

provisions ought to give even politicians the horrors.

Out of the \$451 million to be dished out over 4 years, \$300 million will be dispensed without benefit of Congressional review. The Treasury will just sign for it—and then go out and borrow the money, as though the Government didn't have enough debt, deficits and inflationary potential. Apparently Congress just doesn't give a hoot any more about its once-prized power of the purse, at least not when it conflicts with the vision of all those millions pouring into selected Congressional districts.

Well, no one need have supposed the present Government would be anything but active on the ward-heel political level. Even so, nearly half a billion dollars is a stiff price for turning the general good into a depressed area.

### Polish Constitution Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have many close ties with Poland, which it is my pleasure to review each May on Polish Constitution Day. The provisions of the 1791 Constitution proved that the Polish people at the end of the 18th century sought a liberal government from the medieval feudal elements, just as we had sought and won our freedom in 1783. A historian has written of the Polish Constitution:

Posterity \* \* \* joins with the best contemporary opinion in deeming the Constitution of the 3d of May one of the greatest achievements in Polish history.

For this reason the Polish people have remained true to their ideals, first expressed in this Constitution no matter where they have moved in the world. Polish immigrants to this country brought with them their love of independence; Polish people helped settle our country and built its cities and towns. They have contributed to our music and our literature. They have brought to us all the elements of their society which it has been so difficult for them to maintain under Soviet domination. Thus, I take great pleasure in honoring them on this most important day in their history.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the

third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

#### POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even into today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

In Wilmington, Del., the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware will mark the adoption of Poland's first constitution on May 7.

Participating in the observance will be the Delaware division of the Polish-American Congress. The observance will be held at Modjeska Hall, in Wilmington.

Prominent Polish and American speakers will address the gathering. St. Hedwig's Choir and children of Polish Saturday morning classes will take part in the program, as will various officials of the city of Wilmington, and of New Castle County.

The Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware recently pointed out, in announcing the plans for May 7 that:

During the past two centuries, Poland, which was the most powerful nation once, became partitioned four times; [has been] ravaged, despoiled, persecuted, and enslaved by greedy neighbors. No nation could suffer so much without leaving a deep scar.

It is the hope and prayer of Polish people everywhere that a spirit of justice, understanding, and cooperation prevail among all the nations for a glorious and lasting peace on earth and good will among men.

The committee on arrangements for the May 7 observance of Poland's Con-

stitution Day in Wilmington, Del., consists of Adam J. Rosiak, chairman; Joseph Falkowski, Ludwig Kopec, Frank J. Leski, Mrs. Frank J. Obara, and Mrs. Charles Kilczewski.

### A Lesson for Kennedy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the experienced have much of value to give to the theorists and I offer to my colleagues the following article by Ruth Montgomery, as it appeared in the Long Island Press on April 28:

NIXON'S A GOOD POKER PLAYER, AND FAR FROM  
OUT OF THE GAME

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Richard Milhous Nixon despite his Quaker upbringing learned to play poker well and profitably during World War II. This should be a warning to those who are ready to count him out of the national political arena.

The relaxed young man who is now going about the business of making a nongovernmental living for the first time in 19 years seems totally unaware of the dire predictions that he is through.

He talks with the calm assurance of a leader who expects to lead. He speaks without rancor of the erstwhile Democratic rival who defeated him by the popular vote margin of only sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent. He obviously respects his own judgment about foreign affairs, and comments on it without boasting.

He seems, in fact to be an extraordinarily well adjusted individual. In talking of the Cuban debacle, Nixon recalled the 3-hour session with Fidel Castro in his Senate office 2 years ago, and his immediate appraisal of the bearded Cuban leader as "a captive of communism."

With dispassion he commented that he was in the minority then, but that top officials at the State Department came around to his way of thinking in March of last year.

Nixon, who is a master in the art of timing, thinks and talks in the vernacular of the poker table. In speaking of our present day foreign policy, the Republican standard-bearer said it is important never to talk any bigger than we are prepared to act.

The biggest bluffer in a card game, he pointed out, is the one most likely to call your bluff, and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is a big bluffer.

The worst mistake for a poker player to make, he continued, is to throw in his hole card before it is necessary. The parallel with the abortive Cuban invasion was obvious, although he voiced no direct criticism of President Kennedy.

While the rebels were pouring into Cuban beaches, in the hope of liberating their homeland and inspiring others to defect, Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk were telling the world that the United States would not raise a finger to intervene.

This was the hole card that was turned up too soon. As a result, many Cubans were afraid to defect. By contrast, during the tense days and weeks of the Quemoy and Matsu crisis, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles carefully concealed the hole card. They left

A2952

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 1

doubt in the Communist mind as to what extent they would be willing to commit U.S. strength in the Formosa Straits. The Reds finally backed down.

Nixon suggested this analogy, even as he praised Kennedy for his courage in deciding to back the Cuban rebels. The mistake was in not being prepared to go all the way, if necessary to insure victory, when America's prestige had been so heavily committed.

