

1963

version of the Common Market. Its independent behavior and successful development set an instructive example for other members of the Soviet bloc. Above all, Yugoslavia is a living manifestation of the fact that a country may be Marxist without being a satellite of the Soviet Union or serving its political purposes.

And beyond this, Yugoslavia is something more.

If one looks at this country for what it is, and resists the temptation to lump all "Communists" together for mass condemnation, it is clear enough that common slogans and quotations from Marx cover a very large spectrum of political and social attitudes within the Communist world. The simple fact is that the contradictions which separate the Yugoslavs from say the Communist Chinese are a good deal more fundamental than the contradictions which divide Yugoslavia from the West.

EXERT GREATER INFLUENCE

It would be an exaggeration perhaps to describe the system in Yugoslavia as liberal. The Yugoslavs themselves prefer the word "progressive" in contrast to the "reactionary" outlook of their Chinese comrades. Yet it is no exaggeration at all to say that communism as it exists here is unique. And that in the historical development of communism throughout the world Yugoslavia may well exert the greater influence in the long run.

When it comes to the internal system a certain degree of caution is advisable. For an outsider—or for that matter for the average Yugoslav—it is hard to say exactly how the system works. What one can say with reasonable assurance is that Yugoslavia has gone further in the process of decentralization both in political control and in the control of the means of production than any other Communist country in the world.

This principle of decentralization is firmly written into the new Yugoslav Constitution adopted this spring. Though it assures Tito's position as president of the country for the rest of his life (he is now 70) it also assures that no one in the future will exercise the same amount of personal leadership. Presidential terms are fixed by law as in the United States to two 4-year terms. Less important positions are fixed except in special circumstances to single 4-year terms.

ALLOWS FOR DEBATE

Though, as in all Communist systems there is only one party, there is room in the Yugoslav political setup for very considerable dissent and debate. The process, as one observer describes it, operates more like that of a board of directors who agree on objectives but argue over ways and means of achieving them.

The new constitution provides, among other things, for four separate houses of parliament which, together with a Federal chamber, legislate in specific fields of economics, education and culture, social welfare and health and political organization. Some American political theorists see in this system a possible improvement on our own system of congressional committees.

Apart from its central political organization, the all pervading authority of the normal Communist state is notably subdued in Yugoslavia. Police activity is restricted and political prisoners are few. Within limits freedom of expression is tolerated and legal protections for the individual are being increased. Religious freedom is guaranteed by the Constitution and, after a brief experiment in collectivization of farms, 84 percent of agricultural property is now privately owned.

In the economic organization of the country, the principle of decentralization in theory at least, goes even further. Under the general blueprint of successive 5-year plans, control, and development of industrial enterprises—from beer factories to hotels to

iron mines and railroads—lie in the hands of separate workers' collectives. Workers councils name their own directors, raise their own money and, again in theory at least, decide on the distribution of profits.

ENCOURAGES MERGERS

Once again, a degree of caution is necessary. Most certainly the central government through its control of central banks and other mechanisms exerts a very real degree of control over a system which otherwise might come close to anarchy. It encourages mergers between competing enterprises, discourages foreign competition and generally sees to it that the economic development of the country conforms with the overall plan.

Even so, however, in a country approximately the size of North Dakota there are some 29 separate railroad systems. If it continues in its present tendencies the economic organization of the country will inevitably lead to what one observer describes wryly as the "restoration of many features of a capitalist economy" with the single proviso of collective ownership.

It is not, however simply the nature of its internal development or the fact that Yugoslavia has managed to dispense with some of the more disagreeable aspects of communism that sets it at the other end of the spectrum from a country like Communist China. For more fundamental in this regard is Yugoslavia's attitude toward the non-Communist world. And most specifically the attitude of its leaders on the issue of peace and war.

This is, of course, the great issue that divides the Communist world today. It lies at the heart of the Chinese charge that the Yugoslav leaders are revisionist, while they, the Chinese, are the true disciples of Marx and Lenin. It is the basis for the growing dispute between China and the Soviet Union upon which the whole future of the Communist movement depends. And in this dispute Yugoslavia plays in its own right a singularly important and prophetic role.

In its approach to the non-Communist world, as in its internal development, Yugoslavia has been on the side of pragmatism as opposed to dogma since Stalin's day.

"You must understand," a Yugoslav intellectual explained to me, "That when we speak of 'capitalist' we are speaking of the system as we knew it—as it existed here and in Eastern Europe before the war. In many ways it was almost like the capitalist system that Marx wrote about in the 19th century. We realize of course that it does not much resemble the system in Western Europe or in the United States today."

CHAMPIONED COEXISTENCE

Thus when a leader like Mr. Kardelj speaks of the "disintegration of capitalism," he is speaking of the dissolution of a system which, for all practical purposes, has long since ceased to exist. His own revisionism consists of the bold assertion that "since the time of Marx and Lenin the world has continued to change, that capitalism has changed in many features, and that socialism too has changed in many features—these changes, of course, taking place in two different directions."

Thus also, since the days of Stalin, the Yugoslavs have championed the idea of "active coexistence" with the West, rejecting the idea of the forcible imposition of the Communist system on other countries and the Chinese theories about the inevitability of war between the "socialist" and "capitalist" worlds. Peace, in the Yugoslav book, is in the elementary interest of socialism as it is in the elementary interest of humanity as a whole.

All this, of course, is quite incompatible with the whole basis for Chinese doctrine and policy. From their point of view it represents a fatal heresy and a very real threat to their own position of power and influence within the Communist world.

With Soviet Russia edging cautiously in the direction of a similar "revisionism" of its own, the stakes are enormous. And the interest of the West in the outcome of the struggle is no less than that of the countries directly involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin concerning the article written by Mr. Noyes. I read the article. There seems to be a paradox between the recitation of facts and the conclusion which he draws from those facts. In the article he points out the repetition with which Tito has proclaimed his devotion to communism. Time and again Tito has reiterated his subscription to the Communist philosophy. Then he points out that in the United Nations Tito has voted with Communist Russia. Then Mr. Noyes finally concludes that although Tito is doing these things, it is to our interests to give him aid. I have some difficulty in following that argument.

COMMUNIST BUILDUP IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the subject of Cuba.

We cannot and should not be complacent about the condition that prevails in the Western Hemisphere through the menace of the Communist base in Cuba; nor should we be lulled into the belief that in spite of the Communist buildup in Cuba and in other Central and South American countries, all is well with our country.

Have we forgotten the words spoken by President Kennedy in his inaugural address when he stated that our country was "unwilling to witness or to permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed and to which we are committed today at home and around the world; let every nation know—whether it wishes us well or ill—that we shall in the interest of survival and triumph pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, and oppose any foe. This much we pledge and more. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

Is it true that "this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house"?

Unwittingly we are supporting Castro and his Communist government. Castro is not our friend but our foe. We are also hindering the foes of Castro, thus indirectly giving comfort and aid to this Communist enemy of our country.

Peaceful coexistence with Castro—the leader of totalitarianism in America—can only lead to increased trouble and danger. Cuba indisputably is the fortress of communism in the Western Hemisphere. It is the training ground for the Communist technique of subversion, infiltration, sabotage, and provocation of riots precipitated simultaneously by push-button technique.

The Soviet military might in Cuba is not growing weaker but stronger. Signs of Communist growth in other Latin American countries are being manifest.

It is blindness of the worst type for us to believe that the Soviet power in Cuba is a trifle and, therefore, should be looked upon with indifference.

Out of South America the word is emerging that Francois Duvalier in Haiti is dealing with Castro and has proposed the establishment of Castro military bases in that country.

For our own security we cannot suffer the present entrenchment of Soviet-Communist forces on the Cuban island.

The people of our country were led to believe that when the quarantine was lifted and the commitment of no invasion of Cuba was given, that the Communist troops and technicians would be withdrawn. Six months have passed; the troops and technicians are still there. Our position is growing weaker and that of the Communists stronger in the Western Hemisphere.

If under the agreement committing our country not to invade Cuba, Soviet Russia committed itself to withdraw its technicians and troops—then our self-respect and the maintenance of our honor requires that we demand a fulfillment of that commitment by Russia.

With respect to Cuba, ostrichlike we are hiding our heads in the sand, thinking and hoping that while so doing the problem will vanish.

Last October 22 our country, by its fearless position, won to itself the respect of the nations of the Far East, Europe, Central and South America. Abandonment of vacillation and the adoption again of firm decision will receive the support of overwhelming numbers of our citizens and reestablish confidence in the minds of the freedom-loving people of the world in our leadership which has waned as Castro has grown ever stronger.

The situation and the time is critical; we cannot afford this retrogression in our ability to preserve the continued free life of our country.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate in its report on the Cuban military buildup, among other things said:

The Soviets are in Cuba primarily for the purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America and we can be sure that they will exploit their foothold to the greatest extent possible. The paramount danger at this time is that the nations of this hemisphere may be subverted one by one and be exploited, in turn, for subversive and revolutionary activities. By this process of erosion our neighbors to the South may fall nation by nation until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

The importance of making every effort to ascertain the truth with respect to this matter cannot be overemphasized. The criticality of it can best be illustrated by the fact that the testimony established that, upon the assumption that all missiles and associated equipment and the necessary personnel were readily available near preselected sites in a state of complete readiness, mobile medium range missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger is clear and obvious.

Whether or not all the strategic missiles and bombers were removed from Cuba is an issue of grave importance. On this subject the report, among other things, said:

It is fair to say, however, that this is a matter of great concern to the intelligence community. Based on skepticism, if nothing else, there is grave apprehension on this score. It is agreed that iron-clad assurance of the complete absence of Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating onsite inspection by reliable observers. The current intelligence estimates that they are not present is based largely on the negative evidence that there is no affirmative proof to the contrary. This of course, was precisely the status of the matter prior to last October 14.

The Organization of American States through a fully coordinated and collaborated plan succeeded in the removal of Trujillo from the control of the government of the Dominican Republic. It did so by severing primarily commercial relationship with Trujillo. The least that the Organization of America States could do is now to apply to Castro the same treatment that it gave to Trujillo.

Among the captive nations rumblings are being heard about the Communist government through the direction of the Soviet providing economic and other aid to nations such as Cuba at the expense of the people of the benefactor Communist government who are denied a better life through the fruits of their labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when it was testified in the Committee on Foreign Relations that all missiles had been removed from Cuba, I put the question to high echelon officials, "Are you certain that the missiles are not in the caves of Cuba?" The answer was, "We do not believe there are any missiles in the caves." I then put the question, "Why do you say 'We do not believe'?" The answer was that, "We have no proof that they are in the caves."

I followed that by the statement, "On the basis of that type of logic you will conclude that there are no missiles in the caves until affirmative proof is brought to you that there are."

I could not subscribe to that type of thinking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond entitled "Cuba: Unresolved—Time for New Action."

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

CUBA: UNRESOLVED—TIME FOR NEW ACTION
(By Roscoe Drummond)

When John J. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and all of the intelligence chiefs of the Pentagon combined are unable to convince the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate that Soviet offensive weapons have been withdrawn from Cuba, something needs to be done about it.

I believe that something can be done. Before attempting to suggest one course of action, I want to point up the central findings of the Stennis committee and to examine whether these findings are supported by responsible, fair-minded men.

After taking exhaustive, secret testimony from the entire intelligence community of the Government, including State, Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, plus more than 70 nonofficial witnesses, the Senate committee unanimously concluded: "Strategic weapons may or may not be now in Cuba. We can reach no conclusion on this because of lack of evidence."

All of the witnesses and all of the testimony from the administration said just the opposite—that the strategic missile and offensive weapons have been removed. But the Stennis committee was unpersuaded. It has grave doubts that it is true.

The committee has grave doubts not only because the evidence of withdrawal is inconclusive, but also because our own past surveillance had these serious shortcomings:

There were several substantial errors in evaluating the intelligence because top officials were subjectively convinced that the Soviets wouldn't try to put missiles in Cuba.

Not until long after their arrival, not until after the President had spoken on October 22, did we confirm that Soviet ground combat battalions were in Cuba.

Even into late October we were more than 100 percent off in our estimates of the number of Soviet personnel on the island.

There is inadequate information today on the number of Soviet troops leaving Cuba—and the number arriving. "Some sources estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba."

With these doubts in mind, the Senate committee reports as follows:

"To a man the intelligence chiefs stated that it is their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba. However, they readily admit that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that offensive weapons remain on the island concealed in caves and otherwise. They also admitted that absolute assurance on this question can come from penetrating and continuing onsite inspection by reliable observers and that, based on skepticism, if nothing more, there is reason for grave concern about the matter."

When a Senate committee, reaching this conclusion, is predominantly manned by such able and objective people as Democratic Senators JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi; STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri; HENRY JACKSON, of Washington; and Republican Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, it cannot be ignored.

