American President Lines are operating the SS *Hope* at cost. Drug and pharmaceutical companies of our country are supplying drugs and medicines when needed. The American petroleum industry has underwritten fuel costs to operate *Hope*. The Pure-Pak Division of Ex-Cell-O Corp. is sponsoring a major motion picture project to raise funds for *Hope*.

Poverty, disease and malnutrition are common in Southeast Asia. Millions of people there are caught up in a catastrophe—they have to produce to survive, but unhealthy men cannot produce.

Hope is an experiment in international cooperation. Hope's backers believe that better understanding among the people of the world can be achieved on a personal level, through friendship, the sharing of knowledge and helping others to help themselves.

Hope's medical staff will benefit greatly, in newfound knowledge. Information will flow both ways. The experience to be gained in diagnosis and treatment of tropical diseases couldn't be gained anywhere in the United States.

These people to people contacts can help form the basis of a lasting peace and understanding. Hope means—Health Opportunity for People Everywhere.

The need for Hope is great. In much of Southeast Asia, there just aren't enough doctors to go around. In Indonesia, there is one doctor for every 71,000 persons.

With such a condition, the medical men are so busy that they find it difficult to keep up with modern techniques and developments. This means they can't get away to the United States or Europe to gain advanced training.

Project Hope will, in effect, bring the medical school to these physicians.

Nurses aboard the good ship *Hope*, now on a training and teaching mission to the Republic of Indonesia, where the religion is chiefly Moslem, report that patients coming aboard the ship carry small compasses, to show them the direction of Mecca.

Project Hope is headed by Dr. William B. Walsh, heart specialist at Washington, D.C.

"I don't think anybody should really pay too much attention to them. I think they make no contribution to the fight against communism here in the United States and, in fact, I think if anything they are a hindrance. It seems to me it is an organization in the area of the humorous and I don't think so much attention should be taken."

We can agree that they make no contribution to the fight against communism. But we cannot agree that they should be ignored.

These people need to be exposed because they weaken our democratic fabric when it is in mortal combat with communism and, in that respect, they serve the cause of communism. They breed distrust of democracy.

They have members who are men of great wealth and influence in the country. Three former heads of the National Association of Manufacturers are members. A former head of the Internal Revenue Service is a member. Their governing council includes prominent industrialists across the country.

Their founder, Robert Welch, is a successful businessman, whose public speaking appearances are attracting capacity audiences. The membership of this organization has grown rapidly in the few years of its existence.

Its methods of operation—anonymous telephone calls and mail to public officials—are calculated to frighten timid officeholders with being smeared with the Communist label.

They are masters at exploiting the deep-rooted fear of communism among our people. Fear-ridden people believe a lot of ridiculous things. They might even believe that our last three Presidents were part of the Communist conspiracy, particularly if the charges are ignored. Remember what Hitler said about the "big lie."

There is only one way to deal with people like this—make them prove their charges. McCarthy was finished when he went before the country to try and prove his charges against the Army.

Recent Developments in Antitrust Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the speech delivered by Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, before the American Bar Association at Washington on April 7, 1961.

I am sure that all Senators will find the speech very informative. Mr. Loevinger is considered to be an outstanding authority in the field of antitrust law.

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

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

(Speech by Lee Loevinger to Antitrust Section, American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., April 7, 1961)

One year ago I appeared before this distinguished and elite group to deliver what was then expected to be a "swan song" with

relation to my active antitrust participation. The curious surprise that fate has in store for us and the verity of Bobby Burns' sage observation on the plans of men and the lower animals could not be better illustrated than by the events that have happened to me since then. Indeed, the circumstances that have thus drastically affected my own life may well be relevant to the assigned topic of this speech which is "Recent Developments in Antitrust Enforcement."

The conventional approach to this topic is to review carefully and in detail the decisions of appellate courts that have been rendered since the last such discussion. This seems unnecessary on this occasion. All of you follow the development of antitrust law in the courts; and it would be futile and foolish to attempt to improve upon either the reporting service of Law Week, C.C.H., and the advance sheets, or the analyses and discussion available to you both in publications and in your own offices. It may be more relevant and important to indicate what I consider to be the most important development in antitrust, as in other law enforcement, during the past year.

The most important development in the enforcement of the antitrust laws since your last meeting has undoubtedly been the election of John F. Kennedy as President of the United States. This has resulted in the infusion of a new spirit of energy and dedication throughout the public service. Beyond this that historic event has brought to the highest levels of Government administration and law enforcement a new understanding and a firmer faith in the principles upon which antitrust is founded than there has previously been for many years.

This may most usefully be illustrated for you by suggesting some of my own views. Perhaps these may also serve to lay at rest a few ancient shibboleths of the antitrust bar. The first is the notion that violation of the antitrust laws, whether intentional or not, is merely a normal business risk and really quite respectable. This is related to the feeling that has heretofore been tacit but pervasive that it is inappropriate to have criminal sanctions in the antitrust laws, and that, in any event, these were to be applied only to corporations and not to individuals. In this view even deliberate violations of the antitrust laws were, at worst, venial offenses of no more moral significance than a parking ticket.

It may be hoped that the Philadelphia electric cases, for which the preceding administration of the Antitrust Division is to be given all due credit, have helped to dispel this misapprehension. In any event, it should now be clear that a deliberate or conscious violation of the antitrust laws is not a mere personal peccadillo or economic eccentricity, but a serious offense against society which is as immoral as any other act that injures many in order to profit a few. Conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws is economic racketeering which gains no respectability by virtue of the fact that the loot is secured by stealth rather than by force. Those who are apprehended in such acts are, and will be treated as, criminals and will personally be subjected to as severe a punishment as we can persuade the courts to impose.

In the second place, the Antitrust Division is not receptive to pleas for exceptions, exemptions or special treatment of any company or industry. We have been told frequently and are quite well aware that every industry and situation is unique, that every company is most exceptional and that every case is quite extraordinary. We are also well aware that Congress and the courts have repeatedly and emphatically declared that competition, rather than collusion or monopoly, shall be the basic rule of commerce. This rule springs from the conviction that competition is the counterpart and corollary

of economic freedom, and that a free economy is necessarily a competitive economy. Therefore, in general we will oppose exceptions to or exemptions from the antitrust laws, sought by way of departmental policy or judicial rulings. When asked for comment on a legislative proposal for antitrust exemption, we will take a long, hard look. With exceptions already covered by existing laws, we have seen no persuasive case for compromising any antitrust principles in special cases.

That the necessity for complying with high standards of business conduct required by the moral principles inherent in our legal codes may sometimes cause concern to businessmen and lawyers is inevitable. This is not a difficulty unique to the antitrust laws. The temptation to get rich quickly by dishonest means abounds in private life. Some succumb, but we do not listen sympathetically to the plea that theft or embezzlement, for example, should be legalized because it is no difficult to acquire wealth by other means. While the antitrust laws are, in some respects, complex, they are also flexible and reasonable. The burden of proof resting on those who seek exceptions or exemptions is not borne by the showing that it is more profitable or convenient to have no such inhibiting standards of conduct.

In the third place, the argument that the laws are basically sound but that they must be made more acceptable to business by modifications to make them both more flexible and more certain is either disingenuous sophistry or compounded confusion. To seek both flexibility and certainty in the same laws is a logical contradiction. It is equivalent to a demand that we simultaneously institute both higher and lower prices for a commodity. It is easy enough to write laws that are certain in their operation. In the antitrust field, the per se violations are examples of rules that provide certainty. These could well be extended by either judicial or legislative adoption of more per se rules. Conversely, it is easy enough to write principles that are flexible. In the antitrust field the rule of reason is an example. But it should be clear to any reasonable man that a rule which is certain is, by virtue of that very fact, not flexible. A rule which is flexible cannot be certain in prospective application.

As applied to the interpretation of law, the demand for certainty and flexibility involves polar concepts which must be reconciled and compromised. The difficult task is to write a law which provides a reasonable certainty and a reasonable flexibility respecting a single subject matter. No doubt judgments may differ as to the precise balance between flexibility and certainty that is desirable in a given instance. There is no objective or absolute standard that can provide a clear determination of the proper balance between these competing considerations. However, it is futile and logically absurd to demand more of both flexibility and certainty from the same law at the same time.

The antitrust laws combine both flexibility and certainty to a degree that has been thought appropriate to their subject matter by several generations of legislators and judges. Perhaps they are imperfect; true perfection is probably beyond human attainment. Improvement may be possible; but it is possible only when the demand is for consistent objectives.

In the fourth place, aside from the inevitable compromise between flexibility and certainty, the antitrust laws themselves appear to me to embody a consistent conception and system. The argument is sometimes made that while the basic mandate of the antitrust laws is for competition, other parts of the laws, such as those against price discrimination, inhibit competition.

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

That is what the Constitution says. The House shall originate the revenue measures, not any committee of the House.

How about money to be drawn from the Treasury? Section I, article 9 provides:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Note that the appropriations are to be made by law, not by the Appropriations Committee.

Who shall make the laws? Article VI of the Constitution states:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land.

Every bill that has been referred to by those who talk about back-door spending has been passed by the Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people. A part of that Congress are the members of the House Committee on Appropriations. If they do not like any bill that is being presented it is their prerogative and duty to stand here in the well of the House to oppose it and by their vote show their disapproval.

Congress in its wisdom decided that for good management we should have various committees in the House, but there is no committee of the House that is superior to the Congress itself. When Congress decides that there shall be a call upon the Treasury, that is the supreme law of the land. There is no veto power placed in any committee of the House or Senate. That is what the Founding Fathers said. If we want to change it, it is within our prerogatives, but until that times comes this bill is perfectly legitimate. There is nothing in it that is illegal. There is no back-door spending. It is spending by Congress as authorized by Congress, and should be approved.

The Economics of Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 14, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the April edition of the Progressive carries an article by a highly regarded writer on medical problems, Selig Greenberg, of the Providence, R.I., Journal and Evening Bulletin. It is an exceptionally clear presentation of the economics of hospital care. Mr. Greenberg expresses a view with which many of us in Congress have long been in sympathy, which is that what happens in medicine affects each and every American; therefore the business of medicine is the public's business.

I commend this article to everyone interested in a concise analysis of a rather complex problem, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

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

CRISIS IN THE HOSPITALS

(By Selig Greenberg)

The Nation's hospitals—the outposts of our phenomenal medical progress—are now confronted with a profound crisis, at the very time they are advancing toward ever greater miracles of healing and lifesaving. Soaring hospital costs and hospitalization insurance rates have brought a rising tide of public concern, expressed in demands for greater efficiency in hospital operation, and for reforms in the prevailing patterns of health insurance. Across the country labor unions, business firms, citizens' groups, and public officials are calling for controls on skyrocketing costs, curbs on services which are either wholly unnecessary or could be furnished less expensively, and a more rational and coherent system that will get the most out of the medical care dollar. Increasingly, warnings are heard from responsible sources that the squeeze of spiraling costs may price voluntary insurance out of the market and force full Government control of our whole complex of health services.

There is probably no more explosive issue in the entire controversial field of medical economics than that of hospital costs. For it is here, more than in any other area of medical care, that the problems of the technological revolution in medicine are rapidly coming to a head.