It is out of character for Kennedy, who always plays politics to win, to settle for defeat in the much grimmer business of fighting guerrilla warfare with the Communists.

We are losing to the Reds in Cuba and Laos. We fear Communist coups in Iran and elsewhere. We have infuriated the Portuguese over Angola, and the Dutch over New Guinea. We are enmitizing old allies faster than we are creating new ones.

It is obvious that Nixon hopes Kennedy will find time, in the busy days ahead, to brush up on his poker game. He wants him to win for America.

*Cubafile*  
A Policy on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF  
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, much speculation, projection, and analysis has taken place during the last week concerning the recent Cuban fiasco and the role played by the United States.

While continued, exhaustive inquiry into the whys and wherefores of this lamentable operation is necessary, it is now time to turn our attention to the future; to determine what policy our country is to follow regarding Cuba.

The New York Times in a recent editorial has placed the problem confronting us in sharp perspective. The Times has wisely pointed out that—

The chief danger to the United States and the rest of Latin America is not Cuba by herself, but Cuba as a possible model for other revolutions, and Cuba as a base for the spread of anti-Yankee or communistic doctrines.

The Times goes on to emphasize a sound course of action which includes the defense of the security of the United States, but rightly places its emphasis on proving our support for the Latin American people's demands for social reform, and which proves that we ask partnership and cooperation, not subservience.

I urge my colleagues to read this editorial carefully:

A POLICY ON CUBA

What next in Cuba? The Cuban exiles have been defeated militarily and the United States, which supported them, has suffered a political defeat. However, history is not like a boxing match or a baseball game. It flows like a river. The United States and Cuba are too much intertwined by history, geography, economics, and strategy to be separated. Cuba has been caught up in the vast storm of the cold war. All the forces unleashed by the Cuban revolution are still operating.

Therefore, something has to happen, and the instinct is to say: something has to be done. The first thing to recognize is that whatever is done should not be done hastily. There must be no repetition of the incredibly inefficient intelligence analysis of the Cuban situation which preceded last week's fiasco. To those who knew the situation in Cuba and knew the formidable strength of the leaders and their regime, the outcome of such an invasion attempt was inevitable. And even had it succeeded, the CIA concept of putting in a rightwing government that would have been branded as a Yankee creation was dreadfully wrong. It is obvious that the first step must be to reorganize the personnel and methods of the Federal officials dealing with the Cuban problem today. Any policy, any action to be taken in the future must be based on an accurate assessment of the situation.

There are certain developments that would force the United States to act; and such action would be fully understood by the world at large. If the Russians, for instance, were to set up missile bases or move in with a dangerous degree of military support; if Americans were killed and the lives of the remaining Americans were jeopardized; if Premier Castro were to attack Guantanamo Bay or mount military invasions against his Caribbean neighbors—in such cases the United States would, of course, have to intervene directly, and presumably so would other members of the Organization of American States.

Barring such obviously dangerous, although unlikely, developments the United States should not intervene. Why not? The grave political consequences; the blow to the moral standards and principles by which we live and which are a source of strength in the cold war; the fact that armed intervention without the clearest provocation would reduce our policies to a crude contest in power politics; the loss of needed allies; the perilous international complications—these are the results that would flow from such armed intervention by the United States in Cuba.

Even more basic than our differences in economic system is our philosophic difference with the Communists; we believe in freedom and the rule of law among individuals and among nations. This is the essence of what America stands for in the world, and it is our greatest source of strength. We must preserve it.

The hegemony of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is threatened for the first time in a century. It can only be defended by a positive, creative policy, one that builds. Of course, we are strong enough to crush the Castro regime, but to do so by force would lose us far more than we could gain. It is hard to be patient under such provocation and defeat as we have experienced. Yet it is the mark of true strength to take both defeat and victory in one's stride.

The chief danger to the United States and the rest of Latin America is not Cuba by herself, but Cuba as a possible model for other revolutions, and Cuba as a base for the spread of anti-Yankee or communistic doctrines. How to counter the creeping subversion of the totalitarians is the great problem for the free world, as President Kennedy has recognized. It cannot be done by adopting their methods. That would be to surrender.

Defend the security of the United States. Continue by all legal means to encourage the anti-Batista, anti-Castro Cuban exiles in their determination to establish a free and democratic regime with social justice. They must not be abandoned.

Above all prove—by deeds not just words—that we are determined to support the de-

mands for social reforms throughout Latin America; that we are not merely anti-Communist; that we will oppose rightwing, reactionary military dictatorships as we do leftwing, communistic dictatorships; that we ask partnership and cooperation, not subservience. This is the only kind of "intervention" that can permanently succeed in Latin America.