Why shouldn't President Kennedy renew his urgent exchanges with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to establish the onsite inspection which the Premier himself proposed?

If the offensive weapons have been removed—as stated—and if Soviet troops are to be withdrawn, as promised, then onsite inspection should be welcome to Moscow.

Unless Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, in objecting to on-site inspection, is doing exactly what Moscow wants, he is now in no position to refuse to fulfill Khrushchev's promise to President Kennedy.

The time is opportune to reopen the inspection issue and to reopen it with urgency.

I think most Americans will agree with the Stennis committee's unanimous appeal:

"The entire Cuban problem, both military and political, should be accorded the highest priority by our governmental officials to the end that the evil threat which the Soviet occupation of Cuba represents will be eliminated at an early date."

1963

8579

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I point out to Mr. Drummond that while he states that promises were made for the removal of missiles and the removal of troops and technicians, an examination of the documents exchanged between Khrushchev and the President will disclose no mention by words that on-the-site inspections were to be made and no declarations that the technicians and troops were to be removed. I think that is one of the unfortunate sequels on the exchange of messages last October.

A few minutes before I ran into the Pravda editorial, an aid showed me a hostile editorial from one of our California newspapers, which was not at all pleased with something I had to say recently.

I grumbled and groused a bit.

Then I thought of the Pravda editorial. And I thanked the Lord that I was lucky enough to have been born an American and into a free society, where we all too often take a free press for granted.

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Supreme Court's decision yesterday in the sit-in cases is another major step in the struggle to remove unfair discrimination against Negro citizens. The Court's decisions make it clear that the power of the State cannot be used to enforce segregationist practices. Those who loudly object to Federal legislation to enforce civil rights have never hesitated to enact State legislation to deny civil rights. The Supreme Court has said, in effect, that such State laws cannot stand against the constitutional guaranty of freedom of assembly.

In a perceptive and moving editorial in today's New York Times, it is noted that—

The Court's new rulings should reinforce respect for legal process that is the only durable foundation for all liberty.

As the Times points out, these decisions have provided "every American with a clearer definition of what freedom means."

Mr. President, I know that this editorial will be of interest to many Members, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 21, 1963]

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM

Two weeks ago, when 1,000 Birmingham Negroes were arrested for chanting demands for freedom, the commander of the city's police sneered at the youthful demonstrators were swept off to jail. "If you'd ask half of them what freedom means, they couldn't tell you," he declared. Yesterday the U.S. Supreme Court made some important new contributions toward providing every American with a clearer definition of what freedom means.

One thing it was said was that in Birmingham and all other cities that make segregation a matter of public policy, whether by ordinance or official ukase, no Negro can be prosecuted for seeking service in a white-only restaurant or other public place. Another thing it said was that, where attempts are made to enforce such encrusted patterns of segregation, no Negro can be arrested for insisting on his equal right to use a public park. These fresh breaches in the wall of discrimination will make it increasingly hard to stem the tide toward implementing the constitutional guarantees of racial equality, to which the Court gave such impetus with its historic ruling on public school desegregation 9 years ago.

Their most immediate effect will be to bolster the pact between leaders of the Negro and white communities of Birmingham

and thus to help end the repression that has made it so hard for the Negroes of that industrial city to realize genuine freedom. The desegregation of lunchrooms and other store facilities was a keystone of that pact. So was an upgrading of job opportunities for Negroes.

The Court's new rulings should reinforce the respect for legal process that is the only durable foundation for all liberty. Extremists in the Ku Klux Klan and the White Citizens Council are once again put on notice that equality of opportunity is the inexorable wave of the future. The advocates of nonviolence and orderly methods in Negro ranks now have powerful new ammunition to use against the Black Muslims and other advocates of total warfare with the white community. The Court has again proved its worth as a force for national unity based on justice.

NATIONAL ACTORS EQUITY WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Friday, May 17, the President signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 39, designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

Next Sunday, the 26th of May, the Actors' Equity will celebrate its 50th birthday. During that period, Equity has provided responsible and capable leadership in the performing arts, and has greatly encouraged and enhanced the cultural life of our Nation. It is my hope that the enactment of this resolution into law will call nationwide, and perhaps even worldwide, attention to the essential place of the legitimate theater in our society.

I am pleased to have introduced this resolution, and grateful that the Congress and the President have acted on it in time for the observance of the historic occasion of Equity's 50th birthday.

Mr. President, on Monday, May 20, Victor Riesel, in his nationally syndicated column "Inside Labor," paid tribute to Actors' Equity for its efforts in the past and its goals for the future on behalf of its more than 13,000 members. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Mirror, May 20, 1963]

IT'S ABOUT TIME WE GAVE OUR ACTORS A HAND (By Victor Riesel)

Let's give the actors a great big hand. Literally. Why? Because there isn't a cause or a charity which has not asked the performers of the land, members of Actor's Equity, to go on stage without pay.

The players, whose union is 50 years old this month, are willing to give benefits, but they frankly now want a few of their own in return.

They want no charity. They want the public's support in making the actor's life easier, more secure economically. They can't eat glamor.

My good friend Ralph Bellamy, Equity's president since 1953, sat recently with some colleagues, each of them stars of the theater. Some suggested they jot down on pieces of paper their average earnings from the work on stage and drop the slips, unsigned, into a hat.

The average income of these performers who are famed household names was revealed as \$8,000 a year from live theater.

THE COMMUNIST PRESS VERSUS A FREE AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just stumbled across a fascinating editorial which ran recently in Pravda, the newspaper in Russia, which I would like to share with my colleagues and, indeed, all Americans.

For it demonstrates, I think, a fundamental and irrevocable difference between the totalitarian Communist society that Soviets practice and the free society Americans know in a very basic area—the press.

The Pravda editorial, published on May 5, 1963, to mark the 51st anniversary of the Communist Party paper, has this to say about the purposes and duties of the press in its closed society:

Thanks to the constant concern and care of the Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee, our press has grown into a giant and has turned into a mighty ideological force.

The great Lenin, standing at the source of the Soviet press, determined its lofty purpose as a weapon in socialist construction.

The party attaches great importance to the education of the new man, who will approach his work and his duties in the society in a Communist manner. This requires much tireless work. We must not think that Communist consciousness will grow on its own among the people along with the growth of our economic successes.

Preparations are now developing on an increasing scale in the country for the coming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which will discuss the tasks of ideological work of the party. The duty of the press is to give wide coverage to these preparations and to increase attention to questions of ideological life, political work among the masses, and education of the masses.

The Soviet press always has held high the Leninist banner, a banner of communism and proletarian internationalism.

The high appreciation by the party of the services of our press and of the work of the Soviet journalists as party assistants puts many obligations on the workers of the press and on its wide activities and testifies to the increasing significance of the press in Communist construction and in Communist education.

That, in sum, is the essence of the editorial. Just think of it, Mr. President. Ideological force, weapon, brainwasher, mouthpiece, apologist, propagandist—that, practically in Pravda's own words, is the function of the press in the Communist society.

Nary a word, of course, about simply giving the news and letting the reader decide. Or of giving the news at all. Or of presenting both sides of a question.

This is not much above the union contracts Broadway minimum of \$115 a week.

That is when actors work, of course. And most of Actors' Equity's 19,500 membership don't work too often. There will be more opportunities in a few weeks when some 200 rural theaters brush off the straw—as many as 4,000 of Equity's members will find work on bucolic stages. However, during the winter season the total employment figure is nearer 2,000, including Broadway.

What do they want of the public and the Government? Many things. They want some tax breaks. Today, for example, if a writer takes 3 years to finish a book, he can spread its earnings over the entire period for income tax relief purposes.

But if an actor invests cash and work in a career and gets a break the third year after earning very little previously, he can't spread anything but his waistline.

Actors' Equity wants the international theater exchange program revived. On our side it is dead. Next year not a single professional American theater company will be abroad under Government auspices. However, the Soviets will be touring their Moscow Arts Theater and other quality performing groups.

Actors' Equity also decries "the increased invasion of the American stage by foreign actors." They come in greater numbers these days. The Immigration Service is lax with awaiting actors, says Equity. Stars from abroad such as John Gielgud, Lawrence Olivier and Vivien Leigh are welcomed.

But the actors' union objects to those of lesser ability coming here, getting stage jobs "not on the basis of their talent, but mostly because they will work for less or because they appeal to the snob set that will flock to the theater to hear anyone—good or bad—from abroad."

On the other hand, very few American stage people are permitted to work in England. The London Government protects its players. Americans who do land theater jobs in Britain after a short time, are told to pack up and leave.

Yet the American actors are reasonable. They have a strong union. They have struck only twice since they were organized in 1913.

But the public takes Equity's members for granted—as though acting was an obsession, a hobby, and not a profession chosen for life.

These actors deserve a great big hand. Let's give it to them to help get what they want from the Government.

NEW YORK RAIL RATE CASE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday the Supreme Court put an end to railroad rate differentials that have traditionally favored the ports of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Norfolk. This represents a great victory for the State of New York, and, in the long run, for the national interest.

Since 1877, shipments from the Midwest to the so-called southern ports have enjoyed lower rates than shipments to New York and the New England ports, so far as these goods were destined for the export trade. The same rate differential has also been in force with respect to import shipments traveling in the other direction.

The result of yesterday's decision will allow the rail carriers serving the ports of New York and New England to lower their rates to the level of the roads serving the southern ports.

Such lower rates had been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1956. The Commission failed to approve

these, but a three-judge Federal court in Boston reversed this decision. It was the judgment of the Boston district court upholding rate equalization that was sustained yesterday when the Supreme Court affirmed by equally divided vote.

This development, Mr. President, will be of enormous benefit not only to the citizens, the businesses, and the railroads in and around the port of New York, but also to the import-export trade of the United States, which is expected to expand considerably under the historic legislation enacted last year.

Elimination of the archaic rate differential will put a finish to the diversion of considerable commerce from the port of New York that has worked great hardships on workers and business alike. Today, we in New York can look forward to reinvigoration of the port of New York's historic role as the great entrepôt on the North Atlantic trade route.

Great credit for this victory is due the Port of New York Authority and the New York Central Railroad, and the brilliant legal representation that they received throughout this long fight. In the end, I am sure that the southern ports will not regret yesterday's decision, for they, too, have an immense stake in the overall expansion of the import-export trade that yesterday's decision will surely foster.

TEACHER RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller has designated today, Tuesday, May 21, as Teacher Recognition Day in New York State. He has urged all to join in expressing the appreciation that is due teachers for the inestimable contribution they make to our society.

It is fitting that New York, with a tradition of excellence in education should honor the devoted men and women who have given their lives to teaching the future generation. But the honor which is due to the members of this profession cannot be confined to any one State, and the recognition of their contribution to our society should not be confined within the geographic borders of any one section of this country.

During the last session of Congress, I introduced a joint resolution to designate a National Teachers' Day. The resolution was passed by the Senate in the last days of the session, but was never considered by the House of Representatives.

Early during this 88th Congress, I re-introduced the same resolution which would authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the second Monday in April as National Teachers' Day, inviting the people of the United States to display their esteem and respect on such a day in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies. The teachers who are charged with the responsibility of providing higher standards of education for the American people are called upon to perform vital service to our Nation. If we are to compete with other countries in science and technology and if we are to move forward in the fields of economics and technical as-

sistance to the world's underdeveloped lands, we must provide our children with the finest schooling available anywhere in the Western World. This goal cannot be achieved unless we are willing to recognize, honor and end encourage our teachers.

I have asked the Senate Judiciary Committee to move forward quickly in reporting this bill and take occasion today, on Teacher Recognition Day, to salute the teachers not only of my own State but of the whole Nation, and to promise them that I will do all within my power to see to it that a national day in their honor is proclaimed and celebrated.

EXTREMIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN WEST

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, throughout history there have always been many people quite willing to say and to believe that "it can't happen here." This has usually been the case when extremists, from either end of the political spectrum, threaten to warp our political system to their own ends.

Such was the case, at least until recently, in my area of the country when the John Birch Society and its fellow travelers and front groups stepped up their campaign of fear and hysteria.

Mr. President, I am confident that it will not happen here, that the dedication to truth and fairplay, the reliance on facts and democratic process will continue to characterize western politics. One reason for this is that the activities of the Birch Society have been and are being exposed for what they really are. And like all activities that operate in an undercover fashion, the light of exposure is a severe handicap for these societies.

Therefore, I would like to commend the Washington Post and Reporter Julius Duschka for a very excellent series of articles which began Sunday on the extremist activities in the Rocky Mountain West. The first three of these articles have already appeared, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

BIRCHERS AND ALLIES OUT TO WIN THE WEST (By Julius Duschka)

SALT LAKE CITY.—It's springtime in the Rockies and the Birchers are blooming in the valleys. The John Birch Society and other radical rightwing groups have found fertile soil in the thinly populated, highly individualistic and extremely conservative Mountain States of the West.