Hospital services now not only account for the largest single portion of the Nation's health care bill, but they are at the heart of our system of medical practice. As medicine grows more intricate and its tools more elaborate, the trend inevitably is toward increasing concentration of medical services within the hospital. And it is the very triumphs of medicine which are catapulting costs. Nowhere is this more evident than in the hospitals, which have become a large-scale and complex business requiring the coordination of a great array of professional skills and huge capital investment in expensive facilities and equipment.

Basically, the crisis of hospital function and financing stems from the fact that we are both the beneficiaries and the victims of the remarkable progress of medicine which has brought us better health and longer life but also has enormously complicated the rendering of medical services and raised their costs. The resolution in medicine is far from over, and hospitals have yet to fulfill their growing potential. Further scientific advances will unavoidably mean still costlier diagnostic and treatment procedures, more elaborate, and expensive equipment, and an even greater need for technical personnel. A continued rise in hospital costs thus appears inescapable. So it is all the more vital to eliminate the waste, duplication, and lack of integrated planning now common in the hospital field. If there are ways of operating hospitals more efficiently and economically—as many authorities believe there are—the public certainly has the right to insist on getting full value at the lowest possible price consistent with high quality.

Good hospital care clearly cannot be produced cheaply. But if costs are to be kept within acceptable bounds and quality improved, we will need a much higher degree of self-discipline by the medical profession and a far greater readiness on the part of hospitals to yield some of the privileges of their cherished autonomy than have so far

been evident. It is no exaggeration to say that the future of the organization of medical care and practice in the United States depends on the extent to which the doctors and the hospitals can be prevailed upon to recognize that their business is the public's business.

The statistics of rising hospital costs and utilization are instructive and sobering.

For a number of years, hospital room charges have been advancing at a much faster rate than any other item in the United States Department of Labor's consumer price index. The overall index, which is pegged at 100 for the 1947-49 period, had risen to 124.6 by the end of 1959. At that time the index for all medical care services put together stood at 150.8. But for hospital room rates it was 208.9.

In 1946, the average cost per patient-day in voluntary hospitals was \$9.39. By 1959, it had jumped to \$30.19, an increase of more than 220 percent. Nor is the end of the spiral anywhere in sight. Experts are generally agreed that hospital costs will continue to rise at the rate of 5 to 10 percent a year. A spokesman for the American Hospital Association has predicted that the average cost per patient-day may reach \$50 by 1968.

Of equal importance in contributing to the steady climb of the Nation's hospital bill is the striking increase in the rate of hospitalization. Thirty years ago, 37 out of every 1,000 Americans were admitted to general hospitals in the course of a year. Since then the ratio of hospital admissions has zoomed to 124. A variety of factors has figured in this upward trend. For one thing, hospitals can do much more for the sick than they could two or three decades ago. Widespread insurance coverage has removed much of the economic deterrent to hospital care for those in the middle- and low-income groups. In the Nation's population there has been a steady increase in the numbers and in the proportion of older people, who have a higher incidence of chronic diseases requiring more frequent hospitalization. Many conditions of modern city living make for significantly higher hospital use than in rural areas. The large proportion of working wives means that often there is no one at home to take care of a sick husband or child. The high price of household or nursing help to care for the sick at home and the limited size of city apartments also force up the hospitalization rate.

The net effect of higher costs of hospital care and its much greater frequency has been a tripling of expenditures for hospital services in the United States in the past 15 years. Out of a total private medical care outlay of \$18.3 billion in 1959, payments to hospitals were \$5.5 billion, the biggest single share, and \$500 million more than the amount paid to physicians. The latest available breakdown shows that 30 cents out of every medical care dollar now goes to hospitals, 27 cents to doctors, 26 cents for drugs and appliances, 11 cents to dentists, and the remaining 6 cents for other professional services.

There are many sound reasons for the continued rise in hospital operating costs. A U.S. Public Health Service official has summed them up with the cogent observation that "when we talk about the cost of medical care today as compared to the past, we're talking about the price of an electric washer-dryer compared to a washtub."

There is no ready solution for the costliness of new and more effective medical procedures, more elaborate surgery, and more potent drugs. Such dramatic advances as open-heart surgery, artificial kidneys, heart pacemaker units, cobalt radiation treatment, and radioisotopes to pinpoint internal abnormalities are restoring patients to health sooner and more completely, and, frequently,

are saving lives which otherwise would be lost. But some of these miraculous procedures are enormously expensive, requiring dozens of physicians and technicians for a single patient.

As productivity has gone up, industry has been able to shorten its work week. But hospitals cannot shorten their week. They must remain open 168 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. To keep pace with the standard 40-hour week in the community, hospitals have been forced to hire many new employees to fill each around-the-clock job. They also have been obliged to bring their lagging wage scales closer to those of private industry. While raising its wage level, industry has often managed to cut its labor costs through automation. But hospitals cannot substitute machines for people. On the contrary, as available life-saving services proliferate and newly developed equipment is constantly added, more rather than fewer people are required to operate them. In 1946 voluntary hospitals in the United States had, on the average, 156 employees for every 100 patients. By now the ratio of employees for each 100 patients has risen to 225. Whereas in the automobile industry wages currently account for only about one-third of production costs, payroll expenditures have shot up to 70 percent of hospital budgets.

New medical sophistication has made hospital care an accepted component of the average American's standard of living. The public learns quickly these days of new medical discoveries through the press, radio, and television. The more people learn about medical progress, the more they are likely to go to the hospital, where the latest advances can be most effectively applied. The rising standard of living also has brought a demand for more attractive hospital facilities. Hospitals are expected to match the comforts of motels by way of air conditioning, piped-in radio, perhaps television, and certainly window draperies. The new standards also call for a telephone at the bedside and some choice of menu. While the effect of these niceties on the patient's recovery is debatable, their effect on the hospital's unit costs is obvious.

Another element in the picture has been the sharp increase in new hospital construction throughout the country. This expansion has been, in general, a laudable development. Antiquated buildings have in many places been replaced, and additional bed space has been provided to keep pace with the forward march of medical science. But we have lagged in developing more economical facilities such as hospital outpatient clinics and adequate nursing and convalescent homes for chronic patients. Concentration upon the expansion of costly hospital bed capacity designed primarily for the acutely ill is wasteful. Competent opinion is that the more hospital beds are available, the greater is the tendency toward admissions for relatively trivial ailments and for longer-than-necessary stays, particularly when such abuse is encouraged by the benefit structure of hospitalization insurance.

The fact that patients now go home much sooner than they used to—the average length of hospital stay has been cut in the past 30 years from 15.3 to 7.8 days—is in itself far from an unmixed blessing.

The shorter stay means that more intensive treatment is concentrated within a shorter period of time, so that daily costs are higher. An additional cost factor in more rapid patient turnover is that chances are greater there will be vacant beds which have to be staffed but produce no income. One of the paradoxes of the hospital cost problem is that it is the result of both overuse and insufficient use of facilities. On the one hand, hospital beds are sometimes used needlessly for patients who could just as well be taken care of elsewhere at much

lower cost. On the other hand, hospital facilities are not utilized as efficiently as they should be, with the result that about one bed out of four is usually empty, and in some institutions the average occupancy rate is even lower. Lower occupancy means a correspondingly heavier proportion of overhead in daily per-patient costs.

Much wider use of hospital services and their greater costliness have been reflected, inevitably, in steadily climbing hospitalization insurance rates. As Blue Cross and other plans throughout the country have repeatedly been forced to seek premium hikes, growing attention has been focused on the urgent need for eliminating hospital inefficiencies and needless use of expensive facilities. An important point to bear in mind is that hospital costs are no longer solely the concern of patients and their families. With the phenomenal spread of health insurance, which now covers more than two out of every three Americans, the hospital bill is being underwritten by the healthy as well as the sick. This means that the public is more and more looking upon hospital costs not only in terms of charges for services rendered but also in terms of the monthly cost of insurance.

Rate hearings before State insurance commissioners have increasingly provided a platform for the critics of hospital efficiency and of the effect which the present health insurance system has upon it.

Such hearings in New York, Pennsylvania, and a number of other States have produced charges that the prevailing insurance approach lays too much emphasis on hospitalization, ignoring possibilities for more economical treatment of many conditions in the doctor's office or in outpatient clinics; that Blue Cross—and Blue Shield, its companion surgical-medical insurance program—have built in incentives for getting between hospital sheets merely to take advantage of insurance benefits; that hospitals could do considerably more than they have been doing to keep down their operating costs; that because of the general lack of overall community planning and integration in the hospital field there is duplication and overlapping of personnel, equipment, and services; that much of the present organization of hospital services, revolving around the doctor as a private entrepreneur, has become inefficient in the context of the growing complexity of medicine and must be drastically revamped to take advantage of opportunities for greater productivity and lower costs; and that the public is not adequately represented in the management of the voluntary hospitals and the insurance plans.

The adverse effect of health insurance, which now provides the greatest share of hospital income, in relaxing many of the pressures for economy in hospital operations is emphasized in the report of the commission on financing of hospital care. The commission, sponsored by the American Hospital Association and made up of a distinguished group of authorities, concluded after a lengthy study that the emergence of insurance as a major factor in medical economics has to some degree reduced, if not removed, incentives that would otherwise operate to encourage maintenance of hospital operating costs at the lowest level practicable.

The commission's report points out that prior to the extensive use of insurance, when people were required to pay the full bill directly to the hospital, there were natural economic restraints on costs and lower cost institutions providing services of equally good quality enjoyed a competitive advantage in attracting more patients. But with the introduction through insurance of a new element in the relationship between cost and use of services, the report says Blue Cross, as the intermediary between the purchaser of

hospital care and the hospital, must inevitably assume some functions previously the direct responsibility of patient or hospital.

One of those holding that genuine economies can be made by hospitals without lessening quality of service, and that Blue Cross should insist on such economies instead of merely acting as a collection agency for the hospitals, is Francis R. Smith, Pennsylvania's dynamic State insurance commissioner.

Smith, who feels that his authority to pass on Blue Cross premium rates goes much further than the checking of actuarial tables and extends to the things which pyramid costs, has for several years been preaching the doctrine that neither the hospitals nor Blue Cross have done all they can and should to control such abuses as unnecessary admissions and excessively protracted stays and to put into effect other efficiency measures. And the commissioner has used his legal powers to enforce his views. In a series of trail-blazing decisions, he has ordered Blue Cross and the hospitals in Philadelphia and other cities to adopt certain economy measures before any further insurance rate boosts would be granted. Among the economy possibilities he has advocated are wider use of opportunities for outpatient diagnosis and treatment, tighter controls on the scheduling of admissions and discharges and on length of stay, better scheduling of medical procedures to avoid needless delays, more effective use of technicians and nurses, sharing of specialized equipment among hospitals, and greater standardization of supplies along with joint purchasing.

Considerable progress has been achieved in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other Pennsylvania communities under Smith's prodding during the past 2 years. Blue Cross plans have developed medical review teams to ferret out abuse of insurance contracts. They have expanded their coverage of diagnostic services and home nursing visits, in order to cut down hospitalization. Hospitals have organized medical utilization committees to check on needless admissions and excessive stays. They also are moving to achieve greater management efficiencies and to coordinate expansion through joint planning.