Forgotten Remedy for the Voteless Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF  
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the January 21, 1961 issue of the Nation. This excellent discussion of the 14th amendment to the Constitution is of particular importance to this body and should be of interest to us all:

FORGOTTEN REMEDY FOR THE VOTELESS NEGRO  
(By Thomas I. Emerson and Arthur E. Bonfield)

In the current debate over methods of assuring the Negro in the South his right to vote, very little attention has been paid to section 2 of the 14th amendment. For many years major interest in this amendment has focused on section 1, which prohibits the States from denying to any person due process of law or equal protection of the laws. Not many people are aware that those who framed and adopted the 14th amendment viewed section 2, rather than section 1, as its most important provision.

Section 2 provides that representatives in Congress "shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed."

But (it continues) when the right to vote at any election (for Federal or State offices) is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

In addition to section 2 an almost unknown statute, originally passed in 1872 and still on the books, contains the same requirement.

Neither the constitutional provision nor the statute has ever been successfully invoked to reduce the representation of any State in Congress. This failure to adhere to the plain language of our Constitution and law is a continuing national scandal. The matter is now of particular importance for two reasons.

In the first place, there is serious doubt that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, or indeed any legislation based upon judicial procedures, can effectively secure the Negro's right to vote. Thus three of the six members of the Civil Rights Commission, in the first report of that body, characterized proposals for amendment of existing laws as stopgap measures. They urged the adoption of a constitutional amendment eliminating all restrictions upon the right to vote except

A2968

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 1

than anything else to make the Nation over which I fly the greatest and most wonderful in the world.

My white stripes mark me as the emblem of the land of the free, the country in which the oppressed of the world may enjoy equality and liberty.

The blue in my field of stars stands for loyalty. It is the true blue. It tells the story of thousands of men and women who have been loyal to their country through suffering and hardships.

I signify the law of the land.

I stand for the Constitution of the United States.

I represent the Declaration of Independence, the birth certificate of the American Nation.

I stand for peace and goodwill among the nations of the world.

I control the strong, protect the weak, relieve suffering, and do all I can for the betterment of mankind.

I stand for tolerance toward men of all creeds and races.

I reflect the wealth and grandeur of this great land of opportunity.

I tell the story of the achievements and progress of the American people in art and science, culture and literature, inventions and commerce, transportation and industry.

I am the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

I am whatever you make me, nothing more. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I am fear and song, struggle and hope.

I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all you hope that I can be. I am the American flag.

### Unanswered Question

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following editorial appearing in the March 13, 1961, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

Mr. Kennedy announced at his latest news conference that the Government intended to put an extra \$660 million into the purchase of equipment and supplies before the end of the fiscal year on June 30. This was represented as evidence of Washington's intention to pep up the economy and provide jobs.

The announcement prompted a reporter to inquire what had become of the sonorous statement in Mr. Kennedy's inauguration address, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

The questioner remarked that there had been considerable comment that the Kennedy program up to now has been designed to show what the Government can try to do for the people. He asked when the reverse might be expected to set in.

Mr. Kennedy's reply was not very responsive, but seemed to suggest that before the horse can support some of the extra weight to be assigned by the Government in the future, it must be fed up and returned to form.

Well, we think both the question and the answer avoided the real effects of the Kennedy administration program. It isn't so much what the Government can do for the people, or the people for the Government, as

what the administration can do for the administration. This particular \$660 million is being spent by the Government on itself. It will procure goods and services for the bureaucracy and will build up the sinews of big government. If there is primary benefit, it is to the political managers who run the operation.

So the phrasing, more appropriately, might have been: "Ask not what you can do for the Kennedy administration, for you aren't going to be consulted anyway."

### The Will To Win

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is an interesting article on Laos, as written by Marguerite Higgins for the May 1 issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

WHO WON'T FIGHT?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.

"The Chinese won't fight."

It's hard, isn't it, to wrench the mind back to the pre-Korean, dust-settling days of China when the successive defeats sending Chiang Kai-shek to exile were explained away with such reasons as "the Chinese (meaning the non-Communist Chiang Kai-shek Chinese) won't fight"? Then came the day when the reasons for partitioning Vietnam included the charge that "the Vietnamese (those on our side, of course) won't fight." And now we are told that "the Lao won't fight."

But is it really true? And how does it come about that the only Asians that won't fight are the Asians on our side?

It's an important question, this issue of what Asian will or won't fight. The fighting capabilities of the Royal Lao Army, or rather the alleged lack of fighting capabilities, are being used by those who favor letting Laos go down the drain even if this inescapably does let every nation know that we shall not, after all, "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty \* \* \*," as President Kennedy put it 101 days ago.

And let every American know that if the bell tolls for Laos the bell will indeed be tolling for him in that it can well mean the beginning of the end of the West in Asia.

For, thanks to Laos (and contrary to popular myth), time has been our friend in southeast Asia. It has been the high mountains of Laos and its tangled jungles that have provided the buffer between Communist Red China and Communist-controlled North Vietnam and the crucial countries of the area and insured their geographical separation from direct military pressure and subversion.