Western conservatives and liberals alike are concerned over the efforts of the Birchers and their rightwing allies to intimidate opposition and to take over State legislatures and the Republican Party as well as parent-teacher associations.

From the wind-swept high plains of North Dakota to the hot deserts of Arizona, there is mounting evidence that America's rightwing radicals have picked the Mountain States as their political target for 1964. What disturbs responsible Democratic and Republican political leaders in the West is the fearmongering of the rightwing movement

Appendix

Another Crisis Building Up in Cuba While White House Fiddles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last October the failure of President Kennedy to recognize the buildup of a crisis in Cuba brought us almost to the brink of war. Unfortunately, the firm stand enunciated by the President at that time was immediately replaced with a return to a policy of accommodation of the Soviet Union with the result that a new Cuban crisis is developing. The same dangerous lack of intelligence and the same tragic misunderstanding of the situation by the White House seems to be taking place.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we face the realism of Cuba. The President must tell the American people the truth about Cuba and the Soviet buildup there. He must take positive action to end Communist aggression in this hemisphere by reimposing the Monroe Doctrine, by enacting an effective blockade to halt the shipment of strategic materials into Cuba, including oil, by setting a time limit for Khrushchev to get all the Russian troops and weapons out of Cuba.

The dangerous intelligence gap now existing is exposed in the following article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the Washington World. Apparently, President Kennedy unilaterally, through limited surveillance, is denying us information on missile, arms, troops buildup, and on the export of subversion. If these buildups are indeed going on, President Kennedy is guilty of both withholding information from the American people and failing to protect them from the military danger.

The article follows:

CONCILIATION CAUSES INTELLIGENCE GAP ON
CUBA—TRUCK TRAFFIC HEAVY TO AND FROM
CAVES; HUGE TENTS ARE ERECTED, RAIL LINE
BUILT

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

A potentially highly dangerous intelligence gap—strikingly similar to that immediately preceding the war-fraught missile crisis last October—is again developing in Cuba.

Following is what is transpiring there:

Low-level reconnaissance flights have been suspended since February 9. It was such sorties that produced the irrefutable aerial photos of the medium-range ballistic missiles and IL-28 bombers on the Red-ruled island. The halting of low-level reconnaissance flights since February is on direct orders of the President. No reconnaissance flights of any kind can be made over Cuba without his approval.

High-level U-2 reconnaissance flights are being kept to a minimum and the aerial

photos they produce are raising more questions than they answer.

In recent weeks, at least four wide-hatched Russian freighters have docked in Cuban ports and unloaded their cargoes under cover of darkness. The same kind of drum-tight secrecy prevailed last year when the nuclear-armed missiles and IL-28 bombers were shipped there.

Several of these wide-hatched Soviet freighters were armed with 3-inch guns. These are the first armed Communist cargo vessels to appear in the Caribbean.

The administration's iron-handed crack-down on refugee raids is seriously impairing the flow of information from Cuba, particularly from the anti-Castro underground that has been an important source of military information. That has been valuable in planning U-2 reconnaissance flights, providing them with specific targets and missions. Intelligence agents have worked closely with the raiders and the underground.

"DON'T ROCK THE BOAT"

Inside explanation for this extraordinary backstage policy is the President's determination that nothing be done to "rock the boat" in Cuba.

That's the reason given congressional leaders who have been apprised of this undisclosed intelligence gap and are greatly disturbed. They have been told the President believes his conciliatory course will lead to the withdrawal of more Russian troops from Cuba.

The congressional leaders have been informed that the President and Premier Khrushchev have exchanged a number of letters on this thorny issue.

The intelligence gap is causing particular concern among U.S. military authorities because of three baffling developments in Cuba.

These showed up in recent high-level photos, but beyond bringing the disturbing discoveries to light no detailed information has been obtained—due to the lack of low-level reconnaissance flights, the drastic curbs on raiders and the adverse effect that has had on contacts with, and the operations of, the underground.

THREE MYSTERIES

The three disturbing mysteries are as follows:

The appearance of large numbers of Russian tents, some of them big enough to enclose missiles and their launchers.

Heavy transport traffic to and from areas where large caves are known to be. It has long been reported, by refugees and other sources, that the Reds are storing missiles and arms in caves.

Construction of a rail line to a major Soviet camp area. Apparently this camp is to undergo extensive development of some kind.

Intelligence authorities are divided on the reason for the appearance of the armed Russian freighters.

One group is of the opinion the Reds' intent is to ward off refugee attacks. Another group sees a great deal more behind this move. It contends the armed cargo ships are Khrushchev's warning to the United States that another naval blockade will not be tolerated, and that these armed vessels are being used to transport Castro agents to Latin American countries.

Members of the U.S. Intelligence Board, headed by Central Intelligence Director John

McCone, are privately making no secret of their uneasiness over this backstage situation.

FIVE SOURCES OF DATA

They point out that information about Soviet military activities in Cuba is now being obtained chiefly from five sources, as follows: (1) U-2 reconnaissance flights, which are not effective when camouflage is extensively used and when such flights are made infrequently; (2) Cubans allowed to leave by the Castro regime; (3) naval surveillance of ships going to Cuba; (4) newsmen and others invited by Castro; (5) foreign embassies in Havana.

All these sources have serious shortcomings. This is graphically demonstrated by the fact that none of them has been able to provide any definite information on the number of Soviet forces in Cuba.

The totals range from President Kennedy's 13,000 to 60,000 reported by a former Cuban bus driver. Before coming to the United States recently, he traveled extensively throughout the island and carefully noted the number and size of Russian camps and their forces.

Maryland Community Racial Armistice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, a Maryland circuit judge, who secured an armistice in a racially disturbed community in Maryland, has come in for some worthy praise in the lead editorial of yesterday's issue of Washington (D.C.) Evening Star. Under the heading "Uneasy Armistice," the newspaper editor refers to the role of racial negotiator assumed by Circuit Judge W. Laird Henry, Jr. in Cambridge, Md. The editorial points out that the armistice secured by Judge Henry is a vitally important and necessary step toward negotiation and ultimate settlement. Mr. President, in my own opinion, the action prompted by the Maryland judge is definitely a step forward.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Evening Star editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

UNEASY ARMISTICE

Circuit Judge W. Laird Henry, Jr., of Cambridge, Md., has shown that he is both a moderate and a sensible man.

He emerged as a moderate when he took the lead in trying to arrange a settlement between Negroes who have been directing demonstrations in Cambridge and white elements of that small Eastern Shore community. It could hardly have been easy for Judge Henry to assume this role. A descend-

A3183

ant of Maryland's first Governor, he had been an opponent of integration. And since the judgeship he holds is an elective office, he is taking an obvious personal risk. The great need, however, is for moderates on both sides to assert themselves in racially troubled communities, and Judge Henry is to be commended for the example he has set.

The judge has also shown himself to be a sensible man in saying that what prevails in Cambridge is an "armistice"—not a settlement.

This, of course, is true. But without an armistice, one could hardly hope for that climate in which useful negotiations become possible. Now, in Cambridge, negotiations can go forward. Judge Henry will continue to take the lead, and unless extremists on one side or the other kick over the traces a settlement is at least possible. Eventually, a negotiated settlement will come. Judge Henry's big contribution is that he has made this possible now—and without further racial strife.—Editorial, *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., May 20, 1963.

The Secrecy Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, March 18, 1963:

THE SECRECY BOOMERANG

The Kennedy administration is obviously bewildered by the persistence and the scope of attacks on its major policies in the field of foreign relations and defense that have driven it back into defensive positions at a time when it expected to be basking in the sun of public plaudits for its actions. Its bewilderment over why this has happened is rather sad, because it is obvious to most of its critics and questioners that the primary reason for this state of affairs has been the boomerang of its policies of official secrecy and attempted management of the news. Top level administration officials from the President through the Defense and State Departments feel the heavy impact from this boomerang, but don't appear yet to know that it was launched many, many months ago from their own hands.

The Kennedy administration began its tenure with an amateurish approach to the problems of military security, perhaps because so few of its top-level policymakers had had much prior experience with this subject in its modern context. They were horrified by the amount of information available through normal channels, and they had no real appreciation of what was genuine military security and what information was really necessary to lubricate the wheels of technical progress in the type of society we are dedicated to maintaining. They looked enviously at the tight information control in the closed society of the U.S.S.R., and, whether deliberately or subconsciously, they began to emulate many of its worst features. There is also a theory that these administration information policies stemmed from the Boston Brahmin tradition that even though democracy prevailed, it should be operated by a special class of superior people who should tell those they governed as little as possible about what is really being done with their tax dollars, and Government.

POLICY OF DECEPTION

At any rate, when the first major crisis of the Kennedy administration broke in the Bay of Pigs, it adopted the policy later advocated so shrilly by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, that the Government has a right to lie in an attempt to deceive an enemy even if this also means deceiving its own people. It is now evident that the Government did a great deal of lying about what went on just before and during the Bay of Pigs fiasco. While this official lying may have been intended to deceive the enemy, we think it would be difficult to make a valid case on this score. The subsequent record suggests that it was really motivated by a self-serving desire to preserve a governmental image that the facts would not support.

In any event, the administration made its decision at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion to manage the news to suit its own ends, and it has continued to try to do so in every major international crisis since. In a free society with a free press it is difficult to suppress the facts for long, and it is impossible to manage the news very effectively to maintain the desired image for very long if the facts do not support it. Thus the facts have been popping up about what really occurred in Cuba from the Bay of Pigs to the missile crisis of last fall, and each new fact pulls a prop out from under the version dispensed by the official news managers and their talented amateur assistants. Each new fact that proves to be at variance with the official stories told at the time also erodes public confidence both at home and abroad in the integrity and credibility of the public officials involved.

This is why the Kennedy administration is receiving precious little credit for any of its recent maneuvers even when those maneuvers, if fully and honestly explained, would merit plaudits instead of brickbats. The entire problem of NATO nuclear deterrent forces has been handled with the same cavalier disregard for the facts and crudely managed attempts to conceal what is really occurring. From the Skybolt cancellation through the Polaris submarine and surface ship NATO deterrent proposals, it is difficult for anybody here or in Europe to follow the swift shifting of contradictory justifications under which real motivations and policy are thinly concealed.

SUSPICION ABROAD

There is now a widespread suspicion in Europe as a result of all this that there is some secret or tacit agreement between the White House and the Kremlin involving a U.S. nuclear disengagement in Europe in exchange for the Soviet withdrawal of missiles and troops from Cuba. Certainly the net result of the Skybolt fiasco was to take Britain out of the effective nuclear deterrent business for a long time. When the real costs of Polaris submarines are faced in the British defense budget, this proposed force will disappear like a mirage. The withdrawal of Jupiter IRBM's from Turkey and Italy appears to be part of this pattern, even though the administration stoutly denies it. The ire directed against the French effort to maintain a nuclear striking force under its own flag also lends credence to this theory.

It is ironic that the louder the Kennedy administration now denies these rumors, the more credence they gain because people remember the similar denials and assurances given at the time of the Cuban crises that later proved to be deliberate errors of fact justified in the name of expediency.

This Nation is still a free society and its policies must rise or fall on their degree of public support. The people of this Nation are not used to being deliberately deceived by their elected or appointive officials, nor will they tolerate it for long. Until the Kennedy administration recognizes this sim-

ple fact and revises its methods of explaining its policies to the American people, it is likely to encounter increasing suspicion of its motives and diminishing support for its policies.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Mast of the Battleship U.S.S. "West Virginia" Dedicated as a Memorial to War Dead in Impressive Ceremonies at State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 11, 1963, West Virginia University was the scene of a significant tribute to the gallant crew of the U.S.S. *West Virginia*, and to all those West Virginians who have so nobly served in the Armed Forces of our country.

More than 1,000 spectators gathered on the campus as the mainmast of that once mighty battleship was dedicated as a memorial. The ceremony brought to successful climax a project which captured the imagination of the student body, and which required the coordinated efforts of private industry and public officials and faculty members.

Taking place during West Virginia's centennial year, 1963, and as a part of the university's greater West Virginia weekend, the dedication ceremony was impressive in its direct simplicity. Adm. Felix B. Stump, U.S. Navy, retired, from Parkersburg, W. Va., was the principal speaker. Following his remarks, the mast was officially presented to university president, Dr. Paul A. Miller, by Lt. Comdr. Ralph L. Hooton, U.S. Navy, of Rowlesburg, W. Va. The Preston County hero gave meaningful remarks reminiscent of the ships stirring battle encounters. Lieutenant Commander Hooton was stationed aboard the U.S.S. *West Virginia* when she was sunk by enemy action at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Also in attendance on this notable occasion were: the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia; Joseph C. Gluck, past department chaplain of VFW, and now director of student affairs at West Virginia University; officials of the West Virginia Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars; leaders of the American Legion in West Virginia; faculty members; and representatives of the student body. It was indeed a privilege for me to be present and to have the opportunity to participate in the dedication of a memorial so rich in history and meaning.