While hospitals are a big enterprise but not a business in the ordinary sense of that term, Smith said in a recent speech, "This does not mean that hospitals cannot be businesslike. More needs to be done in applying commonsense business practices and methods to hospitals—wherever they will apply."

file

Birch Society Must Be Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the recent controversy over the John Birch Society those who oppose its noxious doctrines have split into two camps. Those who favor exposing and opposing it vigorously instead of laughing at it have support from the Madison Capital Times. I include in the RECORD their recent editorial on the subject:

SHOULD THE BIRCH CULT BE IGNORED OR EXPOSED?

Attorney General Robert Kennedy recently said of the John Birch Society:

about the significance of this group, and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress will take time to read it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Pine Bluff Commercial, Apr. 1, 1961]

THE NEW PERIL

We have been trying to work up a proper degree of concern and indignation about the John Birch Society, and have not so far made the grade.

The society may well be the menace it is being painted to be. We remember a fellow who laughed at Joe McCarthy.

But the Republic has stood off the Soviet Union since 1945 and, with considerable help, whipped two sets of Fascists plus Mussolini's legions more or less simultaneously in the period immediately preceding.

It lived through the know-nothings, the Klan, the silver shirts, and the aforementioned McCarthy, and will, from all indications, also survive the citizens councils.

We are experienced, as a Nation, with crackpots and authoritarians. If the John Birch Society is not about the nearest to impotent of the lot we are, as a newspaper, a good way wide of the mark.

It has been alleged that the John Birch Society is a hate group, hence dangerous. Certainly it is made up of people who know how to hate, and who enjoy the sport. But they are also, and more profoundly, people shaken to their being by fear.

Whether the founder (who grided for his present large responsibilities in his brother's candy factory) knows it or not, the John Birch Society is built upon the proposition that mankind is doomed, and that there is now time only for a desperate rearguard action.

The society is convinced that all forces of change are exclusively in the service of the Kremlin, and that they threaten the civilized world at every point of contact.

What we have here is a fellowship of fear. In its articles of faith, the society resembles nothing so much as one of those sects which have from time to time taken to the basement and sealed up the cracks around the door in the conviction that the world would end at 5:27 a.m. a week from Thursday.

Consider the men and things which the John Birchers or their founder have already conceded to the Communists: They include the President and his predecessor; the Supreme Court; the Nation's city managers; the urban renewal advocates; the proponents of fluoridation; the United Nations.

These people don't need condemnation. They need help.

They need, each of them, a quick course in American history, a heart-to-heart talk with a trustworthy friend and then, perhaps, a good long rest.

The evidence is that John Birchism is incurable, but we can try.

Nor does John Birchism seem to us to be contagious. The presumption on which the organization has been viewed so generally with alarm, is that it is a virus likely to infect innocent people.

All of the evidence we've seen indicates that the people already had the virus, and have simply gotten together to share its miseries.

We suppose that there may be people in meaningful numbers willing to take the oath of allegiance to an outfit which is willing to forfeit the American system of Government for something the John Birchers call, quite gratuitously, "the American way of life."

But we doubt that there are many men of sound mind willing to accept the collateral dictum that Dwight Eisenhower is a Communist.

To the extent that they have done anything, except to each other and themselves, the John Birchers seem to us to have performed a substantial public service.

They have alerted their fellow Americans to the existence on the far, far right of the political spectrum of people every bit as confused, troubled and willing to be led around by the nose as their opposite numbers on the far, far left.

The society also has provided an interesting litmus test for some of our noisier politicians.

Senator EASTLAND, for example, has just spoken well of them.

Until they move beyond their present activities, which appear to consist pretty exclusively of whipping up each others' hysteria and of occasionally slandering men so eminent as to be substantially invulnerable to such attacks, we think the John Birchers more a nuisance than a peril.

If we must have people willing to believe in the things the society stands for, we may as well have the society.

The existence of such a group is bound to cut down on the number of Birchists running around unencumbered by the label, and thus likely to be mistaken for responsible citizens.

"Wisconsin Agriculturalist" Writer Ralph Yohe Describes Vocational Training Outlook for Rural Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the outstanding farm paper, the Wisconsin Agriculturalist, has been carrying a series of fine articles on the theme "Rural Education on Trial." They have been written by a distinguished Wisconsin farm writer, Mr. Ralph S. Yohe. The most recent two articles in this series describe recent developments in vocational schools and technical training.

Mr. Yohe notes that Wisconsin has one of the better vocational training programs in the Nation, established 50 years ago. Sixty-two cities in Wisconsin offer vocational and adult education courses. As of last year, well over 5,000 students were enrolled in these programs.

Mr. Yohe asks:

How does farm youth fit into this picture? Only 20 to 30 percent of the youth growing up on farms will be able to find good farming opportunities. This means that 70 to 80 percent must eventually find jobs in factories and offices.

Yet a smaller percentage of farm youth take training in the State's vocational schools than city youth.

The writer goes on to examine the reasons for this. He suggests in conclusion that vocational training schools be expanded and upgraded, to meet the needs of both city and rural young people.

To better accomplish this he recommends that area vocational schools be established in various parts of the State.

In view of the great interest in vocational training that has arisen in connection with the area redevelopment bill, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Yohe's articles and the accompanying table be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO WE STAND WITH VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS?

(By Ralph S. Yohe)

Wisconsin has one of the better vocational training programs in the Nation. The Wisconsin Legislature established vocational and adult education in 1911—50 years ago.

The program was set up to furnish vocational and industrial training for people in the growing towns and cities of Wisconsin. At that time, there was little thought that such training might someday be desirable for rural youth.

"The growth of the schools has been correlated with the growth of the communities in which they exist; and as the communities have grown and expanded, greater demands have been placed upon the schools for broadened and more comprehensive service," says C. L. Greber, director of the State board of vocational and adult education.

LAW ALLOWS AREAWIDE SCHOOLS

The original law set up the program as individual community activities. The courses are approved, the schools supervised and coordinated by the State board of vocational and adult education.

In 1955, the legislature passed a law to allow areawide vocational schools. Any county or area with 20,000 or more people can set up an area vocational school to meet their needs.

So far no such area schools have been established. Why?

Such schools must be built and run largely through local tax money. The areas that need them most are the least able to build and support them.

Most of the areas that are able to run and support vocational schools already have vocational schools in one or more of the cities.

Wisconsin's present vocational schools get most of their support from the local towns and cities where they are located. The State's vocational schools' income in 1960 came from: 75 percent, local property tax base; 4 percent, State funds; 3 percent, Federal Government; 7 percent, fees and tuition; 11 percent, other sources.

Last year the State's part of the \$10 million for running vocational schools in Wisconsin amounted to \$420,000. This year it will be upped to \$1,785,000.

The Wisconsin program is quite in contrast to States like Connecticut, where vocational schools get nearly 100 percent of their help from the State.

The 62 vocational schools scattered over the State offer a variety of training—trade and business extension education, general adult education, training for apprentices, and instruction for high school age youth.

Wisconsin laws require youngsters to go to school until they are 16 or have graduated from high school. Where vocational training is available, youngsters under 16 who have graduated from grade school can take full-time vocational work instead of high school.

The law also requires that town and city youth from 16 to 18 who are not enrolled or have not graduated from high school must attend vocational school 1 day a week.

1961

Walt Behlen, laid off from the cornfields by mechanization, became an inventor of improved farm equipment. He started with nothing and his company now does \$14 to \$16 million volume annually. He is the town's most famous success story, but there are dozens of others. And now Columbus is known through the Plains States as a little hub of technology for the farm. Population has climbed to 13,000.

EXUDE CONFIDENCE

"If Columbus can catch up, so can the country's scientists," says a pipe-smoking store owner. "We're doing all right with our missiles, and it won't be long before we show the Russians something. Funny thing about Americans—once they wake up they usually go to town. Some people don't believe that, but I do."

William Floyd is 45 years old and he has been principal of Columbus Senior High School for 6 years. In those years the number of students taking advanced science courses has almost trebled, and he attributes this to the effect of the East-West space race on the popular imagination. He thinks Gagarin's flight should be kept in perspective.

"I don't lie awake nights about it. Remember Russia has really concentrated on this project to the exclusion of many other fields of inquiry. The United States is well ahead in the overall picture, and in time we'll overtake the Communists in space exploration. It would be a mistake, I think, for the country to become alarmed because the first man to orbit the earth was a Russian.

"It's overall balance that counts, don't forget. Why we've had outstanding hurdlers from time to time and still had lousy track teams."

Columbus High is a sprawling buff-colored structure situated just north of U.S. Route 30, a major transcontinental highway. The school is 3 years old and impressively equipped. In one room, a laboratory, students not entirely unhappy about an interruption in their work gave a visitor their views about Gagarin's flight.

"I don't think of it as a space race," says Bert Aerni, an 18-year-old senior, as he throws aside his rubber apron. Bert, who wants to be an electrical engineer, adds, "It's all human achievement no matter who does it. The Russians will make propaganda gains, but I don't think we're very far behind them."

After a pause Bert says softly, "Even so, I guess I am disappointed we didn't do it first."

Anita Mueller, 17, a senior who plans to be a math teacher, isn't especially impressed with the Soviet feat. "Really," she remarks with a twinkle, "what's the difference between a man and a monkey?"

Back downtown Ben B. McNair, president of the Citizens Bank, leans back in his chair and rubs his chin. Mr. McNair, at 63, has been a banker all his life, but it was only 2 years ago that he helped found Citizens. The institution has grown rapidly and now has deposits exceeding \$2 million. Mr. McNair doesn't think "we should be down on ourselves."

"The Government's going about this space business in a logical way," he says. "We're not shooting a man up there just for the sake of trying."

"The sad thing is that some foreign nations are so impressionable. When I was in Italy a while ago, some people over there told me communism has more to offer than democracy. They tried to support this notion by pointing to Russia's superior athletes. What sense does this make? But undoubtedly many people will be impressed in the same way by the Soviet space man."

The idea that many of the peoples of the world use vulnerable criteria in judging ide-

ologies was echoed heatedly by Peter Haas, a young farm-equipment salesman.

"Answer me this, will you? Why should we get in a scientific vaudeville show with the Russians? So what if all the banana countries start doing a rain dance every time somebody shoots off a rocket. Sure, putting that guy up there was a great stunt, but does anybody doubt next year at this time we'll have guys doing the same thing? I'm tired of all this moaning and walling."

But Alice Micek, a bookkeeper, was unwilling to pass off the Soviet success so lightly. "This is a serious setback for the United States. It will provide a lot of propaganda for the Reds. I think the Russians are ahead of us because we give away too many secrets. Television and newspapers report about our missiles in such detail, it's no wonder the Communists have the advantage. Now something should be done about it."

OTHER PROBLEMS

Joe Justice, an auto mechanic, doesn't see the sense of space experiments in the first place. "The Government is having a hell of a time making ends meet on earth without going someplace else," he declares.

Mike Kincaid, owner of KJSK, the local 1,000-watt radio station, believes interservice squabbling is still holding up the U.S. missile program. He thinks it's time we got busy and got a man up there too. And he's confident we will eventually outstrip the Russians in space.

Expressing similar confidence were three workers at the Behlen Manufacturing Co., a farmer and his helper who were repairing a corn crib, two housewives browsing in the J. C. Penney store, a pharmacist, and James Preston, manager of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce.

And if a casual traveler through the pleasant streets of Columbus, Nebr., can claim a total impression it must be that confidence in America's ability to cope with this challenge in space is both strong and deep.