Look at a map and one glance will show how the existence of a non-Communist Laos brought time—the vital time Malaya had to have in its own fight against Communist guerrillas; time for Burma to bring its own Communist Party into line; time for Thailand to build its army and resistance to the so-called free Thai movement being nurtured by Pelping-recruited exiles on Red Chinese soil; time for Cambodia to embark on a policy of neutralism and the geographical immunity that permitted Prince Sihanouk to practice it; and time for South Vietnam to

pursue its gallant fight against the relentless Communist infiltration from the north and time through free elections to restore its good name in a world where the West is far more preoccupied with rapping those on its side than in considering what Communists do to the little people in places like North Vietnam and Red China.

Now, back to the fighting fronts. In Laos today a lot of towns are falling and victories being claimed in the name of Lao. The Communists would have us believe that the Buddha-loving Lao on our side let Buddha get in the way of fighting, but that the Buddha-loving Lao on the Communist side are military heroes.

Some Lao do, of course, fight and fight well (even those on our side) as this correspondent can attest after experiencing frontline combat conditions in Indochina with Lao and having also a basis of comparison in frontline combat conditions with Koreans and Chinese.

But no Lao, even be he a Communist, is going to change from an irregular guerrilla without anything bigger than burp gun into a skilled artilleryman (and the barrage against Muong Sal was a very model of destructive accuracy) in the short months since the Soviet December airlift first began providing these weapons in great numbers. The United States has been so busy tearing down the admitted exaggerations of the Royal Lao about Communist Vietminh battalions that it has failed to make clear to the world (or to itself?) the critical importance of the fact—and it is a fact—that Communist Vietminh officers counseled by Soviet advisers and aided by Vietminh and Soviet technicians have been firing the artillery and directing the Lao units in battle. There are about 1,000 non-Lao officers in active combat on the Red side.

And why, speaking of will to win, has the United States stood idly by and counted Soviet airlift airplanes instead of letting the Royal Lao army shoot them down? If a precedent is needed the Communists have shot down our planes in Laos.

Said a Lao official: "You belittle our courage. Yet every time we want to do something like shoot down a Soviet plane you say that this escalates the war."

When the Communists increase their artillery, when they openly show their Vietminh officers, then belatedly our side is permitted to take steps along the same line, only usually less. You Americans admit now they have 1,000 foreign soldiers fighting with them. But—because of world opinion—you refused until the 11th hour to even put the American advisers in uniform. World opinion inhibits you. It doesn't inhibit them. How could anybody win under these conditions?"

### Is the John Birch Society a Menace?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JAMES B. UTT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial written by Mr. William K. Shearer, publisher of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Banner in Oceanside, Calif. The editorial is entitled "Is the John Birch Society a Menace?" and is, I believe, the best exposé of the massive propaganda campaign launched against the John

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2967

Local civil defense officials, he pointed out, are on duty only from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. Civil defense headquarters is closed from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m. and on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays.

"I am not a defeatist, but a realist," he said. "I do believe the people should be told exactly what they face and that realistic discussions should be engaged in by competent authorities beginning at the national level."

Commissioner Ormond R. Bean said Earl's statement was a fair one and wasn't so sure it represented a minority view. However, he said, "I don't feel that I am in a position to say the mayor isn't right (in supporting the local civil defense effort)."

## PRESIDENT CALLS ALERT

Commissioner Mark A. Grayson, who is presiding over the city council in the absence of Mayor Terry D. Schruck said that under the circumstances he would participate in the exercise. Schruck is in Honolulu.

As a veteran of two wars, Grayson said, "I feel that any precautions at this time are better than none at all. The President has called this alert and we have been notified by the Governor. It behooves us to do something about it."

*Cuba free*  
The President's Decision on Cuba

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as we stand behind our President and await his leadership in the Cuban situation, Gould Lincoln writes an interesting article, which appeared in the Washington Star on April 27:

CURE FOR CASTROISM STILL ELUSIVE  
(By Gould Lincoln)

The search for a scapegoat in the failure of the Cuban anti-Castro invasion may be interesting, and even valuable, but it is not going to settle the problem which a Communist Cuba presents. Eventually the United States, either with or without the support of the rest of the American Republics, will have to act to get rid of Fidel Castro and his government or resign itself to seeing world communism—with Soviet Russia in its forefront—move in a big way into the Western Hemisphere. Since the days of President Monroe the United States has been firm in its determination to prevent the encroachment of any European country upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere. Spain's grip on South and Central America was broken by the efforts of the peoples of these Latin American countries. And in 1898 the United States went to war with Spain and set Cuba free. It would be tragic, and probably fatal to our own freedom, to allow Russia to move in and take the dictatorial position which Spain once occupied in this Western Hemisphere.

How long can the United States—and the other American Republics—afford to wait before acting? The Monroe Doctrine, enunciated by the United States so long ago, and the Caracas agreement entered into by the American Republics in 1954, both pledging to prevent foreign advances into the Western Hemisphere, are solid grounds for action. President Kennedy has sought the support of the principal political leaders of this country, Republican and Democratic, in this

crisis. These leaders, including former President Eisenhower, former Vice President Nixon, and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York, all Republicans, have said the President must be supported. What steps the President will decide upon are still to be revealed.