The 55-foot spar, which weighs 8 tons, stands in the center of a beautifully landscaped terrace centrally located on the university's main campus. As an 18-gun salute boomed, and flags of the United States, the State of West Virginia, and West Virginia University flew at

PAYOFF

The truth is that the Goulart-Dantas following is powerful in the government employees union that spearheaded the wage-increase demand, so the two leaders in effect "pressured" themselves. The huge raise will pay off a political debt to the army—which sustains Sr. Goulart's power—and is insurance for Dr. Dantas' election as Sr. Goulart's successor in 1965.

President Goulart is often described as an opportunist. But his heir-apparent, Dr. Dantas, is wedded to his own set of principles. He remains viscerally anti-American, with a political philosophy little changed since he was a uniformed Brazilian Nazi before World War II.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas have maneuvered the United States into subsidizing their political ambitions. Latin America is watching to see what President Kennedy's team does about it now.

Cuba: A Major Threat to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, that Cuba poses a major threat to the United States is a view shared by one of America's most outstanding and capable news columnists, Mr. David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report. In a May 20, 1963, syndicated column, Mr. Lawrence discusses this problem in view of the Stennis committee report and presents a point of view that I too share. I recommend this column to my colleagues and am asking that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

CUBA HELD MAJOR THREAT TO U.S.
(By David Lawrence)

The greatest danger to the security of the United States today is in Cuba. There is enough Soviet military strength remaining on the island to launch an attack on this country.

Yet the American people are being led to believe that Soviet military strength in Cuba is negligible and that an attack is as unthinkable as the missile buildup last year was supposed to be.

This was the reasoning used by Government agencies here in the autumn of 1962 to minimize the meaning of the Soviet troop movement and of the preliminary steps for the setting up of missile bases.

The most important official document on the Cuban situation has received only passing attention in the last 11 days from the American people. No announcement has been made of what the Kennedy administration intends to do about the facts that have just been disclosed. There are no signs that the Soviet Government is being prodded to get its troops, technicians, and military equipment out of Cuba, or that any demand is being made to permit on-the-spot inspection in order to find out whether any missiles are still concealed inside the island.

The latest word to the American people about the gravity of the Cuban situation comes not from Republican critics trying to make a political issue but from a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate headed by a Demo-

cratic chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi. All seven members—four Democrats and three Republicans—signed the unanimous report. It tells the unvarnished truth about what has happened and points out a lesson for the future. Here are some extracts from the report, dated May 9, which was written after hearing for many weeks secret testimony given by the intelligence agencies of the Government, civilian and military: "While a reasonably competent job was done in acquiring and collecting intelligence information and data, in retrospect it appears that several substantial errors were made by the intelligence agencies in the evaluation of the information and data which was accumulated * * *.

"Even though the intelligence community believes that all (strategic missiles) have been withdrawn, it is of the greatest urgency to determine whether or not strategic missiles are now concealed in Cuba. The criticality of this is illustrated by the fact that, assuming maximum readiness at preselected sites, with all equipment relocated, the Soviet mobile medium-range—1,100 miles—missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours.

"Some other sources—primarily refugee and exile groups—estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba. Bearing in mind the lack of hard evidence on the question and the substantial underestimation of last fall, we conclude that no one in official U.S. circles can tell with any real degree of confidence, how many Russians are now in Cuba and we are of the opinion that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure * * *.

"The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas * * *.

"It is agreed that ironclad assurance of the complete absence of Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating on-site inspection by reliable observers * * *.

"The importance of making every effort to ascertain the truth with respect to this matter cannot be overemphasized. The criticality of it can best be illustrated by the fact that the testimony established that, upon the assumption that all missiles and associated equipment and the necessary personnel were readily available near preselected sites in a state of complete readiness, mobile medium-range missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger is clear and obvious * * *.

"Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity * * *.

"Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sealanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.

"Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union."

This means that the range of certain Soviet military planes has been increased substantially. They need fly only one way in a surprise attack, drop bombs on the United States and land in Cuba.

Yet in the last few weeks nothing has been done to insist upon on-site inspection in Cuba by the United Nations or by any other agency. The Kennedy administration has

retreated on this point, and only an informed public opinion in the United States and throughout the world can bring about an advance—to verify what has actually happened.

The Battle Over Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the May 7, 1963, edition of Look magazine.

A moving narrative of what happens when a man is put to death, it is one of the best arguments for the enactment of my bill H.R. 545, which would abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions except the military services and the treason statutes.

The article follows:

THE BITTER BATTLE OVER CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

"The death penalty isn't punishment—it's revenge." These grim words sum up the feelings of Jack R. Johnson, tough warden of Chicago's Cook County Jail, a man whose job it is to press the switch of an electric chair and a man who is unalterably opposed to capital punishment. A growing number of lawmakers, governors, and penologists agree with Warden Johnson and want to do away with the death penalty. Opposing them are police officials and other authorities who fear that abolition would encourage murder. The reformers argue that the threat of execution does not deter. They also ask this disturbing question: Most killers are spared. Why should others die?

EIGHT-YEAR JOURNEY TO DEATH: THE CASE OF VINCENT CIUCCI

Capital punishment is neither swift nor certain nor just, argue those who would outlaw it. There are around 8,600 murders a year, for which some 6,000 to 7,000 persons are tried—but less than 50 of them are executed. During Warden Johnson's 7½ years at Cook County Jail, he has had to electrocute only 3 of 33 condemned men. Some of the others are still awaiting appeals and new trials, but most have already won new trials and had their sentences reduced to prison terms.

Among the few whom Johnson executed was Vincent Ciucci, 36, a Chicago grocer. The prosecution charged that Ciucci shot his wife and three young children and then set fire to the house so that he could hide the crime and marry another woman. It took four trials before the State could obtain the death penalty. One ended in a mistrial. At another, Ciucci got 20 years for the slaying of his wife; at a third, he received 45 years for the killing of a daughter; at a fourth, the death penalty was finally imposed for the murder of his 8-year-old son. Warden Johnson pleaded with the State pardon board to spare Ciucci. "We gain nothing by imposing a death sentence," he said. A prosecutor, opposing mercy, countered: "If Ciucci doesn't deserve the chair, then nobody does." With death imminent, Ciucci made public a story he had never told at his trial, known before only to his priest, lawyer, and the warden. He actually had killed his wife, he said, but it was in a rage

Placed 135 professionally written "Visit U.S.A." articles in 142 overseas publications having a combined circulation of over 100 million readers.

Planned and conducted a 13-State tour by leading travel writers from 9 countries, resulting in the publication of approximately 50 articles of locally-created "Visit, U.S.A." material;

Arranged or assisted in over 50 U.S. tours by travel agents, journalists, television teams and carrier personnel from abroad.

In addition to these promotional activities, the Travel Service has also been busy helping to facilitate travel to this country, to create a more friendly welcome for our visitors and to improve our knowledge of international travel habits. As examples, USTS has:

Led the drive for cutting redtape at our borders, with such advances as the waiver of personal appearance requirements for tourist visa applicants, the institution of oral baggage declarations at major ports of entry, accelerated screening of Mexican visitors by Government inspectors and noticeable improvements in the overall efficiency and courtesy with which all incoming travelers are processed by Federal officers;

Designed and erected 12 welcome signs at our principal ports of entry, featuring a message from President Kennedy;

Visited nearly every State, contacting civic leaders, community service organizations, travel industry associations, and other local groups urging them to begin or strengthen grassroots hospitality programs for guests from abroad.

Produced and distributed over 10,500 "community kits" containing a variety of informative material on how localities can become better hosts to guests from abroad;

Mounted a nationwide advertising campaign, built upon the theme "Company's Coming," utilizing prime media space and time donated as a public service by magazine and newspaper publishers, and radio and television station owners through the cooperation of the Advertising Council. This award-winning campaign, stressing how individual Americans can make a visitor's stay more enjoyable, has so far commanded over \$2 million worth of advertising space given at no cost to the Federal Government;

Produced and distributed over 8,300 copies of the first comprehensive industrial plant tour guide of the United States for use by foreign and domestic travel agents as well as the individual traveler;

Collected and published detailed statistics on the pattern of tourist travel to the United States, including the results of three comprehensive surveys of 875 departing visitors conducted by USTS at the New York and Honolulu international airports and aboard the cruise ship *Canberra*.

Topping the list of its accomplishments, I believe, has been the Travel Service's foresight and skill in catalyzing the efforts of private industry in support of the "Visit U.S.A." program. Working through a 36-man Travel Advisory Com-

mittee, representing leading elements of the U.S. tourist and transportation industry, the Travel Service has been instrumental in aiding, developing and promoting a broad range of private programs for the benefit of increased foreign travel. A few leading examples include the \$99.99-day bus ticket, the flat-rate fare plans offered by eight local-service airlines to foreign visitors, the 15-percent railroad coach discount, the reduced-rate accommodations given by three major hotel chains, the extensive foreign visitor welcome program launched by the American Hotel Association, the scores of extraordinary advertising and special promotion programs undertaken by U.S. and foreign-flag carriers to sell more travel to the United States of America, and many others.

The most remarkable thing about the Travel Service story is that all of this has been accomplished by one of the smallest agencies in Washington. Compared with the multitudes employed by most of our other international agencies, the USTS worldwide professional staff of 24 persons—12 in the United States and 12 overseas—can only be described as tiny. As a matter of fact, 59 of our 79 foreign-aid missions individually employ a larger number of U.S. citizens than the total complement of USTS personnel assigned abroad. Our economic-aid mission to South Vietnam alone is 20 times larger than the entire overseas staff of USTS. The Travel Service's current budget of \$3,350,000 is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our foreign-aid budget.

I cite these figures simply to show that the U.S. Government does not have to create a giant agency to get things accomplished around the world. Whatever else it may stand for, the U.S. Travel Service is a proud and encouraging example of that fact. Paraphrasing a well-remembered statement by our "fellow citizen," Winston Churchill, it can be said of the U.S. Travel Service that never in the history of Federal bureaucracy has so much been done, with so little, by so few.

United States Still on Sucker List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the United States continues to be the chief patsy for all wanting an easy handout.

Just as I predicted, Brazil has literally thumbed her nose at the United States. In statements to this House, I pointed out the futility of granting Brazil the \$400 million loan the State Department approved on the 25th of March of this year.

I stated on numerous occasions prior to that date that Brazil would use the money to enhance her trade with Russia and that in effect after she got her hands

on the money she would do with it just as she saw fit.

Now Brazil has signed a new 5-year trade agreement with Soviet Russia involving more than \$600 million and although she denies any U.S. dollars were used, the terms of the contract were, oddy enough, spelled out in U.S. dollars.

Furthermore, one of the so-called declared purposes of the loan was to help Brazil fight inflation and Brazil promised the United States in writing, that she would eliminate subsidies on wheat and petroleum products so as to reduce the cash deficit of the Brazilian Treasury. Brazil promised a policy of containment in budgetary expenditures for 1963 and to attempt to hold wage increases to actual cost-of-living increases and salary adjustments for public employees to 40 percent.

Now what has she done after the United States bailed her out based on her promises—why Brazil has done a complete about-face. Brazil in effect has doublecrossed the United States.

Brazil has restored federal subsidies on food and oil and agreed to a 60-percent increase in pay raise for Government employees and the army. Thereby insuring a new round of inflation and breaking faith with the United States. Proving the U.S. loan was an exercise in futility.

Mr. Speaker, Virginia Prewett, in an article in today's Washington Daily News, factually and vividly calls attention to this breach of faith. I included her article called "Subsidizing Brazil's Doublecross" in my remarks and urge my colleagues to read it.

SUBSIDIZING BRAZIL'S DOUBLECROSS

(By Virginia Prewett)

Brazil is a huge, beautiful, and underdeveloped country whose rulers for over 2 years have bucked U.S. foreign policy for Cuba whenever we took a firm tone toward Castro. Today, Brazil's rulers have embarked also on an open course of bucking U.S. foreign policy for Brazil.

Within the past 2 months, Brazil's President Joao Goulart and his Foreign Minister Dr. Francisco San Tiago Dantas have quite spectacularly broken a vital agreement with the Kennedy administration.

THEY KNOW

The speed with which they have splintered solemn promises solemnly made to Washington is almost without parallel. Thick-skinned Norte-Americans may not know that by this action Brazil has flung the United States a challenge. But Brazil's Latin American neighbors know.

The incident turns on the recent financial bailout granted Brazil by the United States. In March, President Goulart sent Dr. Dantas to Washington to plead that Brazil might soon have to default on official and commercial debts—the equivalent of national bankruptcy. To get a U.S. bailout of \$398 million, the Goulart-Dantas team promised in writing to curb Brazil's rampant inflation.