It could be, of course, that Columbus, which found out how to make such a strong comeback itself, could be an exception. Or it could be that the climate that permitted the ingenuity of its citizens full play is not much different from the climate in Livermore, Calif., and Waterville, Maine.

The Constitution and What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio promotes as essay contest among the high school students in Ohio.

The subject assigned always has some connection with civic or governmental responsibility.

This year the subject assigned was "The Constitution and What It Means."

I am proud that the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio is represented among the 12 winners selected this year.

Miss Diana Dietrich of Laura, Ohio, is one of the ninth grade winners. Her prize winning essay is as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS

To fully develop your own character you must know your country's character. Therefore it is necessary to understand our Con-

stitution of the United States. The Constitution of our country provides for the form of government, limits the Government's powers, and assures the rights and liberties of the citizens. First, let's consider the history of our Constitution.

The signing of the Declaration of Independence marked the birth of a new nation. In the period between the signing of the two documents, America had no centralized government. In 1778 the Articles of Confederation were drawn up by the Second Continental Congress. These articles left much to be desired. There was no President, Vice President, or Supreme Court. Congress could make laws, but had no means of enforcing them. In September 1786, commissioners from five States met at Annapolis. This important meeting soon led to the ratification of the Constitution by nine States on June 21, 1778. From this time on the Constitution became the supreme law of the United States. Many people agree this was the most important document made in our history.

What I like best about the Constitution is the soul and heart of it. Unless our Constitution satisfies the feelings of our heart, unless it feeds the human soul, unless it stirs our emotions, it cannot be regarded as an expression of the American spirit. The most precious expression, next to the Bible, is the Constitution. In the Bible we find our relationship to God. In the Constitution we find liberty, the next important thing in life. In studying the Constitution every American can say with pride: "When danger threatens my life and liberty neither the President nor Congress nor armies can enter and take away my life and liberty." The soul of the Constitution is in every paragraph. All the parts are mighty links that bind the people in an unbreakable chain of the Union.

You need not be a scholar to understand the basic principle of the Constitution. Yes, it is important to know the laws and regulations, but not as much as knowing it gives the three God-given rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let's consider the Preamble to the Constitution. We do not know from whose brain it came. It is a great voice of the people, giving expression to their souls' desire. Summed up, the Preamble declares that our forefathers sought union, justice, tranquility, safety, welfare, and liberty. You should read the Preamble again and again. As you read it, the words are most ardent hopes and the holiest feelings of the human heart.

Times does not wear down nor eat away the truths of the Constitution. War cannot overturn our liberty as long as Americans are worthy of their forefathers. Instead of fading with age, the glory of the Constitution will remain through the ages. May we guard our birthright and hand it down to our future generations as the "jewel of their soul."

file

The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an excellent editorial concerning the John Birch Society appeared in the Pine Bluff Commercial, a rather small daily newspaper in my State. I think that this editorial hits the nail on the head

was reaffirmed 100 years ago during the great crisis that threatened to destroy the Nation. On September 22, 1862, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves from the bondage that had long been a glaring gap between the lofty idealism of America as the land of the free and the actual reality of everyday life in the young Republic. It is small wonder that in the great world beyond our shores Abraham Lincoln is the best known President of the 19th century; he was the man who reaffirmed our basic American belief in the equality of mankind and man's natural right to freedom.

In our own days, 100 years after Lincoln's stirring proclamation, there still exists a glaring gap between the political idealism we profess and the reality of American society. In defiance of clear and precise orders from the highest court in the land, a large segment of our population is still denied basic civil liberties and rights, thereby creating a scandal in the world and giving our enemies ammunition to use against us. Anyone who has traveled beyond our frontiers, well knows that the first question a foreigner asks about the United States of America deals with the problem of discrimination. And we do not need to travel abroad to know that we have a desperate need to strengthen our heritage and to bolster our self-respect as a nation by closing the gap between our lofty aspirations and the political reality that so humiliates us. Our national mystique is as lofty and noble as any ever conceived by any people, but we must live up to these ideals if we are to be true to our destiny.

The American Religious Town Hall of the Air represents a program of action committed to the proposition that Americans can best be educated to fulfill their responsibilities if they can have and hear free and frank discussions of the issues before the Nation. As an interreligious institution, including within its scope all facets of religious life in our land, the Religious Town Hall of the Air has brought to the radio and television audiences discussions of all sorts of religious, political, social, and economic issues, with emphasis upon the moral problems that are involved, and with ample opportunity for all points of view to ventilate opinions. We believe that in this program we are helping to strengthen the determination of our fellow citizens to defend and protect the ideals of civil and religious freedoms of our Nation. With this in mind we would like to suggest that it would be fitting for the Nation to pause for a review of the problems of equal rights for all citizens during the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Therefore, we of the Religious Town Hall of the Air urge other Americans interested in maintaining the moral tone of our Nation to join us in an appeal to the President of the United States for the proclamation of a new national frontier of freedom and equality during the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Let us join together to expel the remnants of intolerance, tyranny and oppression, and let us renew our faith in our national mystique that honors liberty, equality, and opportunity for all by declaring the period from July 4 to September 22, 1962 as a national jubilee commemorating the liberation of the inalienable rights of all men.

Bishop A. A. Laiske of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and President of the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc.; Bishop T. Otto Nall, Minnesota Methodist Conference and Vice President of the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc.; Donald G. Paterson, Secretary; Martin E. Kriesel, Treasurer; Jane P. Power; Violet G. Culbertson; James J. Dalglis; Doreen Wendland.

"Hope" Comes to Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues share my great personal interest in project Hope. Accordingly, I call their attention to the following article appearing in the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin on April 1, 1961:

"HOPE" COMES TO INDONESIA—NATIVES HAIL CHAPLAIN OF HOSPITAL SHIP

(By the Reverend William P. Anna, Jr., rector of Zion parish, diocese of Washington)

(The Reverend William P. Anna, Jr., an Episcopal priest, is Protestant chaplain aboard the steamship *Hope*. This San Francisco-based hospital ship, financed by public contributions and Government help, is spending a year in the South Seas. It treats native patients aboard and ashore; its staff teaches nurses and doctors. How the *Hope* has become a symbol of international hope is told in Father Anna's article.)

ABOARD SS "HOPE."—The first greeting I got in Indonesia was from a 10-year-old boy.

The *Hope* had been at sea almost 3 weeks out from Honolulu. It was Sunday. She was docking at Balikpapan in Borneo, during the 7 o'clock communion service.

After the service, I went ashore. As I stepped onto the dock, the boy came up. I greeted him in what I believed was idiomatic Indonesian we had studied evenings on the voyage. "Salamat pagi," I said. "Good morning."

In very intelligible English, the lad replied: "Good morning, Pastor. Thank you very much. Welcome to Indonesia. We are glad to see you. We like to practice our American."

The language barrier, I discovered, is not at all impossible. Ours is studied in their high schools and universities, their second language.

Indonesian contains no conjugation or declensions. Man is "orang"; men, "orang-orang."

By the time we reached Djakarta, the ship's hospital was in order, ready for business.

Twenty nurses from the training center at Bandoeng were with us, and 30 other nurses are with us for 6 months. They will form the nucleus of the teaching staff for the new Ibu Sukarno Hospital in Djakarta, where a nursing academy will be established.

I went out to the theological seminary to talk with the student body. The faculty is American, Dutch, Filipino and Indonesian.

I learned quickly, I hope, never to preach to them nor lecture them. Just answer their questions. And the questions about the *Hope* and its purpose were sharp.

"Tell us about your church in America?" they asked. "Tell us about your home and family?" In the end, I told them almost every detail, even about our dogs.

"We like you," they said. "We like American people. We like America. We do not understand American policy."

I certainly learned more about Indonesia than I have been able to tell them about America.

The most unexpected call of the first half of our tour was Sumbawa, a primitive and sparsely populated island, but seemingly rich in resources.

We stopped in a well-protected anchorage to go ashore.

There is only one doctor on the whole island, a German from Stuttgart who came here after his retirement to spend the rest of his medical career working in a place that otherwise would be without a physician.

Our work was well organized. Soon the hospital was full. A clinic, set up ashore in a warehouse, operated at full capacity. Ninety-eight operations were performed by our surgeons in 2 weeks. A German surgeon aboard did a fantastic number of cataract operations, and for these he is especially well qualified.

The gratitude of one old man surpassed anything I have seen, and it was rather a symbol of what makes our medical project real.

He came on the first day. Constantly, he asked, "Am I next?" All he was praying for was to be able to see the outline of his family.

I was going down the aisle in the ward just before he was to go to the operating room. He pulled my shirt. "They say I am next," he said; and they rolled him off the cart, rejoicing.

The last day in Sumbawa they had a final reception and lunch for the staff.

There he was, standing at the edge of the crowd, and repeating again and again, "Thank you. Thank you. Thank you."

A Responsible Study To Advance Freedom Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the problem of alerting the American people to the significance of freedom and the danger of communism is far too important to be left to the crackpots.

The fact is that communism is on the march in the world. Freedom has been on the defensive. Too few Americans care deeply about freedom. The oppressive nature of communism is far too little understood.

For these reasons, it was heartening to read of a responsible and constructive attempt to meet this need. An article in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Journal reports on the efforts of a group sponsored by corporations, and several foundations, to do this. Educational and Federal Government leaders met and worked with this group.

I ask unanimous consent that this 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:

IMPROVED STUDY OF REDS IS URGED—EDUCATORS, MILITARY CALL INSTRUCTION ON COMMUNISM SAFETY MEASURE FOR UNITED STATES

(By Edmund B. Lambeth)

CHICAGO, ILL.—An organized effort to expand and improve instruction about communism in the Nation's schools and colleges was urged Wednesday by more than 700 participants in a national military, industrial, and educational conference.

have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

IT IS NOT CONSERVATISM
(By Raymond Moley)

Five weeks ago I noted in this space the rapid growth of conservative groups on many college campuses. That manifestation of dissent from prevailing liberal thinking, together with the evidence that conservatism is growing among older people as well, is a wholesome sign. It offers a promise that our two-party system and our national elections will be real contests of opposing political philosophies. And the fact that so many young people are in the movement indicates that the coming generation realizes more than ever the burdens and debts which it will inherit from the altogether too spendthrift governments we have had since the war.

The perils that threaten this growth of conservatism will come, not from its liberal opposition but from those who in the name of conservatism would bring discredit by igniting passions against their neighbors, besmirching good Americans as friends and dupes of communism, and by adopting methods of organization which should be alien in this country. One such threat is the John Birch Society and the utterances and activities of its founder, Robert Welch, and some of the leaders in the group.

I have watched the growth of this society with the deepest regret and misgivings especially because so many sincere people have become members of it and risk their good names through association with its more radical spokesmen. Those who are devoted to sound conservative principles owe it to themselves and their true objectives to repudiate the John Birch Society and methods as I do here.

COMMUNISM AND CRIME

As I have noted the writings of Robert Welch over the past decade I have seen the transformation of a man who in the beginning spoke out against a certain blindness in our foreign policies to the real nature of the international Communist conspiracy and the danger embodied in the presence in our Government and society of elements of communism. Well before Welch appeared on the scene I advocated in this space and before a congressional committee the outlawing of the Communist party in the United States. That objective has substantially been accomplished although it must be recognized that elements of that conspiracy still lurk in our midst. It is the responsibility of our Government and indeed of all of us to expose and eliminate such elements by due process of law, just as we would deal with the criminally inclined elements of other sorts.