## STOPS PARTISAN POLITICS

President Kennedy has assumed full responsibility for not preventing the ill-fated Cuban invasion by anti-Castro forces, trained and armed here in the United States and in other not-too-distant places. He has not sought to place the blame for U.S. policy in this respect on former President Eisenhower and his administration. He stepped promptly on his Secretary of the Interior, former Representative Udall, of Arizona, when Mr. Udall in a television broadcast commented that the plans for the invasion had been made in one administration (the Eisenhower administration) and then turned over to the Kennedy administration to be carried out. This was seized upon by several Republican spokesmen as a partisan political move on the part of a Kennedy Cabinet member. This is no time for partisan politics.

One reason for the failure of the anti-Castro Cuban invasion lay in the fact that there was no second line either of attack or defense. If there was one, it appears to have been abandoned. President Kennedy's error was his statement, made when Castro began screaming "invasion," that this country would not send military forces to intervene in Cuba. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democratic whip of the Senate, following a breakfast of the Democratic congressional leaders with the President on Tuesday, is reported to have reiterated there will be no U.S. invasion of Cuba. Why should such assertions be made? Especially when it may turn out invasion is the only way in which to deal with this Communist menace in Cuba. Why give Castro and his Russian backers this assurance and so encourage them to strengthen the hold of Communist dictatorship in Cuba, militarily and otherwise?

## PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

Meanwhile, various proposals of what to do about Cuba have been advanced. One is to cut off all trade between this country and Cuba—already almost entirely curtailed. A second is an economic blockade. A third, suggested by a Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, is for an immediate meeting of the Latin American heads of government, in conjunction with representatives of this country, perhaps in Venezuela, to discuss the Cuban issue and to arrive at an agreement on what should be done. A fourth proposal came from Senator DODD, Democrat of Connecticut, who told the Senate there should be an immediate blockade of arms shipments from Soviet Russia to Castro's Cuba, and a stern warning that Soviet military aircraft will not be tolerated over Caribbean waters.

The Connecticut Senator said that if this country had given the Cuban Freedom Fighters the proper air support, their invasion of Cuba last week would have succeeded. He added: "I say we should have done so, and that we should be prepared to do so. We can no longer tolerate a situation in which a Quisling totalitarian regime, directed at the subversion of the entire Western Hemisphere, is able to maintain its hold over the Cuban people because of massive quantities of arms placed in its hands by the Kremlin."

Castro and the Communists in Cuba are, at the present, much more of a threat to the Latin American republics in the Caribbean and South America than they are to the United States—which Castro has not

the force to attack. He might, indeed, be able by subversion and force of arms to overthrow some of these other governments and make possible Communist regimes, unless he is effectively checked. Eight of these Latin American countries have no diplomatic relations with the Castro government, six have broken such relations, two not having had such relations. The six which have broken off relations with Castro are the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Peru and Honduras. Haiti and Paraguay have not had such relations.

## I Am the American Flag

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of participating in the dedication ceremony of a branch post office in the Monmouth Shopping Center, Eatontown, Monmouth County, N.J.

On this occasion a brief speech was read by a young man named Edmund Labuda, Jr., who attends the Red Bank Catholic High School, Red Bank, N.J., being a member of the freshman class. Young Labuda's father is a member of the post office staff at Eatontown, N.J. He read his address in an impressive and dignified manner, and I am glad to have permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

## I AM THE AMERICAN FLAG

Since the time of my birth many stories have been told about me. Now I feel it is my duty to tell you what I am and for what I stand.

Born during the Nation's infancy, I have grown with it, my stars increasing number as the country has grown in size. The domain over which I wave is now expanded until the sun on my flying now never sets.

I am not only an emblem showing the authority of the United States, indicating supremacy when flying over land, possession when flying over Government buildings, power when displayed by troops—I mean much more than that. I represent the ideals and traditions, the principles and institutions, the hopes and aspirations which constitute what is to mankind the greatest nation in the world, the American Nation.

Stirring are the stories of my stars and stripes. My 13 red and white stripes recall the history of that long, bitter 8-year struggle in which the Thirteen Colonies fought and stood side by side for freedom, exemplifying the principle that "In union there is strength."

Each of my stars tells the story of a great and sovereign State which has entered the Union.

Filled with significance are my colors of red, white, and blue into which have been woven the courage and strength of Americans.

The red in my stripes proclaims the courage that inspires men to face danger and to do what is right. The strength and courage of American manhood from the conquest of the wilderness by the pioneer through the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict has done more

Having driven off the bombers the fighter planes secured control of the air and went about seeking two invasion ships with vital ammunition and radio communications equipment. Then they joined the heavy tanks in driving the invaders off the beach-head and into the surrounding swamps.