Within short weeks, the two Brazilian leaders have done the opposite. They've restored federal food and oil subsidies, and agreed to a 60-percent pay raise for government employees and the army. A new round of inflation is assured.

President Goulart and Dr. Dantas solemnly tell U.S. newsmen that political pressures forced them to do this.

the African coast. However, for some reason we do not yet understand, he could not find the light. We raised the question of whether the device really was deployed into space.

Cooper was very insistent on this point. He felt it when the squib exploded, and he heard the noise. Mercury Control was dubious, however.

An hour and a half later, we learned that the astronaut was right. At sunset on the fourth orbit, he saw the reflection of the sun's rays off a shiny object several miles away. Then he observed it flashing. He watched the blinker all through the 45-minute flight on both the fourth and fifth orbits.

I think this incident illustrates why a man is needed. Cooper was not immediately able to use his sense of sight as originally intended. But his senses of hearing and touch, combined with his judgment, enabled him to make the decision that the experiment had not failed. And so he kept looking. He says he could see the light up to about 12 or 13 miles away.

A related experiment was the observation of a very bright light on the sixth orbit as he passed over South Africa. The purpose was to compare the ground light with on-board light source and to measure its intensity to calculate atmospheric absorption. Cooper reported this experiment was also successful.

He had less success with an attempt to deploy a 30-inch orange-colored balloon to test its visibility and to obtain information on the drag resulting from the few molecules of atmosphere at that altitude. He tried twice yesterday to release the balloon, but we will have to wait and see whether he is able to try again today.

Another experiment performed yesterday was a rather simple one. During the fifth orbit, he turned off the cooling fan in the spacecraft and disconnected the cabin temperature control, to determine whether the temperature remains within tolerable limits without using electrical power to maintain it. The information we have from the experiment indicates that such a procedure is feasible.

Today, he was scheduled to take a great number of photographs, of space, of the horizon, and of the earth below him. The photographs of space will enable scientists to establish the nature of Zodiacal light. The horizon pictures are intended to obtain information that will help us navigate more precisely on the way to the moon. The earth photographs, in infrared light, will enable us to do a better job of weather observation and prediction. In another experiment today, he was to investigate how to point a high-frequency radio antenna to improve communication with ground stations.

Throughout the flight, he has been taking radiation measurements on crossing the South Atlantic, to measure radiation created by high-altitude nuclear explosions. Also throughout the flight, he has been operating an experimental television camera, transmitting crude images of himself to selected ground stations.

I believe the amount of experimentation on this mission is a harbinger of the future. In earlier flights in Project Mercury, the time available was limited, and the astronauts' first concern had to be with operating the spacecraft and learning to solve the problems associated with operation.

In future programs, the situation will be similar. First, we will perfect the mechanics of flight. Then we will use the system as a tool, for scientific observation and for other purposes.

Thus far, I have confined my remarks to the peaceful exploration of space. As those in this room know well, other activities, whose aims are not so peaceful, can also take place there.

The Department of Defense has not fully defined the role man should play in its space activities. However, under an agreement between Secretary McNamara and Mr. Webb, reached in January 1963, NASA will manage the Gemini program to assure the fulfillment of both DOD and NASA requirements, and the DOD will contribute funding, in an amount to be determined later. When the Gemini system becomes operational in 1966, it will of course be available for use by any agency of the Government having work to do in space. When the Apollo system becomes operational by the end of the decade, it will be similarly available.

In summary, we are proceeding step by step to develop broad capabilities in manned space flight.

We have learned in Project Mercury that the conditions of space flight do not interfere with man's ability to tend and improve the reliability of an automatic system.

We will develop in Project Gemini a two-man space system, with which we will conduct experiments in long-term weightlessness, learn the techniques of rendezvous, and improve our general proficiency of flight. The system will be operational by 1966.

In Project Apollo, we will produce a system of safe, reliable transportation between the earth and the moon on a routine basis and, in so doing, we will make the United States pre-eminent in space. We will begin manned exploration of the moon before the end of the decade.

Man is of value in space because his presence increases the reliability of the system. Although manned flight is more expensive than unmanned flight in the development phase, the increased reliability of a manned vehicle will ultimately enable us to carry out complex tasks in space more effectively and, very possibly, at less expense than with automatic equipment.

Thirteen years ago, the late William Faulkner made a comment that may apply to the present discussion:

"I believe that man will not merely endure; he will prevail. He is immortal * * * because he has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

In exploring the moon and planets, I am convinced with Faulkner that man will prevail.

Cuba
The Smile of Safety, or "What Are We Being Told About Cuba?" or the Use of "Soft Soap" in Dispelling the Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, an article entitled "The Smile of Safety: What Are We Being Told About Cuba?" by Charles Burton Marshall, surprisingly appearing in the New Republic of May 25, 1963, and is one of the finest analyses of the "soft soap" technique of the New Frontier in salving over and dispelling the Communist threat 90 miles from our shores.

This article is written by a confessed Democrat who says in the article:

I, for one, feel put off by much of what the administration and friendly publicists have been saying to allay misgivings about Cuba—nothing partisan, for I am a Democrat.

The pointed and thoughtful way in which Mr. Marshall disposes of the numerous and fallacious arguments and excuses offered on Cuba by the administration apologists and professional explainers deserves the attention of the House.

Marshall disposes of the "smiles of safety" that emanate daily from the New Frontier on Cuba, such smiles being on the subjects: first, that it is better to have Russians than Cubans in charge of weapons; second, that options are available and a choice of one can be deferred; third, that Khrushchev really is not so bad, he is being pushed; fourth, that the Russian military forced Khrushchev on missiles in Cuba; fifth, that Freedom Fighter raids encourage Russians to remain in Cuba; sixth, that the real test of correctness is the support of other nations; seventh, that there is some good in Cuban communism—a showcase for failure, and a costly operation; and eighth, our policy is to prevent another "Hungary" in Cuba.

This article follows:

THE SMILE OF SAFETY: WHAT ARE WE BEING TOLD ABOUT CUBA?

(By Charles Burton Marshall)

The Communist buildup in Cuba, as Hans Morgenthau noted in Commentary some months ago, is detrimental to the intellectual and emotional health of our body politic. One aspect of this important ill effect concerns the discourse of our Government and of those who undertake to interpret its attitudes to the public. To understand this, one must take into account the predisposition of ruling groups.

It is not enough for high officials to have their policies, if the term is apt, made binding. In that sense public support is not even a problem. The Kennedy administration clearly has the authority to carry through on whatever course it elects to follow in Cuba. No one of us would know how to undercut it even if we would. Beyond adherence, however, a government covets admiration. This is due only in part to pride and vanity. An administration must strive to maintain inner morale, to hold to a sense of serving faithfully and well in matters entrusted to its keeping. An obvious and immediate measure of success is general consent to its undertakings. For its own sake, an administration must cultivate the public and weigh its opinion.

In fantasy, one might picture this administration appealing for indulgence regarding Cuba. It might own to the difficulties of having had some of its top men learning on the job. It might concede a want of prudence or a sag of nerve at the time of the Bay of Pigs. It might confess to a default of timely warning against Soviet deployment of conventional forces to Cuba. It might admit to having improvidently eased off the October crisis on the narrow issue of missile placement without achieving a broader and more durable solution. It might candidly say that it has tended to underplay opportunities up to now but hopes to do better.

An administration would never speak thus. It must insist on having played its cards well even in view of dwindling chips. In a frustrating instance like Cuba, it may be tempted to try to make the best of things by making them out a little better than is warranted by realities. The result is both to mislead the credulous and to leave discriminating souls wondering whether the administration takes a proper measure of its problems. I, for one, feel put off by much of what the administration and friendly publicists have been saying to allay

trial base to which the Ordnance Association is so deeply devoted."

Developments in the last 18 months have punctuated this point particularly. In the President's budget document for fiscal year 1964 we are told that the development, test, and evaluation of most large strategic weapons systems, currently contemplated, will have been essentially completed or will be in the final and less expensive stages by 1964.

As Mr. Webb noted, we have found the contractors phasing out of heavy military procurement programs eager and anxious to use their resources in the space program. We had requirements for such resources and, therefore, it has been possible to keep together many of these experienced research and development teams.

Today, I want to discuss with you the manned space flight program that is occupying so many of these teams. I'd like to describe briefly what we are doing and discuss some of the reasons why man is of considerable value in space. Finally, I want to illustrate this tremendous importance we attach to having men in space with examples from Gordon Cooper's mission.

As you know, the space program is divided into four major categories, science, advanced technology, applications, and manned flight. Although the titles are almost self-explanatory, I will describe each portion in sufficient detail that it may be identified.

The space science effort is concerned with obtaining basic knowledge about conditions in space and on other astronomical bodies. At the present time, the science program makes use of unmanned sounding rockets, satellites, and deep space probes as tools with which it gathers information.

In advanced technology, we are carrying out research to improve propulsion, electronics, materials, structures, and other elements of space systems, to enable us to undertake more difficult space missions in the decades to come.

In applications, we are employing space systems to produce benefits in the present or in the near future in such areas as communications, navigation, and weather observation.

Manned space flight is a form of technology, in which we are providing a tool that will be used for a variety of purposes. In the current phase, manned space flight is more expensive than unmanned flight because a manned vehicle is heavier and more complex, and requires a more powerful booster vehicle to launch it into a space trajectory. Later, I will explain why I believe manned space flight will not always be more expensive.

In the manned space flight program are three approved projects—Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo—with which we are proceeding step by step in the development of broad capabilities.

This week's news has renewed your familiarity with Project Mercury, in which we have produced a system that combines a modified form of the Atlas ICBM as the launch vehicle and a one-man spacecraft weighing 3,000 pounds, about as much as a compact car.

We have learned many things in Project Mercury, but the most important lesson is that the conditions of space flight do not interfere with the ability of a trained man to attend an automatic machine and to improve its reliability. In the orbital flights of John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, and Wally Schirra, we learned that weightlessness is no problem for periods lasting as long as almost 9 hours. The Cooper flight, extends this experience to 34 hours.

Our second manned space flight program, Gemini, will make use of a new and more powerful booster, the Titan II, which will provide sufficient thrust to launch into orbit payloads weighing 7,000 pounds.

The Gemini spacecraft will carry a two-man crew on flights lasting up to 2 weeks, and it will have propulsion, guidance, and navigation equipment with which the astronauts will be able to make limited changes in their flight path. Thus they will be able to carry out experiments in rendezvous.

Another important characteristic of the Gemini program is that the work is directed at an operational spacecraft system, with which manned flights will be carried out on a comparatively routine basis; this in contrast with Mercury, in which each spacecraft is different, and each flight an experiment.

The first manned Gemini flights are planned for next year. Rendezvous experiments are scheduled to begin in 1965. The system will be operational in 1968.

The largest of our programs is Apollo, in which we will begin the manned exploration of the moon before the end of the decade. Landing the first Americans on the moon will certainly be the most dramatic moment of this program. Perhaps it is understandable, therefore, that there is an impression abroad that achieving the first landing on the moon is the only object of Project Apollo. This is very far from being the case.

The primary goal of Project Apollo is to develop a safe, reliable system for transporting men repeatedly and routinely in the space environment at as low a cost as practical, and—in the process—to make the United States preeminent in manned space flight. It may very well develop that we will reach the moon before the Soviets. If so, this will provide a very welcome demonstration of our preeminence. But winning a race is not our primary purpose.

Many of the elements of United States preeminence will be produced along the way, long before a man of any nationality sets foot on the moon. Later this year, for example, we will conduct the first two-stage flight of the Saturn launch vehicle, carrying a payload weighing 18,000 pounds, heavier than anything the Soviets have placed in orbit to date.

Next year, the Saturn I will carry into orbit payloads weighing as much as 22,000 pounds, and it will be employed in 1965 as the booster for the first manned earth-orbital flight of the three-man Apollo spacecraft.

Also in 1965, we will begin flight tests of the Saturn IB, a vehicle with an improved second stage, which will provide the thrust to carry into earth orbit payloads up to 32,000 pounds, almost 11 times the weight of the Mercury spacecraft. This vehicle will be operational in 1966, in time for manned earth-orbital flights of the entire Apollo spacecraft—including the two-man lunar excursion module, a special purpose vehicle that will be employed to shuttle two men between the moon's surface and the parent spacecraft in orbit about the moon. This two-man craft will fill a function similar to a small boat carrying passengers from a ship anchored offshore to an island.

To provide launch power for lunar flights, we will develop in Project Apollo the giant three-stage Saturn V, with a first stage generating 7½ million pounds of thrust, five times as much as the Saturn I and IB, the equivalent weight of 80 Mercury spacecraft or 18 times the mass of the largest payload the Soviets have claimed to have orbited.

In Project Apollo, we are developing a spacecraft weighing 45 tons—as much as the largest tractor-trailer on the highway, fully loaded, which will have the ability to carry three men on earth-orbital flights lasting 2 weeks or more, and to engage in extensive maneuvers in space. It will be constructed to protect its crew in flight between the Earth and the Moon, and will carry the lunar excursion module.