But opposition to communism as a criminal activity is not confined solely to conservatives. Individuals of all shades of ideology share the conservative's fear of communism. In fact, it was to a degree due to the warnings of American socialists that this Nation was sharply made aware of the danger. Because Norman Thomas and I agree that communism is our enemy at home and abroad does not make us ideological brothers.

UNFORTUNATE METHODS

The evidence is now before us through the enterprise of the press and the statements of Members of Congress that the John Birch Society, has so concentrated its attention on communism and has become so vehement in its pursuit of that one issue that it has adopted methods and has made statements which must bring it into general disrepute. Specifically, Americans do not

like the terms "monolithic" or "authoritarian" as applied to any American group or society. They resent loose and inaccurate name calling especially when applied to Presidents and other high officials who are charged by the people with responsibility for their protection. They don't like the idea of "infiltrating" various worthy organizations in our society.

I need not elaborate upon these facts. They were documented by Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20.

For a good many years I have specified those mistaken policies of Government under the name liberal which tend to limit the liberty of the individual, weaken the fiber of America and its institutions, and endanger national solvency. A belief in dynamic growth through individual enterprise constitutes a true conservatism. It is endangered by those who assume the livery of conservatism, but adopt radical methods.

Peace Corps Relationship With the Selective Service System Explained by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared on page 1 of the April 1961 issue of Selective Service, the official publication of the Selective Service System:

PEACE CORPS RELATIONSHIP WITH SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM EXPLAINED

(By Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System)

The Peace Corps has been established by Executive order of the President. Legislation has been requested to continue this organization. The activities of the Peace Corps have been covered rather completely by the press, radio, and television. Its relationship with the Selective Service System has been indicated but a statement of this relationship seems advisable.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is flexible enough to provide deferment for members of the Peace Corps without amendment of any kind. In other words the relationship of the Selective Service System with registrants who become members of the Peace Corps can be handled administratively.

The power to defer registrants who perform functions in the national health, safety, or interest now exists. The establishment and operation of the Peace Corps is in the national interest. So the classification of registrants in the Peace Corps can be handled as any other registrant engaged in activities in the national health, safety, or interest. They will, of course, enjoy the right to appeal shared by all registrants of the Selective Service System.

These statements presuppose the continuance of the present situation of the United States in relations with other nations of the world.

The question has been raised as to the status of registrants who enroll in the Peace Corps, after their return from this assignment. This requires the assumption as to the situation of this Nation in the world, the age of the registrant when he returns,

the physical condition of the registrant with reference to his acceptability for military service, his marital status, and the regulations which apply in existence at the time of his release from the Peace Corps, and whether or not the registrant on his return from service with the Peace Corps engages in an activity which permits him to be deferred in the national health, safety, or interest.

The fact that the registrant has been a member of the Peace Corps will not prevent him from qualifying for further deferment, the same as any other registrant who is engaged in activities vital to the national health, safety, or interest.

New Frontier of Freedom and Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a declaration by the American Religious Town Hall Meeting, Inc., calling on the President of the United States to proclaim a "new national frontier of freedom and equality," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

A DECLARATION BY THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS TOWN HALL MEETING, INC., CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROCLAIM A "NEW FRONTIER OF FREEDOM," A NATIONAL JUBILEE COMMEMORATING THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF ALL MEN DURING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

At this time when our liberal-democratic society is confronted by dangerous enemies abroad whose intention is to destroy our way of life and to dominate the course of human history, it well behooves America to look closely to the springs of her culture, to the sources of her liberty. Every society expresses its highest aspirations, its conception of civilized man and his destiny, and its hopes for the future, in the idealism of its founders. These goals, aspirations, hopes and ideals can be called the mystique of the society; ours has been boldly expressed in great documents, stirring orations and beautiful poetry that has warmed the hearts of millions. We all know only too well that it is difficult to realize all these social goals in actual practice; nonetheless, a society is judged by the gap that exists between the ideals of constitutional government it proclaims, and the political reality of everyday life. It is on this level that our enemies attack us in the forum of the world; they compare our lofty idealism with some of the sordid problems that mar our everyday life. It is to be noted also that they compare our problems, particularly the questions of civil equality and economic opportunity, with the idealism, that is, the mystiques of communism: They carefully avoid comparing the realities of social life in the United States of America with that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Our liberal-democratic political idealism has been proclaimed for the world to hear by Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Jackson, and a host of other statesmen and philosophers who assisted in the founding of the Republic. That mystique

1961

Higher Postal Rates Are NeededEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE**

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not worth a nickel to mail a letter to your old Aunt Hepsibah in California? Is it not worth 8 cents to fly a letter to Maine? These two questions have been raised and other comments have been made in an editorial supporting the Postmaster General's recommendation for postal increases in order to help reduce the annual \$800 million deficit. This editorial appeared in the April 15, 1961, edition of the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

HIGHER POSTAL RATES ARE NEEDED

When the total U.S. postal deficit amounts to more than \$800 million a year, Postmaster General J. Edward Day has every reason to seek to reduce this deficit, and every American ought to be willing to accept the requested rate increases in good spirit. The \$741 million a year increase requested of Congress will not permit the postal service to break even, but it will cut down the loss to a great extent.

After all, where can you buy so much service for your money? Isn't it worth a nickel to mail a letter to your old Aunt Hepsibah in California? Isn't it worth 8 cents to fly a letter to Maine? Isn't it worth 4 cents to send a surface postcard or 6 cents to send a postcard by airmail?

It will be noted by those who study the new rates that books and publishers' second-class matter, which includes newspapers and magazines, are in for some sort of increase, for, according to the Associated Press, the proposal would increase the rates of "all other classes of mail." This, at any rate, should preclude the receipt of letters saying, "Naturally you're for higher postal rates—you won't be affected." To what extent we shall be affected we do not know at this moment, but we have said before—and we repeat: We are perfectly willing to pay any increase in postal rates the Government thinks we should pay.

Actually, the larger the newspaper, the smaller the percentage of its mail circulation. American Newspaper Publishers Association figures show that of papers over 100,000 circulation, only 5.7 percent of this circulation uses the mails, whereas in papers under 5,000 circulation, 28.2 percent goes through the mails.

Perhaps one reason Uncle Sam has been moderate in increasing mail rates for newspapers (outside of the perfectly obvious one that he thinks it valuable to have citizens well-informed) is that the newspapers, themselves, give him a lot of help, even though paying full rates for services not rendered. Some 83.3 percent of all copies of daily newspapers in second-class mail are sorted by the newspapers, arranged in sacks or packages by the newspapers, delivered to railroad stations or post offices by the newspapers, thus eliminating sorting or other handling by postal employees.

Since we too shall be affected, we can, in good conscience, applaud the Postmaster General's wise plan to put the Post Office Department on a more businesslike basis—and we hope Congress will give him what he asks.

Moral Principles Have To Be RevivedEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. WILLIAM H. BATES**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Julius Szygowski, representative of the Polish Government in exile, has written a timely letter under the heading of "Moral Principles Have To Be Revived." I believe the cause of liberty will be strengthened by calling nationwide attention to this excellent document, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following statement by Dr. Szygowski:

The disquieting turn of events upon the international arena makes it ever more urgent to reassess western policy with regard to Russia and her ruthless methods. The truth must be faced and the admission made that so far the behavior of the Western Powers towards Russia and her political aims has been marked by vacillation and mistakes, even by moral shortcomings. As an outcome, public opinion has the deeply rooted impression that the Western World cannot cope with Russia and is defenseless against the progressive expansion of international communism.

The process which has brought about these pernicious consequences is not of recent origin.

It cannot be denied that many lofty ideals proclaimed by the Western Powers were abandoned. Many agreements for assuring the fate of minor nations were not honored, and many war aims were jettisoned.

All this took place gradually, until the Western World's moral position offered rather gloomy perspectives before the subjugated and other countries.

There is a small wonder that in this moral and political climate, Russian affirmations that the Western World will gradually be forced by pacific means to submit to the Communist world, superior to it in every field, are beginning to acquire an air of probability especially in the eyes of various masses of Asian and African populations.

On the other hand, the memory of various accomplished facts so detrimental to different nations lives forever in the minds of people and in the pages of history, serving us a warning not to believe in the words of those who once have broken them.

The elevated and equitable principles formulated for the postwar world in the Atlantic Charter and later incorporated within the Charter of the United Nations Organization remained only upon paper.

Soviet Russia understands well this moral weakness of the West and takes proper advantage of it. And so, Khrushchev's obvious aim is to undermine the authority and prestige of the governments, systems, and ideologies of the Western democracies. He tries to destroy this not only among the Western peoples, not only among the captive nations living in hope that the West will help to liberate them, but also among the people of the newly formed African and Asian state entities.

CASE OF POLAND

Lack of broadly conceived political vision, a decline in morality with regard to other countries and in the sense of obligation to honor agreements on the part of the West are nowhere more evident than in its attitude to Poland, its most loyal ally and holder of a prime key position in Europe.

The Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of August 1939 for a new partition of Poland

should have helped the West to see through Russia, while the latter's invasion of Poland on September 17 of the same year should have opened eyes to Russia's chief purpose, i.e., to the spreading of communism westwards.

Immediately after the Germans attacked her on June 22, 1941, and she had to seek salvation in Western aid, Russia was obliged to conclude agreement (signed on July 30 and December 4, 1941) with the Polish Government, then in London. She announced in this that the German-Soviet treaties for the partition of Poland (of 1939) were considered null and void.

Yet Russia did not for a single moment hold up efforts to undermine the Polish Republic from within and from without, nor cease to lay insistent claim to Poland's eastern provinces. The Western Powers failed at the time to assess the danger facing the whole democratic world, they gave Poland no proper support against Soviet designs, thus opening the way for the Communist westward drive.

It was in October 1943 that Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and China agreed under paragraph 6 of their security declaration drawn up at a conference in Moscow that a Soviet administration would take over Polish territories in measure as war operations proceeded. Here it must be stressed that the Polish Government in London, though an ally in good standing and obviously a party most directly affected, was neither invited to the conference nor informed of this decision.

On Stalin's demand and chiefly with the support of President F. D. Roosevelt, it was definitively decided at the Teheran Conference in November 1943—again without the knowledge of the allied Polish Government in London—that in the allocation of occupation zones, i.e., future spheres of influence, Russia's share would embrace all Poland and Hungary, a large part of Germany, and part of Austria.

It was only later, at the Yalta Conference held on 4-11 February, 1945, that formal agreement was reached between Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union regarding the annexation of nearly half of Poland's territory by Russia who would also have absolute control over the rest of Poland.

It can be safely stated that most of the world perturbations and the menace to security in general undoubtedly stem from this hardly creditable transaction. It decisively helped to shift the balance of power between the two incompatible worlds in favor of the Russian communistic imperialism.

All this could have been avoided but not being so, the Western World had to pay dearly for the subsequent consequences.

KATYN WOOD MASSACRE

As mentioned before, Russia on July 30, 1941, declared the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of 1939 null and void and in the same time concluded the treaty with the Polish Government in London, whereby diplomatic relations were resumed. This, however, did not hinder Russia from continuing to prepare Communist administrative and military cadres which were to seize in a proper time all civil and military authority in Poland.