About 45 hours after the landing operation was initiated, Capt. Roberto San Roman, commander of the Cuban expeditionary force, sent an urgent appeal to Washington for air support. Unless this was forthcoming within a few hours, he reported, the entire operation would have to be abandoned. He spoke from a walkie-talkie to a ship which relayed his message.

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., Deputy Director of the CIA, alerted some of the key men in Washington. These advisers awoke President Kennedy at 2 a.m., April 19, and discussed the crisis for 2 hours. They argued in favor of fighter air support from the American aircraft carrier in the Caribbean in a last attempt to save the situation.

But it was too late. A naval communications snag developed and before anything could be done, even if there had been a disposition to do anything, it was all over. The invasion force was trapped in the swamps, and Castro had scored the greatest victory of his career.

Another desperate attempt to save the situation was made just before dawn of Thursday, April 20. Cargo planes and two B-26's tried to ferry fresh supplies to the beach-head, but were shot down.

The pilot who related part of this account was standing by at his base at 9 a.m. that day, ready to return to the beachhead. But before he could take off, word arrived that the last resistance had been snuffed out.

He survived to level this bitter attack against those responsible for the operation: "It was a crime to commit us to war in which we were denied the right to destroy the enemy fighter force and were denied fighters of our own so as to be able to defend ourselves."

## Russian Flight Into Space: Triumph or Disgrace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a letter from my constituent which places the achievement of the Russians in putting a man in space in its proper perspective:

LOS ALTOS, CALIF., April 19, 1961.

DEAR Mr. GUBSER: Enclosed is a newspaper editorial which very well describes the sacrifices which have been required of the Russian people in order for their country to be first in space. Before we embark on any crash program to catch the Russians in space we should well consider the points brought out in this editorial.

No doubt there will be many who will propose panic-type programs to catch the Soviets. As for myself I want to know how much any of these crash programs will cost me in additional taxes per month. And more important yet I want to know how much more of my American freedom I must sacrifice, for I am not willing to become a

slave to the state so that I can "catch up to the Soviets."

Those who tire of being second should bear in mind that we lead the entire world in liberty and justice and the dignity of the individual. One Soviet citizen has experienced a ride around the earth in space, yet no Soviet citizen has experienced the blessings that the least U.S. citizen has inherited as his inalienable right; namely, freedom. Let them try to catch us in this respect.

In the meantime let us maintain and exploit our advantage.

Very truly yours,

W. ASHLEY CHAPMAN.

[From the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, Apr. 17, 1961]

RUSSIAN FLIGHT INTO SPACE: TRIUMPH OR DISGRACE?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Not by any means the greatest "feat" in world history, but in many respects the biggest disgrace—this is another way to look at the successful launching of a man into outer space by the Soviets.

Millions of human beings in Russia live six to a room in slums and in hovels, while millions of others work in slave-labor camps. Billions of dollars that should be expended to lift the living standards of a nation are spent instead for one of the most spectacular propaganda stunts of all times.

For what else is it? Is human life improved because a small vehicle travels in the sky at about the same distance from the earth as New York is from Wilmington or Baltimore? Was human life further advanced because in 1957 the first Sputnik sped around the earth in an hour and a half? Today the United States continues to have "sputniks" in orbit around the globe and the Russians have one. Has any human being felt any benefits from such stunts?

President Kennedy stated, in a nutshell, at his Wednesday press conference the simple truth about the Soviet's cruel disregard of human welfare as it concentrates on propaganda stunts. He said: "A dictatorship enjoys advantages in this kind of competition over a short period, by its ability to mobilize its resources for a specific purpose."

This is the real reason for the Soviet achievement in sending the first man into outer space. The United States could have done it even earlier if it had decided to take away from other necessary things the money to spend on space research. As it is, the people of the Soviet Union are deprived of the benefits of better living.

It is significant that one of the big rewards to the new "hero of the Soviet Union" is that he will be permitted to have a four-room apartment for himself, wife, and two children, instead of the two rooms he has heretofore been allotted.

In the not-far-distant future, the United States, too, will be sending a man around the world a couple hundred miles above ground. Someday also there'll be a flight to the moon and to other planets. But, as a practical matter, these stunts cost vast sums and the question is whether humanity can afford them.

The biggest achievement to look forward to is some way to talk to all the Russian people at one time and to persuade them to get rid of the dictatorship that terrifies the world and inflicts misery on human beings everywhere.

As for "discoveries," the biggest of all times is still that of Christopher Columbus, who found the land where freedom and liberty can flourish as it does today. Someday the Russian people, too, can enjoy the benefits of that same discovery.

## To Those Who Are Afraid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. RALPH HARVEY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star of March 28, 1961:

TO THOSE WHO ARE AFRAID

Following our recent defense of the House Un-American Activities Committee, we received a letter from a college student who says he is a loyal American, but is afraid of this House committee:

"I am an American and I am afraid," he writes. "I am afraid that a committee such as HUAC would twist my words around to prove, or should I say to show evidence, that I hold undemocratic ideas. \* \* \* Would I be able to speak against some part of the Government, say HUAC, without being called a Communist or a Communist dupe? Would I be presumed to be innocent, or would I have to prove my innocence by denouncing my beliefs or opinions?"