We are constructing in Project Apollo facilities all across the United States and we are building a launch complex for assembling

the entire space vehicle indoors, protected from weather and salt spray, and for transporting the vehicle in a vertical position to the launch pads more than 3 miles away. A high firing rate will be made possible by the availability of three pads and four assembly bays inside the building.

Finally, in Project Apollo we are establishing a primary earth station for control of manned space flight missions, at which we are installing modern equipment programmed to enable a mission director to make decisions almost instantaneously in a vast number of contingency situations.

These facilities, skills, techniques, and hardware will be available to serve the Nation for many years after the first explorers step onto the Moon. They will provide great flexibility in carrying out whatever operations in space may be required by the national interest.

Frequently, the question is asked, why man in space? Can we not do as much with automatic instruments, at less expense than with man? The answer to these questions is that, both on earth and in space, there are many functions better performed by machines than men. A machine never gets bored and, if we provide proper maintenance, it does not quickly get tired. Any job that must be performed repeatedly, without variation and without imagination, is usually done better by machine.

But a machine has no judgment. It does only what we program it to do. It deals only with situations that can be predicted in advance. It cannot deal with the unexpected.

Furthermore, the reliability of a complex machine is limited. As its complexity increases, its inherent unreliability increases accordingly. If a trained man is present, however, he can determine how to deal with malfunctions. He may be able to get the equipment back into working order. If not, he may be able to shift to another operational mode.

As we attempt more difficult tasks in our flight programs, the role of man will grow continually. The pilots will carry out essential functions in the rendezvous procedures in Project Gemini. In Project Apollo, they will check out the spacecraft, navigate, correct course en route, and fly the lunar excursion module to an altitude of several hundred feet above the moon to take a close look before landing. If they find evidence of hazard, they will be able to move as much as 1,000 feet sideways before landing.

On the moon, the explorers will emplace equipment, collect samples, make photographs, and take notes. They will look for the unexpected. When they find it, they will decide what to do about it.

If necessary, we could design and program machines to do all of these things. If we did, however, I believe the machines would be as large, as complex, and as expensive as manned spacecraft. Furthermore, I am certain they would not be as reliable. Consequently, we would have to carry out more flights to gain the same amount of information, and the cost of exploring the moon with unmanned instruments might well be greater than with men.

Perhaps the role of man in space will be a little clearer if I describe for you some of the things Gordon Cooper is doing.

Altogether, he has 11 experiments to perform during his 34 hours in orbit, in addition to helping us evaluate how his system reacts to the conditions of space flight. He did about half of the work yesterday, and was scheduled to do the rest today.

Several of these are concerned with determining the ability of the human eye to see. During the third orbit yesterday, for example, he released into space a device with a very bright flashing light.

He was scheduled to begin observing the light immediately after sunset, as he crossed

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3221

misgivings about Cuba—nothing partisan, for I am a Democrat.

I cite as an initial example the premise that Soviet armed forces in Cuba, whatever their numbers, present no military threat. That premise was conveyed recently as a point of information to our Armed Forces abroad by the Department of Defense. The idea is plausible only if the key term is construed in a narrow, technical sense. Back in Dean Acheson's days in State and George C. Marshall's in Defense, use of the term military or its counterpart political in so sterile a way was forbidden to subordinates. Why employ it now in so technical and misleading a sense just to butter up the troops?

Another illustration of bad discourse about policy relates to "options"—a conjuring word on the New Frontier. I heard a high figure in this administration describe policy as a recondite business designed to keep down risks by minimizing the stakes at issue and deferring choice. He then lauded our Cuba policy on the basis of this supposed measure of statesmanship. Nonsense. It only distorts policy to represent it as the art of backing away from issues wherever feasible.

This brings me to a point about interpreting the Soviet Union, especially as personified by Nikita Khrushchev. Our policy seems often to treasure a certain presupposition about him. The Camp David kewpie—rough but tractable, not a bad fellow down underneath—is taken for authentic. That other side to the man—pressing hostile aims at every safe opportunity—is supposed to be aberrant and reluctant. It is all reminiscent of Harry Hopkins' faith that the real essence of Stalin was the genial banquet host, not the ruthless seeker of advantage in negotiation.

Thus the stealthy deployment of Soviet missiles to Cuba is attributed to pressure on Khrushchev from others. The withdrawal of them is accounted for as an act of man's true self in response to an opportunity provided by our armed interposition. His gesture of giving in a little on terms for a test-ban inspection is supposed to show his true colors. The subsequent reversal is explained as due to dire compulsion on him. He who smiles and says what we want to hear about Laos is sincere, but the unremitting pressure on neutralists in Laos is Mao's mean doing.

Such persistence in optimistic appraisals showed in the President's explanation of the need to curtail maritime raids by Cuban exiles: they might deprive the Russians of an opportunity to go home—as if the Russians were tarrying out of pride rather than for advantage, awaiting only a moment for graceful exit.

Devotion to looking on the sunny side was carried to even greater lengths in a recent article by Joseph O. Harsch—this time in anticipation of a long Russian sojourn in Cuba rather than an early exit. In the Christian Science Monitor, he expounded, without endorsing a theory that vindicating Cuba's freedom to go and to stay Communist would somehow serve an exemplary purpose in establishing a right for other Communist satellites to break away and to overturn masters—a bit like admitting wolves to the fold so as to set a precedent for sheep to go raiding.

It is said to be less risky for phlegmatic Russians rather than Cuban hotheads to be in charge of weapons on the island. On reading this idea in the writings of three journalists, I attributed it to private heresy. Then I heard it uttered by an administration thinker. What can one say? Maximilian might have been less risky in Mexico than the Mexicans. Is policy to be beguiled by the smile of safety?

Another characteristic of the administration's conduct is a preoccupation with con-

sensus—the notion that the main test of a policy lies in getting enough other governments to go along with it. Again and again, I have heard administration spokesmen try to vindicate our policy by citing the size of a vote garnered in the Organization of American States. I heard one such man the other day count the Russian deployment in Cuba as a positive boon because it had aligned so many Latin American governments with us. The critical question here involves not the outward disposition of these allies but the inner power and durability of the government concerned. Consider the recent conference at San Jose, Costa Rica, where three presidents of Central American States joined ours in an avowal on behalf of constitutional processes. A few days later one of them was expelled by unconstitutional process.

In a recent speech Vice President JOHNSON made a big thing of the idea that Cuba is a showcase of Communist economic shortcomings. What Communist country has not been? The rub is that such a showcase is all too likely to display something else—namely, the feasibility of taking over a society, deliberately depressing consumption, and using stringency in combination with monopoly of supply as an instrument of control. Communism has subsisted not on a reputation for generating affluence but on its effectiveness in holding on to power once installed.

What conclusion are we to draw from the exodus of a quarter of a million refugees from Cuba? A recent speech by the Secretary of State interpreted this phenomenon as ominous for the man in Havana, an achievement for U.S. policy. Communist regimes, however, have generally permitted or even abetted the emigration of intractable elements when feasible. When otherwise, as in the instance of China, the regime got rid of opponents by massive executions. The drain may get out of hand and have to be stanching as in the instance of the Berlin wall. That extreme is not in sight for Cuba. Short of it, the exodus of refugees helps more than it hinders in remodeling a society.

In the New York Times, James Reston has alluded to secret U.S. assistance to guerrillas in Cuban backlands: stuff too deep for officials to own to, but with signs of having come from the horse's mouth—yet not necessarily conclusive, for the horse may be the same as prompted Reston to write 17 months ago that "obviously the United States would not tolerate a Communist regime in Cuba, no matter how freely elected, if that regime allied itself to Moscow and exercised its sovereign rights to maintain a Soviet military base." Let us, however, assume the authenticity of Reston's later report. What it prompts me to say is this: Proxy war does not exempt a nation from obligations. In such concerns a government must not trifle. Encouraging guerrillas is no substitute for policy. Such warfare is not an end but only an early, contingent step toward taking over. The crunch comes with the approach of success. Would we then sustain what we had abetted? Our statesmen must ask themselves this question and answer it in a conclusive affirmative before indulging in any such experiments.

This brings me at least to reflect on an off-heard assertion that there must be no Hungary in Cuba. The noble cliché begs question. Any situation like Hungary or Cuba is sui generis. What is the precise relevant significance of Hungary? Seen in one way, the Hungarian tragedy of 1956 was a rising against Communist rule quelled by outside force while others withheld success. In another perspective Hungary represented the interposition of enough Russian forces to save a minion regime under internal threat. In the first sense, the Budapest phase may have occurred in Cuba more than 2 years ago, at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion. In the second sense,

Soviet forces to cope with any internal uprising are probably the ones already in Cuba—the ones whose lingering presence our officials both publicly deplore and privately explain as having a brighter side.

Fringe Benefits Create Hidden Paychecks—May Aggravate Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the family paycheck is no longer an accurate indicator of the American breadwinner's income. In recent years, fringe benefits have increased dramatically, thus offering our workers greater security and hidden income.

According to a Wall Street Journal article of May 14:

Wage and salary payments have almost tripled since World War II . . . [while] employer payments don't show up in paychecks, so-called fringe benefits, have increased nearly sixfold.

These benefits, which vary among companies, include such services as insurance and pension programs, free lunches, price discounts and country club privileges.

From 3 percent of wages and salaries in 1946, these employer fringe payments have swelled steadily—to a record 7 percent last year—

According to the article.

The steady increase in these benefits may have some serious economic implications, particularly with regard to unemployment. Some opinion holds that because of larger fringe benefits employers prefer to work their existing employees overtime, when required, rather than hire new employees. This view is supported by a recent Labor Department study which showed that 7 percent of all manufacturing work is being done on an overtime basis while more than 4 million persons are jobless.

In addition, there is evidence that the rise in fringe benefits may be contributing to immobility of labor. As the article points out, less than 4 percent of U.S. production workers switched jobs last year compared to 7 percent in the postwar period. As workers become increasingly mindful of the nonwage rewards of seniority, labor mobility—an essential condition for dynamic economic growth—may decline.

In a speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on April 30, George P. Shultz, dean of the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, discussed the need for a smoothly functioning labor market and the important contribution this could make toward easing our unemployment problem. Dr. Shultz also discussed fringe benefits and their relation to overtime work, the age distribution of the labor force, voluntary

A3222

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 21

mobility and the overall problem of unemployment.

Because of the important contributions which the Wall Street Journal article and Dr. Shultz' speech can make to a serious discussion of our unemployment problem, I include them in the Record at this point:

THE CHALLENGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

(An address by George P. Shultz, dean, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, to the annual meeting, United States Chamber of Commerce, Apr. 30, 1963)

A new willingness is abroad in the land—to reexamine the operation of labor markets and to experiment with a variety of devices to improve their efficiency. This new look can, in the long run, provide a vital part to an overall solution of the unemployment problem. I will emphasize it here because it tends to get lost in all the discussion of tax cuts and the stimulation of total demand. Please don't misunderstand me. Like a great many others, I favor an immediate and substantial net reduction in tax rates, but I argue that steps such as this—which operate at the aggregate level—have the best chance of producing full employment with a reasonably stable price level if they are accompanied by improved operation of labor markets. My thesis, then, is "policies for full employment and for efficient labor markets go hand in hand."

At the same time, it is necessary to recognize the short-term pressures arising from the unemployment of the present and recent past. The practical problem is that the fact and the fear of unemployment—a genuine fact and a justified fear for all too many people today—may lead to solutions of expediency, solutions which move away from the conditions for a healthy labor market. The challenge of unemployment is to design private and public policies that raise employment and that are consistent with long-term goals.

CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT AND FUTURE DEMANDS ON THE LABOR MARKET

Two facts about current unemployment are particularly impressive, to me at least. The first bears on the seriousness of the problem, and the second on its composition.

Each month the Department of Labor announces that employment for that month has reached a record high. This is an important observation, and deserves emphasis. But, coupled with questions about the statistics on unemployment—questions directed largely at inclusion of groups with a loose attachment to the labor force, such as youths looking for part-time work or secondary earners looking for a spell of employment—it has led many people to wonder how serious the unemployment problem really is.

I call your attention to one group of people whose experience has special significance. They are labeled, with one of those well-turned census phrases, "married males, spouse present." This is a large group, approximately half the labor force. The men in it are primary earners, usually responsible for the support of a family. They want full-time jobs. The rate of unemployment among them is typically half to a third that of other men, doubtless reflecting in part superior skill and a greater drive for productive employment as well as a different age distribution. How have they fared recently?

Last March over 1½ million such men were unemployed, an unemployment rate for this group of about 4½ percent. This rate has been consistently above 4 percent since 1958 and has exceeded 6 percent in a number of months since then. In the years 1961-67, by contrast, this rate ran generally under 3 percent, including some extensive time periods when the rate was between 1 and 2 percent. Even in the

1964 downturn, it did not stay long at the 4 percent level.