But after 21 months, Soviet Russia broke off (on April 26, 1943) relations with the Polish Government in London as a first step to securing a free hand. The pretext for this unusual step toward an ally in time of war was an exceedingly flimsy one: namely, Poland had requested an investigation into the massacre of several thousands of Polish officers in the Soviet Union, in Katyn Wood near Smolensk.

On April 15, 1943, the Polish Government applied to the International Committee of the Red Cross asking it to appoint a delegation to investigate the case on the spot.

Stalin thereupon wrote personal letters to President Roosevelt and to Mr. Churchill on April 21, 1943, accusing the Germans of this mass murder of Polish officers. The Western Powers ostensibly accepted the Soviet version and, judging by the documents published to date, refrained from alluding to this crime at any major international conference, at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, or on any latter occasion.

In the U.S. House of Representatives a resolution was passed on May 18, 1951, whereby a Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Murder was set up with Hon. RAY J. MADDEN as chairman. Detailed evidence was collected and the committee filed its final report on December 22, 1952, with the following recommendations: (1) that the U.S. President issue instructions to the U.S. Delegate at the United Nations Organization to present the Katyn case to the General Assembly; (2) that the President request that the General Assembly seek action before the International Court of Justice against the U.S.S.R. for committing the massacre; and (3) that the President instruct the U.S. delegation to seek the establishment of a temporary U.N. Commission which would investigate mass murders and crimes against humanity.

Since then, however, nothing has been done. It can be safely stated that the attitude of the Western Powers with regard to the Katyn massacre does not reflect credit upon them nor raise their prestige.

The rupture of diplomatic relations with Poland, because Polish Government requested the International Red Cross to investigate the Katyn massacre, was deemed necessary by Stalin not only for the realization of his underhand plans against that country but also for his longer designs against the whole democratic world.

FOREIGN OCCUPATION OF POLAND

This whole unfriendly attitude of Western Powers toward Poland and disregard of the international law, allowed Stalin to realize his plans. In measure as Germans evacuated Polish soil before the advancing Soviet forces, Stalin handed over the civil administration of Poland to his stooge organization, the so-called "Polish Committee of National Liberation" very soon proclaimed as the government of the country. It cannot be too strongly stressed that this alleged government could not be and was not a Polish government in the legal and constitutional sense. It was nothing but a political tool in the hands of the Kremlin.

The German administration of rump Poland during the occupation (1939-45) was directed by a German governor-general in Cracow. Craftier Communist Russia has camouflaged her occupation of Poland by ruling through "the Government of the Polish People's Republic" in Warsaw but composed for the most part of Communist graduates of the Moscow school. Both systems, of course, can be regarded merely as the administrative organs of a foreign occupation. The only difference, that the German occupation never claimed to be anything else whilst that of the Russians is more skillfully and cunningly devised. Stalin succeeded even to obtain the respectability for his administration in Poland by assuring its legal status upon the international forum. And again, this success will be found to derive from the weakness and imprudence of the representative of Anglo-American policy at the Yalta Conference. Thus, Poland has been given, against her will, the status of a Russian satellite.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT OF POLAND—IN EXILE

In virtue of the Polish constitution and, hence, of the international law, there exists the legal and constitutional Polish Government (in exile) in London, England. It works and acts abroad for the reestab-

lishment of Poland's freedom and independence. Realizing that in our times the liberation of Poland has to be based upon a broader scheme which would help other eastern-central European nations to regain their freedom, the Polish Government (in exile) deems that the following points obviously merit an examination: (The below described plan has been repeatedly presented to the Governments of Western democracies by the Polish Government in exile since October 1955; however there has been no favorable reaction at this time.)

1. It is an essential condition for security in Europe and (owing to this continent's key position) to the whole world to establish such a state of affairs that could eliminate or at least seriously hinder any direct clash of the war potentials. This could be attained by linking together the countries of Europe within a United States of Europe. Until nations of Europe become ripe for this, it is necessary to seek some intermediate solution.

2. The solution of this problem should be sought in the creation of a neutral zone between East and West. It would embrace countries neighboring with Russia and now subjected by her: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. The setting up of such a neutral zone on sound political, economic and military foundations would produce a favorable basis for a durable arrangement of peaceful relations in Europe.

3. This neutral zone in east-central Europe should be created on the basis of an accord concluded on the one hand by all the member-countries as sovereign states, free of any foreign military occupation and foreign-imposed governments, and on the other hand, by all the powers interested in the maintenance of world peace. The countries of the neutral zone should bind themselves not to join any warlike blocs and not to conclude any military alliances with countries outside the neutral zone. The powers not belonging to the neutral zone and interested in maintaining world peace, including a united Germany and Soviet Russia, would jointly guarantee the frontiers of the neutral zone countries so that, in case of aggression from East or West, all the guarantors would automatically become the allies of the neutral-zone lands in defense against such an aggression. Such a situation would undoubtedly become an element arresting any kind of aggressive design from whichever direction it may come.

4. The neutral zone so conceived would not act as a barrier separating East from West, but would preeminently serve as an intermediary and liaison between them in the ideological, cultural and economic fields. Those member countries of the neutral zone who have for centuries past been so wronged by both Russia and Germany, would gradually lose memory of this painful past, the bitterness felt toward these neighbors would die out little by little and could in the future become transformed into a loyal international collaboration based on sincere, natural amity.

5. The relations between the member-states of the neutral zone in east-central Europe would best be based on a sui generis confederate agreement. Such a union of independent states, adequately armed for the defense of its neutrality and guaranteed by the other powers, would provide full assurance for the maintenance of peace in Europe and hence facilitate this in the whole world. Only under such conditions would the question of disarmament acquire current significance, and only then could the huge sums now uneconomically expended be devoted to the good of humanity.

6. The problem of the unification of Germany can really be reduced to that of liberation of East Germany from Soviet occupation. Once such a zone of neutral

countries is created between Russia and Germany, with East Germany west of this zone, unification of the two German republics would probably be immediate and automatic. Hence, it can be said that the problem of the unification of Germany is a function of the general problem of security.

7. In order to accomplish this, the Western Powers should regain the political initiative at all costs. Under the present circumstances, this could be achieved solely by presenting Russia with the demand for a far-reaching revision of the situation she has brought about by dint of violence, underhand methods and the violation of international agreements. Russia's acts to the plain detriment of the weaker nations should be disavowed and denounced forthwith. It is necessary firmly to demand the immediate and unconditional liberation of the captive nations, and the righting of all the wrongs inflicted upon them. But again at this point it should be cited that the Western democracies failed (a) to guarantee the existing frontiers between Germany and Poland (b) to initiate talks about the organization of eastern-central Europe, thus giving Mr. Khrushchev an opportunity to bring up these two problems at the U.N. General Assembly in September 1960 in such a way as to further his own interests. The hypocritical and brutal ideology of the Communist world should be countered by a clearly formulated, broadly conceived ideology based upon the moral principle of the truth that equal rights are due both to strong and to weak nations.

It is worthwhile to mention that the recent "14 points accord" of Gov. N. A. Rockefeller and Vice President Richard Nixon stressed the necessity "of leading and inspiring the formation in all great regions of the free world of confederations, large enough and strong enough to meet modern problems and challenges," and suggested that "we [the United States] should promptly lead toward the formation of such confederations in the North Atlantic Community and in the Western Hemisphere."

In applauding this idea, such remarks seem to be proper: the more precise and definite are the plans of the Western democracies, the greater the determination they show in the realization of these plans, the greater their pressure toward this end and the greater their solidarity in such action, the sooner and the more certainly will it be possible to establish a system of relations that will enable mankind to enter upon the road of lasting peaceful development, and assure Europe the possibility of real unification.

And this must be done—before it is too late. A two-power world can never be at peace.

file
The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 18, 1961

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the best editorials that has come to my attention with reference to Robert Welch and the John Birch Society is one appearing in the April 17 issue of Newsweek written by its contributing editor, Raymond Moley entitled "It Is Not Conservatism."

Mr. Moley present a powerful argument to every thinking American. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to

1961

The need for Federal FEPC legislation is painfully evident. The 17 States which have such legislation on their books (and Pennsylvania since 1955 is one) are hopelessly hamstrung in obtaining adequate enforcement where interstate commerce is involved, as it is in such a large percentage of commercial employment situations. Thirty-three States with almost 80 million people are outside the coverage of any FEPC legislation today.

With unemployment in the United States at about 7 percent of the total labor force in February, nonwhite unemployment stood at a staggering 15 percent, a rate that would never be tolerated if it applied across the board. But this discrepancy is not limited to recessions. Unemployment among nonwhites runs just about double the rate for whites at all times according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Among the employed, the pattern of discrimination is less apparent, but no less real. In the occupational structure of our society, positions as managers, officials, executives and proprietors are held at 14 percent of all white male workers, but only 2 percent of all Negro male workers. Over 10 percent of all white male workers are in professional and technical occupations; less than 3 percent of all Negro male workers. Over 33 percent of all white female workers are in clerical occupations. Only 8 percent of all Negro female workers have gained access to clerical work.

The difference in wage rates is no less startling. The Department of Commerce reports that in 1957 the average wage or salary of a white person was \$3,775; of a nonwhite \$1,845. This deficiency in earnings for Negroes as a class is said to total a staggering \$12 billion per year. Granting existing differences in educational opportunities and trained skills these statistics still establish a substantial differential based on racial prejudice.

The bill which Congressman Celler and I have drafted would make racial discrimination in hiring, promotion, and firing, an unfair labor practice for which administrative and ultimately judicial sanctions would be available. The proposed law, which would be administered by a 5-man Fair Employment Practices Commission, would apply to all employers, business or labor organizations, who are engaged in interstate commerce or operations affecting such commerce and employ more than 50 persons.

While the roadblocks to such legislation in the Congress under our archaic and undemocratic rules of procedure are substantial, we are hopeful that this bill will pass the 87th Congress before it finally adjourns in 1962. I am confident that these measures will ultimately have the all-out support of the administration. The only question is one of timing.

It was President Kennedy who stated last fall that "Freedom is indivisible, in all its aspects. To provide equal rights for all requires that we respect the liberties of speech and belief and assembly, guaranteed by the Constitution, and these liberties in turn are hollow mockeries unless they are maintained also by a decent economic life. Those who are unemployed, or too poor, uninformed, or too uneducated to enjoy their constitutional freedoms of choice, do not really possess those freedoms."

The unending task to insure the enjoyment of equal rights, including equal job opportunity, by all citizens of the United States is a goal worthy of the best efforts of all of us. If this high goal is to be achieved in our lifetimes or those of our children, the active efforts of all men of good will both in and out of government must be dedicated to the end. The work of your commission is designed to bring that goal closer to reality. I salute you in your all-important assignment and wish you every success.

President Kennedy Rightly Urges Creative Thinking by TVA

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
 HON. JOE L. EVINS**

**OF TENNESSEE
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Tuesday, April 11, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "President Rightly Urges Creative Thinking by TVA," which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean of March 29, last.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT RIGHTLY URGES CREATIVE THINKING BY TVA

If any member of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors had any doubts concerning what the President of the United States feels this independent agency's role is, Mr. Kennedy's latest letter should have dispelled those doubts.