Apparently this student is indeed afraid. He was afraid to sign his name. He says he believes himself to be only one of many young citizens who have such fears.

How about it? Are his fears groundless? Or are they realistic?

Our student didn't explain the beliefs he holds which he thinks might bring him before the Un-American Activities Committee. So we don't know whether he really has reason to be afraid, or not.

Does the committee twist the words of a witness to create a false impression that the witness is disloyal? There's no way to prove this, either way. Let's say that sometimes it may happen. But far more often the witness himself twists and contorts his own words in efforts to avoid questions he does not want to answer.

Witnesses before this committee most often come into the headlines—and into trouble with the courts, loss of jobs and loss of reputation—over two kinds of questions. In one kind the committee is trying to get from the witness a flat statement as to whether he is loyal, or has been involved in subversive activities or connections. The other kind includes questions aimed at any knowledge the witness may have of other persons involved in activities with which the committee is concerned.

If a person is loyal, why should he fear or resent being asked if he is? If he has not engaged in subversive activities, or has done so only innocently and unwittingly, why should he be afraid to talk about that? If he is himself loyal, but knows persons of activities that may be subversive, does not his own loyalty compel him to disclose what he knows? A person sure of his own loyalty has no need to fear the questions of the Un-American Activities Committee.

But if a person knows himself to be disloyal, has knowingly joined disloyal groups or activities, then he has every reason to be afraid of the committee. The only way out we have to suggest is to make a clean breast of it and then set out to salvage himself.

Can a witness speak against the Government, against the committee itself, without being called a Communist or a Communist dupe? Well, that depends. If what he has to say follows the Communist line, he should be prepared to defend it vigorously

The black eye a small minority has given the labor movement affects all of us.

A case in point is a recent statement by Senator McCLELLAN.

The McClellan hearings built up steam for the Landrum-Griffith law. This law put the clamps on the officials of dishonest unions. But it also put the clamps on honest unions. Thus, it hurts you and me.

This month, Senator McCLELLAN demanded still more restrictive legislation. He claimed "stronger laws are needed in some areas to protect working people who are members of some unions."

Such may be the case. But we are sure antiunion employers and lawmakers will clap their hands in glee.

To paraphrase President Crowell's words, the Landrum-Griffin law does not differentiate between clean unions and corrupt ones.

We hope President Crowell is right in predicting that gangsterism in unions will decline in the next 2 years. However, we hope it doesn't take a new Landrum-Griffin law to do it.

Another remark by President Crowell is also worth repeating. Crowell predicted the recession will make more members turn out for union meetings. We agree that this is fine.

But, as Crowell pointed out, there are some unions whose leaders "have forgotten how to lead." And, in these unions, greater membership participation will cause trouble.

No union member or officer should forget that the union exists for the rank-and-file membership.

Both President Crowell and Executive Secretary Robert S. Ash stressed the importance of electing friends of labor. This applies to everything from the board of education to the President of the United States.

Alameda County's clean, vigorous labor movement has an outstanding record in this respect.

Many labor councils and federations give lip service to the fact that gains over the bargaining table can be lost through anti-labor ordinances, laws, and court rulings.

In Alameda County, we do something about it.

As a result, most of the county's legislators are friends of labor. Governor Brown and President Kennedy carried Alameda County by big margins.

*Cubafile*  
The Cuban Affair

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a report on the Cuban fiasco, with the conclusions formed by Joseph Newman of the New York Herald Tribune. The article appeared in this morning's issue:

SEARCH FOR THE GUILTY IN THE CUBAN AFFAIR: THIS IS ONE VERDICT

(By Joseph Newman<sup>1</sup>)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—President Kennedy's top foreign policy advisers, anxious to

<sup>1</sup>The writer of this article—Joseph Newman—is the chief United Nations correspondent of the Herald Tribune, and was the author of this newspaper's recent series, "Cuba—S.S.R.?" which exposed the extent to which Castro has allied himself with the Communists. Newman was the Herald Tribune's roving Latin American correspondent for several years and before that was stationed in Moscow.

protect the United States from worldwide condemnation, watered down the battle plan for the invasion of Cuba to the point where it was virtually doomed to failure from the outset.

This is one of the major conclusions that emerge from questioning of American and Cuban participants in the abortive scheme to bring down the pro-Communist regime of Fidel Castro. They were interviewed in the three principal centers of the invasion operation—New York, Miami and Washington.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk is scheduled to appear tomorrow at a closed-door hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America to testify about the administration's handling of the Cuban invasion.

The committee also plans to hear Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Dulles originally was scheduled to testify tomorrow, but when it became known that Mr. Rusk would appear, the testimony of Mr. Dulles was put off "until a later time," possibly Tuesday.