The experience of this group, the core of the labor force, indicates to me a problem of serious concern.

If the problem is serious, it is also diverse in its characteristics. Some people are unemployed because they are in the process of a voluntary shift from one job to another. Such shifting about is basically healthy; indeed, one of the costs of a high level of unemployment is that it inhibits voluntary changes in jobs. Some are unemployed because they have not learned how to search for a job effectively—youths or women entering the labor force or men laid off after a long period of work with one employer. Some find that skills they possess are no longer marketable or, if they never acquired a special skill, that the market for unskilled labor is not good. Some are located in the wrong area of the country or have a strong attachment to an industry and hope—often a vain hope—for a call back to work. Some are unemployed because of characteristics other than their qualifications for work. Of course, there are others who will be reemployed when work in their industry picks up again.

No doubt much of this unemployment will disappear with a rise in aggregate demand. But some of it is best cured by a combination of adequate demand with improved location, training, information, or treatment. It is in this sense that labor market or manpower policies designed to bring about such improvements are the handmaidens of a full employment policy. To neglect the operation of labor markets and the institutional arrangements which shape their character is to invite an approach confined to the aggregate level, likely to be inflationary, and therefore employed with a timidity inappropriate to the seriousness of the problem.

THE LABOR MARKET APPROACH

The demands made upon the operation of labor markets will surely be greater in the next 10 years than in the last. Change, we here with tiresome frequency, is the order of the day, though it should be as frequently pointed out that this is as much the result of shifting consumer tastes and sources of raw material as it is of new technology, and that, without this change, our standards of life let alone our position in the world would rapidly deteriorate. In addition to the shifting about of workers induced by economic change there are some clearly foreseeable trends within the labor force itself. It will be growing at a relatively rapid pace and shifting sharply in its composition. Growth will be most rapid among those under 25 and over 45 years old. It may be noted that relative growth, that is compared with the last decade, will rise sharply for the under 25 age group, the only age group where the rate of increase will be more rapid than the past decade. We will return to the implications of this fact in a few moments.

It is important, then, from the standpoint of meeting long-term manpower developments as well as immediate unemployment problems to make the labor market process as efficient as possible. We are talking here, of course, about human beings and their movement to the places and jobs in which they can be most productive. But, while human beings are involved, what they are involved in is a market process—a fact hard for many to accept, since so much has been made of the idea that "labor is not a commodity." Nevertheless, we ignore at our peril the fact that this market like others relies on good information about supply and demand, the possibility of movement away from one industry, occupation, or area and of entry into others, and that the price of labor in a given market will have impact on the quantity demanded.

The labor market approach also has in it

an element of frustration in that we are constantly talking about policy shifts of apparently small dimension. We seem to be in the position of responding to large and important problems with small bits and pieces. How much more satisfactory it is to have one big solution that will solve all the problems. But, I must say, how aggravating it is to me to read statements that "only 15 percent of the unemployed workers were able to benefit" by such and such an approach, and that therefore the approach was hardly worthwhile. What we must do is work on as many bits of the problem as possible knowing that in total these bits will add up to something worthwhile. And in this adding up, the objective of general improvement in labor market processes can provide a theme and a guide to the adjustment of private and public policies.

Let me now take up by way of example two areas where attention is being and can be further focused to improve our labor markets. In each, we see a combination of public and private policies, and in each we see possibilities for improvement.

RETRAINING, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POLICIES

Great attention has been focused in the last year or two especially, on the idea of retraining, of adjusting and upgrading the skills of the labor force to fit the composition of demand for labor. Three pieces of Federal legislation, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, all provide help to individuals seeking retraining, and the Trade Expansion Act provides some help in relocation.

In general, the retraining approach suggested by this legislation strikes me as a good one, in keeping with the objective of improving the operation of labor markets. The concept involved is one of adjustment to the difficulties of an area, industry, occupation, or group of people, by expanding individual skills and job horizons. In addition and as a side benefit it puts pressure for better performance on the employment service, as an agent for the collection and dissemination of information. And it helps dramatize the inadequacies of our system of vocational education, and so, we may hope at least, will lead to improvements.

This approach contrasts sharply with that so frequently found in private and public policy: the approach of protecting the status quo. If I may be permitted a critical aside here, it seems to me that businessmen who extol the virtues of free enterprise and decry governmental intervention are often the most vocal in demanding protection, aid, and comfort when competition pinches. But let me also acknowledge that similar comments could be applied in a meeting of farmers, labor leaders, or for that matter, educators.

If the retraining approach has the merit of emphasizing adjustment in the right direction, it also has built into it many problems. But the approach is right so the problems are worth analysis and discussion. Information in the Manpower Report transmitted by the President to the Congress in March 1963, suggests some of these problems and points up the issue of defining the appropriate role for public and private responsibility in this area.

Consider first two types of information found in the tables included in this report. Table F-3 tells us the age and education levels of those receiving training under the Manpower Act in 1962. Ten percent of the 6,315 persons involved were 45 years of age or older. About two-thirds were in the age range 22 to 44. The education level of the total group was predominantly (60 percent) 12th grade or better and 90 percent had an 8th grade or better education.

By contrast, the really disadvantaged groups, the ones who present the greatest

version of the Common Market. Its independent behavior and successful development set an instructive example for other members of the Soviet bloc. Above all, Yugoslavia is a living manifestation of the fact that a country may be Marxist without being a satellite of the Soviet Union or serving its political purposes.

And beyond this, Yugoslavia is something more.

If one looks at this country for what it is, and resists the temptation to lump all "Communists" together for mass condemnation, it is clear enough that common slogans and quotations from Marx cover a very large spectrum of political and social attitudes within the Communist world. The simple fact is that the contradictions which separate the Yugoslavs from say the Communist Chinese are a good deal more fundamental than the contradictions which divide Yugoslavia from the West.

EXERT GREATER INFLUENCE

It would be an exaggeration perhaps to describe the system in Yugoslavia as liberal. The Yugoslavs themselves prefer the word "progressive" in contrast to the "reactionary" outlook of their Chinese comrades. Yet it is no exaggeration at all to say that communism as it exists here is unique. And that in the historical development of communism throughout the world Yugoslavia may well exert the greater influence in the long run.

When it comes to the internal system a certain degree of caution is advisable. For an outsider—or for that matter for the average Yugoslav—it is hard to say exactly how the system works. What one can say with reasonable assurance is that Yugoslavia has gone further in the process of decentralization both in political control and in the control of the means of production than any other Communist country in the world.

This principle of decentralization is firmly written into the new Yugoslav Constitution adopted this spring. Though it assures Tito's position as president of the country for the rest of his life (he is now 70) it also assures that no one in the future will exercise the same amount of personal leadership. Presidential terms are fixed by law as in the United States to two 4-year terms. Less important positions are fixed except in special circumstances to single 4-year terms.

ALLOWS FOR DEBATE

Though, as in all Communist systems there is only one party, there is room in the Yugoslav political setup for very considerable dissent and debate. The process, as one observer describes it, operates more like that of a board of directors who agree on objectives but argue over ways and means of achieving them.

The new constitution provides, among other things, for four separate houses of parliament which, together with a Federal chamber, legislate in specific fields of economics, education and culture, social welfare and health and political organization. Some American political theorists see in this system a possible improvement on our own system of congressional committees.

Apart from its central political organization the all pervading authority of the normal Communist state is notably subdued in Yugoslavia. Police activity is restricted and political prisoners are few. Within limits freedom of expression is tolerated and legal protections for the individual are being increased. Religious freedom is guaranteed by the Constitution and, after a brief experiment in collectivization of farms, 84 percent of agricultural property is now privately owned.

In the economic organization of the country, the principle of decentralization in theory at least, goes even further. Under the general blueprint of successive 5-year plans, control, and development of industrial enterprises—from beer factories to hotels to

iron mines and railroads—lie in the hands of separate workers' collectives. Workers councils name their own directors, raise their own money and, again in theory at least, decide on the distribution of profits.

ENCOURAGES MERGERS

Once again, a degree of caution is necessary. Most certainly the central government through its control of central banks and other mechanisms exerts a very real degree of control over a system which otherwise might come close to anarchy. It encourages mergers between competing enterprises, discourages foreign competition and generally sees to it that the economic development of the country conforms with the overall plan.

Even so, however, in a country approximately the size of North Dakota there are some 29 separate railroad systems. If it continues in its present tendencies the economic organization of the country will inevitably lead to what one observer describes wryly as the "restoration of many features of a capitalist economy" with the single proviso of collective ownership.

It is not, however simply the nature of its internal development or the fact that Yugoslavia has managed to dispense with some of the more disagreeable aspects of communism that sets it at the other end of the spectrum from a country like Communist China. For more fundamental in this regard is Yugoslavia's attitude toward the non-Communist world. And most specifically the attitude of its leaders on the issue of peace and war.

This is, of course, the great issue that divides the Communist world today. It lies at the heart of the Chinese charge that the Yugoslav leaders are revisionist, while they, the Chinese, are the true disciples of Marx and Lenin. It is the basis for the growing dispute between China and the Soviet Union upon which the whole future of the Communist movement depends. And in this dispute Yugoslavia plays in its own right a singularly important and prophetic role.

In its approach to the non-Communist world, as in its internal development, Yugoslavia has been on the side of pragmatism as opposed to dogma since Stalin's day.

"You must understand," a Yugoslav intellectual explained to me, "That when we speak of 'capitalist' we are speaking of the system as we knew it—as it existed here and in Eastern Europe before the war. In many ways it was almost like the capitalist system that Marx wrote about in the 19th century. We realize of course that it does not much resemble the system in Western Europe or in the United States today."

CHAMPIONED COEXISTENCE

Thus when a leader like Mr. Kardelj speaks of the "disintegration of capitalism," he is speaking of the dissolution of a system which, for all practical purposes, has long since ceased to exist. His own revisionism consists of the bold assertion that "since the time of Marx and Lenin the world has continued to change, that capitalism has changed in many features, and that socialism too has changed in many features—these changes, of course, taking place in two different directions."

Thus also, since the days of Stalin, the Yugoslavs have championed the idea of "active coexistence" with the West, rejecting the idea of the forcible imposition of the Communist system on other countries and the Chinese theories about the inevitability of war between the "socialist" and "capitalist" worlds. Peace, in the Yugoslav book, is in the elementary interest of socialism as it is in the elementary interest of humanity as a whole.

All this, of course, is quite incompatible with the whole basis for Chinese doctrine and policy. From their point of view it represents a fatal heresy and a very real threat to their own position of power and influence within the Communist world.

With Soviet Russia edging cautiously in the direction of a similar "revisionism" of its own, the stakes are enormous. And the interest of the West in the outcome of the struggle is no less than that of the countries directly involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks made by the Senator from Wisconsin concerning the article written by Mr. Noyes. I read the article. There seems to be a paradox between the recitation of facts and the conclusion which he draws from those facts. In the article he points out the repetition with which Tito has proclaimed his devotion to communism. Time and again Tito has reiterated his subscription to the Communist philosophy. Then he points out that in the United Nations Tito has voted with Communist Russia. Then Mr. Noyes finally concludes that although Tito is doing these things, it is to our interests to give him aid. I have some difficulty in following that argument.

COMMUNIST BUILDUP IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the subject of Cuba.

We cannot and should not be complacent about the condition that prevails in the Western Hemisphere through the menace of the Communist base in Cuba; nor should we be lulled into the belief that in spite of the Communist buildup in Cuba and in other Central and South American countries, all is well with our country.

Have we forgotten the words spoken by President Kennedy in his inaugural address when he stated that our country was "unwilling to witness or to permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed and to which we are committed today at home and around the world; let every nation know—whether it wishes us well or ill—that we shall in the interest of survival and triumph pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, and oppose any foe. This much we pledge and more. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

Is it true that "this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house"?

Unwittingly we are supporting Castro and his Communist government. Castro is not our friend but our foe. We are also hindering the foes of Castro, thus indirectly giving comfort and aid to this Communist enemy of our country.

Peaceful coexistence with Castro—the leader of totalitarianism in America—can only lead to increased trouble and danger. Cuba indisputably is the fortress of communism in the Western Hemisphere. It is the training ground for the Communist technique of subversion, infiltration, sabotage, and provocation of riots precipitated simultaneously by push-button technique.

The Soviet military might in Cuba is not growing weaker but stronger. Signs of Communist growth in other Latin American countries are being manifest.

8578

It is blindness of the worst type for us to believe that the Soviet power in Cuba is a trifle and, therefore, should be looked upon with indifference.

Out of South America the word is emerging that Francois Duvalier in Haiti is dealing with Castro and has proposed the establishment of Castro military bases in that country.

For our own security we cannot suffer the present entrenchment of Soviet-Communist forces on the Cuban island.