The President wrote: "The TVA is in the business of resource development and I want to feel that in your future thinking on the continuing problems of the valley region, you will be giving thought to the problems which go beyond the production and sale of power.

"We need much creative thinking in this area and the TVA has stood in the past for original and bold thinking. This vigorous and imaginative momentum must be continued."

This was President Kennedy's reaction to the Board's decision to locate its newest steam plant on the Clinch River in east Tennessee. The President had suggested favorable consideration of a site in southeast Kentucky, a seriously depressed region with idle coal fields.

Never did President Kennedy presume to dictate policy decisions to TVA, an independent agency, and it is in keeping with this approach that he has termed the Board's steam plant decision the proper one. A difference in capital outlay of \$30 million he deemed complete justification for selecting the Clinch River site.

Nevertheless, the reminder Mr. Kennedy has given the Board is one which was needed. Since TVA constructed its first steam plant at New Johnsonville, its underlying philosophy has seemed to shift slowly away from the emphasis on "the business of resource development." Its "production and sale of power" role, a legitimate one, has received increasing attention.

This newspaper has called attention to this situation. It has suggested that the slide rule is a magnificent instrument, but that it should not entirely replace TVA's department of vision and farsightedness. When TVA came to this valley it thought in terms of river navigation, flood control, recreation, forest protection, improved agricultural methods, and saving eroding soil, as well as cheap electrical energy.

It dreamed of lifting a region by the intelligent use of all its resources, not by the coldly efficient and economic development of power alone, necessary though this might be.

The regional problems are not the same today, of course. Industrial development has become a major need, and therefore an abundant supply of electrical energy remains a major concern. But recreational and navigational demands have also grown and the possibility of constructing tributary dams to meet these and other needs is worth exploring.

Facts Pave the Way to Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Crosby, columnist of the New York Herald Tribune, recently in one of his articles referred to the fight against the program "The Untouchables" in a manner which was interpreted as maligning persons of Italian origin. Representing as I do the 19th Congressional District in which there are a great number of persons of Italian origin who are contributing to the success of the great city of New York and to the development of our country, I can attest to the contributions made by this segment of our population.

I deplore the references by Mr. Crosby and believe that his statements are divisive. The Americans of Italian origin are aroused by this column, and an indication of the resentment of persons of Italian origin to the unfair references can be gleaned by an article published in the *Il Progresso* on Sunday, March 26, 1961. The resentment of the Italian-Americans has been manifested against the program "The Untouchables" by pickets, boycotts, and conciliatory conferences. The leading organizations in this fight to eliminate the unfair stereotyping of Americans of Italian origin were the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., the Sons of Italy, the Columbian Association, and the National Italian-American League to Combat Defamation.

The column published by the *Il Progresso* sets forth the contributions by persons of Italian origin through the years, during the wars and defense of our country, and in the promotion of our economy and our country. This article answers fully any statements made by Mr. Crosby and any unfair inferences which might be derived from a reading of his article. The open letter to Mr. Crosby which was published on Sunday, March 26, 1961, follows. I am certain that the reading public will draw the proper conclusions after reading this open letter:

**AN OPEN LETTER TO A COLUMNIST OF THE
 NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE**

DEAR JOHN CROSBY: In your column in the New York Herald Tribune, last Wednesday, you deplored the fact that an agreement was reached between the National Italian-American League to Combat Defamation and Desilu which produces "The Untouchables" on the basis of which future episodes of the television series would refrain from using Italian names for its fictional characters of hoodlums and delinquents. And you decry that "one more national group removes itself forcibly from the ranks of villainy." Of course your feelings are completely at variance with those of the great majority of Americans who resent the slurs on whole ethnic segments of the people who have caused "Abe" the merchant, "Paddy" the drunk, the dutchman "Schultz" and "Black Face" to be ban-

ished from the American scene and feel it is high time to do likewise with "Tony" the gangster.

Your statement "that it would be extremely difficult to write a history of organized crime in this country * * * without filling it almost exclusively with Italian names", is more indicative of prejudice than of accuracy. You offer no statistical proof of your wholly gratuitous assertion. Let us offer you the survey of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, which indicates that the Federal prison population with Italian names is less than 3 percent. This means that 97 percent of all Federal prisoners are of ethnic origin other than Italian. This despite the fact that Americans of Italian origin constitute about 10 percent of the national population. You describe the use of Italianate names or Sicilianate types in "The Untouchables" as "one of the few admirable things" about it, thus revealing an instinctive approval of the very sore point which Desilu recognized and promised to remove in the interests of better intergroup relations to which you are obviously opposed.

And when finally you reluctantly concede that Italians have produced "Toscanini too" * * * it is apparent that you have not gasped the significance or import of our contribution to the greatness of America in every field of human endeavor since its discovery by Christopher Columbus. Yes, the history of our country, which was named for Americus Vespucci, is replete with Italians like Marco da Nizza, who explored what is Arizona today and Francesco Chino who laid the foundation for the great cattle industry in the Southwest; and Enrico Tonti, who founded the first trading post in Chicago and was one of the founders of the colony of Louisiana. And his brother Alfonso Tonti who helped Cadillac found the city of Detroit and Umberto Beltrami who discovered the sources of the Mississippi. And Filippo Mazzei, physician and counselor to Thomas Jefferson, who incorporated the philosophy of Mazzei in the Declaration of Independence with the immortal words "That all men are created free and equal."

And wasn't it an American patriot of Italian origin who made possible the victory of Gen. George Rogers Clark which enabled him to open up the great Northwest? Yes, it was Col. Francis Vigo who financed the expedition and also furnished the military information which brought about the defeat of the Indians in this crucial period in American history.

And it might interest you to know that in the Capitol in Washington 90 percent of the art work, frescos, paintings, sculptures are the work of Italian artists such as Costantino Brumidi, Joseph Franzoni, John Andrei. And even the silver dollar was designed by the Italian DeFrancisci.

In the field of science, how can we evaluate the contributions to America and the world, of the genius and wizardry of Marconi? What is the impact on history of Dr. Enrico Fermi, who made nuclear fission a reality? And Drs. Ghiorso and Rossi of the University of California who discovered element 100 used in the hydrogen bomb? And Dr. Falla who designed the world's largest radium therapy apparatus?

Great educators like Angelo Patri, considered America's greatest child psychologist; Dr. Rettagliata, president of the Illinois Institute of Technology; Dean Emeritus Cosenza, of Brooklyn College; Dr. Edward Mortola, president of Pace College; Mario Pei, world-renowned philologist, whom George Bernard Shaw cited as a master of the English language; Dr. Francis Verdi, professor of surgery at Yale University, have left an indelible imprint on the minds of American students.

Many great captains of industry contrib-

ute to the daily enrichment of the Nation. Men like Giannini, who founded the greatest bank in the world; the Vaccaros of Louisiana, and the DiGiorgios, the fruit kings of America; the Cuneo brothers, operators of the great printing establishment in the world; Amedeo Obici, who founded the Planters peanut empire; Crespi, the cotton king of Waco; Ross Siracusa, head of Admiral television; Martino, president of National Lead Co.; Salvatore Giordano, head of Fedders air conditioning; Riggio, who was president of the board of American Tobacco Co.; our own Pope brothers, of the Colonial Sand & Stone Co., and countless others.

And builders of roads, tunnels, airports, and skyscrapers, engineers and architects * * * men like the Gulls, DiNapoli, Rizzi, Corbetta, DelBalso, Paterno, Petrillo, Lou Perini, et al.

In the field of labor we have such outstanding leaders as Luigi Antonini, first vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; August Bellanca, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Howard Molisani, Vincent LaCapria, George Baldanzi.

And in the entertainment field: theater, movies, television, and night clubs we give you just a few of the outstanding personalities such as Alfred Drake, Don Ameche, Ann Bancroft, Perry Como, Frank Sinatra, Jimmy Durante, Frankie Laine, Dean Martin, Frank Capra, Vincent Minnelli, Anthony Franciosa, Connie Francis, Joni James, Tony Arden, Dennis James, Ernest Borgnine, and Guy Lombardo.

And in baseball men like DiMaggio, Berra, Rizzuto, Colavito. And in boxing the undefeated champion of champions, Rocky Marciano. And the All-America football hero of Navy's gallant squad, Bellino; and the great Columbia Coach Lou Little and a host of others.

We have produced outstanding men in other fields: the food industry; vintners, restaurateurs, and politics where space will permit us, in passing, to mention men like Senator Pastore and Governor DiSalle of Ohio; Rosellini of Washington, Volpe of Massachusetts, and Notte of Rhode Island, and the incomparable Florello LaGuardia.

But we are proudest of our contribution to the defense of our country in all the wars America has fought. We recall the story of Francis Spicola, who though he denounced Lincoln's fratricidal war which divided the country, nevertheless formed a brigade of volunteers to defend the Republic. He was wounded in battle, leading his men, was given the Congressional Medal of Honor and was promoted to brigadier general by President Lincoln himself. Since then the number of our Medal of Honor winners has become legion.

These are the kind of Americans, Mr. Crosby, who—many millions strong—have made and are making their proud contribution to the greatness of America and who justly denounce discriminatory presentations such as "The Untouchables" for their distortion of the true image of the devoted American of Italian origin.

IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO.

file
The John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. HARTKE, Madam President, much has been written and said recently

about the John Birch Society. My good friend, Marsee Cox, the editor of the Terre Haute, Ind., Tribune, made a very candid analysis of the situation, I believe, in a recent editorial entitled "Doctrine of Hatred." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

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

DOCTRINE OF HATRED

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who has become known as the spokesman of Republican conservatism, is of two minds about the controversial John Birch Society. Recently he told newsmen that while he disagrees with its far-right theories he is "impressed by the type of people in it." They are, he thinks, "the kind we need in politics."

They are also either remarkably naive or reactionary in the nth degree. And in fairness it should be noted at once that though Goldwater is "impressed" by those attracted to the group he has specifically disavowed some of its more extreme contentions. Among these are the claims that ours is not a fit form of government with which to fight communism, that Communists have influenced Supreme Court decrees, that recent Presidents from Roosevelt through Eisenhower have been Communists or Communist tools, that Chief Justice Warren should be impeached, and so on.

The John Birch Society, founded by a wealthy retired candy maker named Robert Welch, poses a familiar dilemma. Goldwater expressed a common attitude when he said, "They are anti-Communist and I don't see how we can be against that." Of course no responsible American can be "against" anticommunism. But the question is: Should not Americans be against communism by being vigorously for the principles which have made this Nation a great citadel of freedom?

We say "Yes." We say being for those principles, and working actively to preserve and strengthen them, is far and away the most effective way to fight communism. That is something the members of the John Birch Society have yet to learn. The society's perverted appeal resorts to tactics of both communism and fascism. Whatever may be said of the people attracted to it, its doctrine of hatred is emphatically not the kind of doctrine we need in American politics.

Visit to Washington by Students and Chaperones From Metairie Park Country Day School, New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 13, 1961

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on April 12 it was my pleasure to have as my guests the senior class of the Metairie Park Country Day School. This fine institution, which is located in Metairie on the outskirts of New Orleans, has one of the loveliest settings of any school I have ever seen.