The special investigation, now being undertaken by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor at President Kennedy's request, is almost certain to reach this final conclusion: The military support provided by Washington was enough to compromise the United States in the eyes of the world, but it was too little to give the invading Cuba force a fair chance of overthrowing Castro.

The blame must fall in the first instance on the military-intelligence side (the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Central Intelligence Agency) as well as on the foreign policy advisers. These two groups entered into a compromise between military needs and international political considerations. The compromise resulted in failure.

President Kennedy, in the last analysis, acceded to the compromise, and he authorized the operation, in its crippled form, to proceed against heavy odds.

The plan to invade Cuba with a relatively insignificant force of 1,400 Cuban exiles was based on two broad assumptions: (1) control of the air to secure a beachhead, and (2) snowballing support from the Cuban people, once the invading force could demonstrate that its foothold was secure and that it was on the march.

These two prerequisites for success were severely impaired by restrictions insisted on by three of President Kennedy's chief foreign policy advisers—Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Under Secretary Chester Bowles, and Adlai E. Stevenson, American Ambassador to the United Nations.

Other key advisers—McGeorge Bundy, Walter W. Rostow, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—apparently went along with these restrictions.

#### WHAT LACK OF AIR COVER MEANT

The circumstances are reliably reported to have been as follows:

The Cuban expeditionary force had a small fleet of cargo planes and B-26 bombers. It had no fighter protection for this fleet or for the beachhead, once established. President Kennedy refused to provide air cover, available from nearby Florida bases or from an American aircraft carrier which was cruising in the Caribbean.

In the absence of air cover, the only alternative on which the invasion plan could proceed was the total destruction of Castro's small air force. Intelligence services estimated the force consisted of 20 aircraft: 12 B-26 bombers, 5 British-built Sea Fury propeller-driven fighters, and 3 T-33 jet fighter-trainers.

The surprise dawn attack on Castro's principal airfields on April 15, just 2 days before the invasion force landed on the southern coast of Cuba, was intended to destroy the dictator's fighter-plane force. Rebel Cuban pilots who carried out the raids with their B-26 bombers reported after returning to their secret Caribbean bases that the opera-

tion had been completely successful. They took aerial photographs to support their contention.

But photographs are not always conclusive evidence and the strategic plan called for two more attacks on the Cuban airfields to provide absolute assurance that not a single one of Castro's fighter planes had survived to imperil the entire venture. These attacks by the B-26 bombers was to take place just before the dawn landings at Bahia de Cochinos (Bay of Pigs) on April 17.

They were vetoed by Rusk, Bowles, and Stevenson. The three men were alarmed by Castro's outcries following the first B-26 attack. Charges of aggression were leveled against the United States at a special meeting of the U.N. General Assembly only a few hours after the attack.

The three foreign policy advisers argued that additional attacks would make it impossible for them to uphold the official U.S. contention that this country was not a direct participant in the Cuban attack, and to answer charges that the United States was committing acts of aggression in violation of the United Nations Charter and provisions of the Organization of American States.

For the same reason the three vetoed two other important provisions of the original invasion plan. These called for a direct radio appeal to Cubans to rebel against Castro and the showering of the island republic with leaflets calling on the Cuban people to rise up in revolt.

The radio appeal was to be made by Jose Miro Cardona, head of the Cuban revolutionary council, and the leaflets were to be dropped by the rebel bombers.

By prior arrangement with the leaders of the anti-Castro underground, in Cuba, these were to serve as the twin signals for nationwide sabotage and the beginning of an uprising.

When these signals failed to appear, the underground leaders assumed that something had gone wrong and they were immobilized by uncertainty. Before they could even establish what had happened, Castro, by wholesale arrests in all the key population centers, was able to disarm them.

Forbidden by Washington to transmit the prerecorded revolutionary call by Dr. Miro Cardona, radio SWAN, situated on an island off Honduras and used by the rebels for propaganda warfare against the Castro regime, hastily substituted a message that said: "Alert! Alert! Look well at the rainbow. The first will rise very soon."

But this and the rest of the message proved meaningless to the underground leaders in Cuba. If anything, it meant that something had gone awry.

Much has been written about the failure of the Cuban people to revolt in support of the anti-Castro forces. The fact of the matter is that the landing operation never reached a point where the Cuban masses were put to a real choice between Castro and his enemies.

Contrary to widespread reports, the first part of the landing operation went off pretty much as planned, with the unloading only slightly slower than scheduled and the approach of Castro's ground forces and guns slightly faster than expected.

#### CASTRO PLANES APPEAR

What spread dismay and destruction was the appearance of a handful of fighter planes. The surprise bombings of April 15 had wiped out only two-thirds of Castro's air force. According to a rebel pilot who participated in the battle, five British-made Sea Furies and two American-made T-33 jet trainers survived. These were enough to decide the outcome of the contest and give Castro a smashing victory.

The fighters were able to prevent the rebel bombers from carrying out one of their principal missions: to destroy Castro's heavy Soviet tanks and artillery.