The school is dedicated to the pursuit of higher education and to the development of the kind of individual who will become a valuable citizen in this great country.

and also of the acting minority leader [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain why I shall vote for H.R. 3935 on its final passage, notwithstanding my absolute disapproval of the false definition of interstate commerce and the arbitrary classification of various enterprises set out in paragraph (s) of section 2, which appears on pages 14 and 15 of the bill, and which is designed to add a new paragraph (s) to section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. For clarity and convenience, I shall hereafter call this paragraph 3(s).

I wish to state at the outset that despite my emphatic disapproval of paragraph 3(s), I am of the opinion that H.R. 3935 is a vast improvement in at least two respects over the similar bill which the Senate debated at its post-convention session last August. In the first place, most of the provisions of H.R. 3935 are consistent with the constitutional definition of interstate commerce; and in the second place, H.R. 3935 expressly excludes from its coverage certain local enterprises which the other bill attempted to bring into the maw of Federal regulations.

Most major pieces of Federal legislation are not all good or all bad. It is inevitable that this should be so. Such legislation is obtainable only through compromise of the varying views of a majority of the 100 Members of the Senate and a majority of the 435 Members of the House.

A Senator is at liberty to seek to improve any bill by amendments until such bill is read the third time and the question of its final passage arises. When these events occur, however, the Senator must vote the completed bill up or down. If the bill contains both good and bad provisions, the Senator must base his vote on final passage upon his conclusion as to whether the good or the bad provisions predominate. Under article I of the Constitution, Congress has the power to regulate interstate commerce, which is defined in clause 3 of section 8 as commerce "among the several States." Under the 10th amendment to the Constitution, the power is reserved to each State to regulate intrastate commerce, which is commerce within such State.

As one who shares Gladstone's belief that the Constitution of the United States is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man, I believe that the power of the Congress to regulate interstate commerce and the power of the State to regulate intrastate commerce should be preserved. Indeed, in my opinion, the preservation of these two separate powers is essential to the preservation of our federal system.

For this reason, I have always favored the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which constituted a valid exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce because it restricted its coverage to the employees of industries engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce.

For a like reason, I favor the minimum wage law of North Carolina,

which establishes a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour for the employees of most industries engaged in intrastate commerce, that is, commerce within North Carolina. I am confident that the North Carolina Legislature will increase the coverage of this law and the minimum wage thereby established as soon as it finds such action on its part to be feasible.

H.R. 3935, which is to be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961," has two objects in view. The first is to increase the minimum wages of employees now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour over a period of 2 years and 4 months; and the second is to extend the coverage of the act to employees of certain enterprises not now covered.

While I am conscious of the possibility that the proposed increase in the minimum wages of those already covered by the act may work severe hardships in the case of some industries, I am satisfied that the overwhelming majority of industries employing persons now covered by the act will be able to adjust their compensation rates to the increased minimum wages without too much difficulty, and thereby enable their employees to share more fully in the fruits of their labor.

For this reason, I favor the first object of H.R. 3935 and wish to vote for its provisions increasing the minimum wages of employees already covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour over a period of 2 years and 4 months.

I would favor any reasonable extension of the benefits of the Fair Labor Standards Act to persons not now covered if such extension of coverage were confined to employees of enterprises engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce as these terms are defined in clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act itself.

But I am opposed to that portion of the second object of H.R. 3935 which is embodied in paragraph 3(s).

The opening clause of this paragraph reads as follows:

Enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce means any of the following in the activities of which employees are so engaged, including employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person.

When this opening clause is translated from legal gobbledegook into plain English, it asserts, in substance, that an enterprise is engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce if those employed in it handle, or sell, or work on goods that have been moved in times past in interstate commerce or have been produced in times past for interstate commerce by any person.

This attempted new definition of when an enterprise is engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce is absolutely inconsistent with the constitutional provi-

sion granting Congress the power to regulate commerce "among the several States," and with the constitutionally sound definitions of these same terms in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Moreover, it asserts to be true something which is obviously false.

A sale made or a service rendered within the boundaries of a single State constitutes intrastate commerce, even though the sale or the service may involve goods made in another State and shipped in interstate commerce. Both the English language and the decisions of the courts declare this to be so, and Congress cannot make it otherwise by uttering a legislative lie.

If Congress can expand its powers under the Constitution by giving false meanings to such constitutional terms as "commerce among the several States," then ordered government under a written Constitution has perished in America.

Before H.R. 3935 was read a third time and the question of its final passage arose, I did everything within my power to remove from the bill by appropriate amendments the provisions of paragraph 3(s). To this end I voted for the Holland amendment, the Monroney amendment, and the Russell amendment. Any one of these amendments would have removed the constitutional objections to the bill. Each of these amendments suffered defeat.

Notwithstanding this fact, I will vote for the bill on final passage for these reasons.

The conference committee will have an opportunity to remove the objectionable features from the bill. If this should not occur, then in my judgment the courts will be compelled to declare that the attempt to expand the powers of Congress over retail and service establishments engaged solely in intrastate commerce by the false definitions embodied in paragraph 3(s) are void under article I and the 10th amendment, and that the second object of H.R. 3935 is valid only insofar as it undertakes to extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to uncovered employees of enterprises actually engaged in interstate commerce or actually engaged in the production of goods for interstate commerce.

The courts are expressly empowered to take such action and at the same time to uphold the validity of the first object of H.R. 3935 by section 19 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which reads as follows:

If any provision of this chapter or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this chapter and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

While I do not desire to belabor the point, I have misgivings concerning the classification embodied in subsections (1) to (6) of paragraph 3(s) as to the enterprises to be embraced within the additional coverage. The classification appears to be without legal or economic rhyme or reason and might well be adjudged by the courts to constitute an arbitrary classification within the pur-

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5985

They all deserve our sincere thanks for an excellent job.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

file
JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for more than 10 years certain congressional committees have vigorously concentrated their fire on internal communism. Ignored in recent years has been the development of fascism in America in the form of a secretive organization known as the John Birch Society. This fascist group numbers in its ranks former officials of the National Association of Manufacturers, retired military leaders and a wide assortment of out-and-out crackpots. Its leader, a former candy manufacturer from Massachusetts, has written his equivalent to Hitler's "Mein Kampf," in which he ridicules democracy. He charges that former President Eisenhower is a Communist sympathizer, and he maligns many other highly respected American leaders.

Its every action and policy is contrary to the traditions of our Republic. From promoter Welch right down the line into every cell, the rightwing active members—termed by the St. Louis Post Dispatch "Birchsaps"—not only pass out disturbing comments and false charges against neighbors, against leaders in parent-teacher association groups, and even against members of the clergy and against loyal, elected and appointed government, State and local, officials. But the principles they advocate, if adopted, would turn back the clock 90 years; would repeal and rescind the 20th century.

Mr. President, Robert Welch, self-appointed vigilante, head of the John Birch Society, is keeping inviolate some personal secrets. He will not disclose publicly how many members there are in his organization. He will not disclose the names of his members. He will not inform the public of the number of cells in the John Birch Society.

Above everything else, he will not disclose the names of those silly persons who paid \$1,000 to be life members of the John Birch Society.

It goes without saying that this self-appointed "fuehrer" refuses to give any accounting for the money he receives in life memberships and in dues.

He has fixed this intake at \$24 per year for men who become members. For women, he allows a cut rate of \$12 per year.

Mr. President, Robert Welch, retired lawyer and candy manufacturer of Belmont, Mass., recently addressed an audience of 6,000, each one of whom paid \$1 admission fee. Though his demagogic speech lasted 90 minutes, he was well paid. One technique of the members of the John Birch Society, which they of course acquire from their leader, is to accuse persons who disagree with their views as being Communist sympathizers. They make these brave charges without any documentation nor justification.

We in America face an appalling threat of Communist aggression but that threat comes from Red China with its population of 650 million and from the Soviet Union with a population of more than 200 million. Members of the Birch Society claim to see Communists under neighbor's beds. Their dictator Welch, who is a self-appointed vigilante playing God with other people's patriotism, declaims he is anti-Communist. He alleges that there are 7,000 ministers of the Gospel in the United States who are Communists or Communist sympathizers. He could not name 70 nor even 7. He is guilty of uttering demagogic, untruthful, and wildly fantastic charges.

Mr. President, Dictator Franco of Spain, is also anti-Communist. Hitler and Mussolini were anti-Communists up to the time they met violent deaths. Does anticommunism alone qualify a man as a loyal American? What can serious-minded Americans really think of this man Welch who made money as a lawyer and as a candy manufacturer and now is making much more money as a promoter and denunciator? This fellow has termed former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman as "Communist sympathizers." He denounced the late John Foster Dulles and his brother, Allen Dulles, who is presently Director of our Central Intelligence Agency as pro-Communist and Communist. He is urging the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, who is a thoroughly great and loyal American and who was vice presidential candidate of the Republican Party. What can Americans think of a fellow such as this, other than that he has a wicked tongue and is a crackpot or an unscrupulous, mercenary demagog and slick promoter?

Mr. President, the facts are that we who are rank and file Americans can well consider Welch and those active in his John Birch Society as being subversive of the worst kind. While pretending to be loyal Americans, they are in reality fomenting suspicion against their neighbors, in the churches, and in the universities.

When Robert Welch states the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren is "just one of our specific objectives," he is seeking to undermine the confidence of people in a loyal and dedicated American leader while at the same time pretending that he himself is a loyal American.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy is correct in his statement that the John Birch Society "is ridiculous" and that its members "make no contribution to the fight against communism here in the United States, and in fact—if anything, they are a hindrance." The California State Senate factfinding committee on Un-American activities has announced that it has started an inquiry into the John Birch Society. Personally my view is that as not one of the members of this society, nor its leader, Welch, has committed any overt act of force and violence against constituted authority in this country, I feel there is no occasion for any congressional or legislative investigation of this secret society. Welch

has the same right all Americans cherish—to enjoy the freedom of speech.

In 1854 and 1856, members of the Know Nothing Party elected candidates to office and their candidate for President of the United States in 1856, Millard Fillmore, received many thousands of votes. They claimed that the Pope was coming to America to establish the Vatican somewhere along the Mississippi River. They denounced immigration laws and members of the Catholic Church; they termed themselves a native American party. Like a wave of hysteria, the movement spread through many States from the 1840's to 1856. Then after 1856, the "know nothing" movement died and nothing further was heard of it. Know-nothingism of 100 years ago died the same death that the John Birch Society will die of—unwept, unhonored, and unsung. Leaders of the John Birch Society are busy denouncing the whole foreign-aid program of President Eisenhower and the foreign-aid program being carried forward by this administration.

Misguided citizens who become members of the John Birch Society, even briefly, are making the battle against communism more difficult for governmental agencies such as the FBI. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has denounced activities of the sort practiced by the John Birch Society. Many persons who have become members are really men and women of good will and their motives are of the best. They have been duped by a slick promoter of a secret society whose methods are unconscionable and whose statements are fantastically false.

Mr. President, like the "know nothings" of more than 100 years ago and the "\$50 every Friday" movement of recent years, this will come and go. However, the strength and power of our Republic and the American way of life will grow and grow.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are only 6 minutes remaining for the proponents.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina, because I know the time of the proponents is getting rather short.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, perhaps I could finish in the 6 minutes. I appreciate very much the offer of the acting majority leader [Mrs. NEUBERGER]