The people of our country were led to believe that when the quarantine was lifted and the commitment of no invasion of Cuba was given, that the Communist troops and technicians would be withdrawn. Six months have passed; the troops and technicians are still there. Our position is growing weaker and that of the Communists stronger in the Western Hemisphere.

If under the agreement committing our country not to invade Cuba, Soviet Russia committed itself to withdraw its technicians and troops—then our self-respect and the maintenance of our honor requires that we demand a fulfillment of that commitment by Russia.

With respect to Cuba, ostrichlike we are hiding our heads in the sand, thinking and hoping that while so doing the problem will vanish.

Last October 22 our country, by its fearless position, won to itself the respect of the nations of the Far East, Europe, Central and South America. Abandonment of vacillation and the adoption again of firm decision will receive the support of overwhelming numbers of our citizens and reestablish confidence in the minds of the freedom-loving people of the world in our leadership which has waned as Castro has grown ever stronger.

The situation and the time is critical; we cannot afford this retrogression in our ability to preserve the continued free life of our country.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate in its report on the Cuban military buildup, among other things said:

The Soviets are in Cuba primarily for the purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America and we can be sure that they will exploit their foothold to the greatest extent possible. The paramount danger at this time is that the nations of this hemisphere may be subverted one by one and be exploited, in turn, for subversive and revolutionary activities. By this process of erosion our neighbors to the South may fall nation by nation until the entire hemisphere is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

The importance of making every effort to ascertain the truth with respect to this matter cannot be overemphasized. The criticality of it can best be illustrated by the fact that the testimony established that, upon the assumption that all missiles and associated equipment and the necessary personnel were readily available near preselected sites in a state of complete readiness, mobile medium range missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger is clear and obvious.

Whether or not all the strategic missiles and bombers were removed from Cuba is an issue of grave importance. On this subject the report, among other things, said:

It is fair to say, however, that this is a matter of great concern to the intelligence community. Based on skepticism, if nothing else, there is grave apprehension on this score. It is agreed that iron-clad assurance of the complete absence of Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating onsite inspection by reliable observers. The current intelligence estimates that they are not present is based largely on the negative evidence that there is no affirmative proof to the contrary. This of course, was precisely the status of the matter prior to last October 14.

The Organization of American States through a fully coordinated and collaborated plan succeeded in the removal of Trujillo from the control of the government of the Dominican Republic. It did so by severing primarily commercial relationship with Trujillo. The least that the Organization of America States could do is now to apply to Castro the same treatment that it gave to Trujillo.

Among the captive nations rumblings are being heard about the Communist government through the direction of the Soviet providing economic and other aid to nations such as Cuba at the expense of the people of the benefactor Communist government who are denied a better life through the fruits of their labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when it was testified in the Committee on Foreign Relations that all missiles had been removed from Cuba, I put the question to high echelon officials, "Are you certain that the missiles are not in the caves of Cuba?" The answer was, "We do not believe there are any missiles in the caves." I then put the question, "Why do you say 'We do not believe'?" The answer was that, "We have no proof that they are in the caves."

I followed that by the statement, "On the basis of that type of logic you will conclude that there are no missiles in the caves until affirmative proof is brought to you that there are."

I could not subscribe to that type of thinking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond entitled "Cuba: Unresolved—Time for New Action."

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

CUBA: UNRESOLVED—TIME FOR NEW ACTION
 (By Roscoe Drummond)

When John J. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and all of the intelligence chiefs of the Pentagon combined are unable to convince the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate that Soviet offensive weapons have been withdrawn from Cuba, something needs to be done about it.

I believe that something can be done. Before attempting to suggest one course of action, I want to point up the central findings of the Stennis committee and to examine whether these findings are supported by responsible, fair-minded men.

After taking exhaustive, secret testimony from the entire intelligence community of the Government, including State, Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, plus more than 70 nonofficial witnesses, the Senate committee unanimously concluded: "Strategic weapons may or may not be now in Cuba. We can reach no conclusion on this because of lack of evidence."

All of the witnesses and all of the testimony from the administration said just the opposite—that the strategic missile and offensive weapons have been removed. But the Stennis committee was unpersuaded. It has grave doubts that it is true.

The committee has grave doubts not only because the evidence of withdrawal is inconclusive, but also because our own past surveillance had these serious shortcomings:

There were several substantial errors in evaluating the intelligence because top officials were subjectively convinced that the Soviets wouldn't try to put missiles in Cuba.

Not until long after their arrival, not until after the President had spoken on October 22, did we confirm that Soviet ground combat battalions were in Cuba.

Even into late October we were more than 100 percent off in our estimates of the number of Soviet personnel on the island.

There is inadequate information today on the number of Soviet troops leaving Cuba—and the number arriving. "Some sources estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba."

With these doubts in mind, the Senate committee reports as follows:

"To a man the intelligence chiefs stated that it is their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba. However, they readily admit that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that offensive weapons remain on the island concealed in caves and otherwise. They also admitted that absolute assurance on this question can come from penetrating and continuing onsite inspection by reliable observers and that, based on skepticism, if nothing more, there is reason for grave concern about the matter."

When a Senate committee, reaching this conclusion, is predominantly manned by such able and objective people as Democratic Senators JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi; STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri; HENRY JACKSON, of Washington; and Republican Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, it cannot be ignored.

Why shouldn't President Kennedy renew his urgent exchanges with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to establish the onsite inspection which the Premier himself proposed?

If the offensive weapons have been removed—as stated—and if Soviet troops are to be withdrawn, as promised, then onsite inspection should be welcome to Moscow.

Unless Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, in objecting to on-site inspection, is doing exactly what Moscow wants, he is now in no position to refuse to fulfill Khrushchev's promise to President Kennedy.

The time is opportune to reopen the inspection issue and to reopen it with urgency.

I think most Americans will agree with the Stennis committee's unanimous appeal:

"The entire Cuban problem, both military and political, should be accorded the highest priority by our governmental officials to the end that the evil threat which the Soviet occupation of Cuba represents will be eliminated at an early date."

1963

8579

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I point out to Mr. Drummond that while he states that promises were made for the removal of missiles and the removal of troops and technicians, an examination of the documents exchanged between Khrushchev and the President will disclose no mention by words that on-the-site inspections were to be made and no declarations that the technicians and troops were to be removed. I think that is one of the unfortunate sequels on the exchange of messages last October.

THE COMMUNIST PRESS VERSUS A FREE AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just stumbled across a fascinating editorial which ran recently in Pravda, the newspaper in Russia, which I would like to share with my colleagues and, indeed, all Americans.

For it demonstrates, I think, a fundamental and irrevocable difference between the totalitarian Communist society that Soviets practice and the free society Americans know in a very basic area—the press.

The Pravda editorial, published on May 5, 1963, to mark the 51st anniversary of the Communist Party paper, has this to say about the purposes and duties of the press in its closed society:

Thanks to the constant concern and care of the Communist Party and its Leninist Central Committee, our press has grown into a giant and has turned into a mighty ideological force.

The great Lenin, standing at the source of the Soviet press, determined its lofty purpose as a weapon in socialist construction.

The party attaches great importance to the education of the new man, who will approach his work and his duties in the society in a Communist manner. This requires much tireless work. We must not think that Communist consciousness will grow on its own among the people along with the growth of our economic successes.

Preparations are now developing on an increasing scale in the country for the coming plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which will discuss the tasks of ideological work of the party. The duty of the press is to give wide coverage to these preparations and to increase attention to questions of ideological life, political work among the masses, and education of the masses.

The Soviet press always has held high the Leninist banner, a banner of communism and proletarian internationalism.

The high appreciation by the party of the services of our press and of the work of the Soviet journalists as party assistants puts many obligations on the workers of the press and on its wide activities and testifies to the increasing significance of the press in Communist construction and in Communist education.

That, in sum, is the essence of the editorial. Just think of it, Mr. President. Ideological force, weapon, brainwasher, mouthpiece, apologist, propagandist—that, practically in Pravda's own words, is the function of the press in the Communist society.

Nary a word, of course, about simply giving the news and letting the reader decide. Or of giving the news at all. Or of presenting both sides of a question.

A few minutes before I ran into the Pravda editorial, an aid showed me a hostile editorial from one of our California newspapers, which was not at all pleased with something I had to say recently.

I gumbled and groused a bit.

Then I thought of the Pravda editorial. And I thanked the Lord that I was lucky enough to have been born an American and into a free society, where we all too often take a free press for granted.

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Supreme Court's decision yesterday in the sit-in cases is another major step in the struggle to remove unfair discrimination against Negro citizens. The Court's decisions make it clear that the power of the State cannot be used to enforce segregationist practices. Those who loudly object to Federal legislation to enforce civil rights have never hesitated to enact State legislation to deny civil rights. The Supreme Court has said, in effect, that such State laws cannot stand against the constitutional guaranty of freedom of assembly.

In a perceptive and moving editorial in today's New York Times, it is noted that—

The Court's new rulings should reinforce respect for legal process that is the only durable foundation for all liberty.

As the Times points out, these decisions have provided "every American with a clearer definition of what freedom means."

Mr. President, I know that this editorial will be of interest to many Members, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 21, 1963]

THE MEANING OF FREEDOM

Two weeks ago, when 1,000 Birmingham Negroes were arrested for chanting demands for freedom, the commander of the city's police sneered at the youthful demonstrators were swept off to jail. "If you'd ask half of them what freedom means, they couldn't tell you," he declared. Yesterday the U.S. Supreme Court made some important new contributions toward providing every American with a clearer definition of what freedom means.

One thing it was said was that in Birmingham and all other cities that make segregation a matter of public policy, whether by ordinance or official ukase, no Negro can be prosecuted for seeking service in a white-only restaurant or other public place. Another thing it said was that, where attempts are made to enforce such encrusted patterns of segregation, no Negro can be arrested for insisting on his equal right to use a public park. These fresh breaches in the wall of discrimination will make it increasingly hard to stem the tide toward implementing the constitutional guarantees of racial equality, to which the Court gave such impetus with its historic ruling on public school desegregation 9 years ago.

Their most immediate effect will be to bolster the pact between leaders of the Negro and white communities of Birmingham,

and thus to help end the repression that has made it so hard for the Negroes of that industrial city to realize genuine freedom. The desegregation of lunchrooms and other store facilities was a keystone of that pact. So was an upgrading of job opportunities for Negroes.

The Court's new rulings should reinforce the respect for legal process that is the only durable foundation for all liberty. Extremists in the Ku Klux Klan and the White Citizens Council are once again put on notice that equality of opportunity is the inexorable wave of the future. The advocates of nonviolence and orderly methods in Negro ranks now have powerful new ammunition to use against the Black Muslims and other advocates of total warfare with the white community. The Court has again proved its worth as a force for national unity based on justice.

NATIONAL ACTORS EQUITY WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Friday, May 17, the President signed into law Senate Joint Resolution 39, designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

Next Sunday, the 26th of May, the Actors' Equity will celebrate its 50th birthday. During that period, Equity has provided responsible and capable leadership in the performing arts, and has greatly encouraged and enhanced the cultural life of our Nation. It is my hope that the enactment of this resolution into law will call nationwide, and perhaps even worldwide, attention to the essential place of the legitimate theater in our society.

I am pleased to have introduced this resolution, and grateful that the Congress and the President have acted on it in time for the observance of the historic occasion of Equity's 50th birthday.

Mr. President, on Monday, May 20, Victor Riesel, in his nationally syndicated column "Inside Labor," paid tribute to Actors' Equity for its efforts in the past and its goals for the future on behalf of its more than 13,000 members. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Mirror, May 20, 1963]

IT'S ABOUT TIME WE GAVE OUR ACTORS A HAND (By Victor Riesel)

Let's give the actors a great big hand. Literally. Why? Because there isn't a cause or a charity which has not asked the performers of the land, members of Actor's Equity, to go on stage without pay.

The players, whose union is 50 years old this month, are willing to give benefits, but they frankly now want a few of their own in return.

They want no charity. They want the public's support in making the actor's life easier, more secure economically. They can't eat glamor.

My good friend Ralph Bellamy, Equity's president since 1953, sat recently with some colleagues, each of them stars of the theater. Some suggested they jot down on pieces of paper their average earnings from the work on stage and drop the slips, unsigned, into a hat.

The average income of these performers who are famed household names was revealed as \$6,000 a year from live theater.

This is not much above the union contracts Broadway minimum of \$115 a week.

That is when actors work, of course. And most of Actors' Equity's 13,500 membership don't work too often. There will be more opportunities in a few weeks when some 200 rural theaters brush off the straw—as many as 4,000 of Equity's members will find work on bucolic stages. However, during the winter season the total employment figure is nearer 2,000, including Broadway.

What do they want of the public and the Government? Many things. They want some tax breaks. Today, for example, if a writer takes 3 years to finish a book, he can spread its earnings over the entire period for income tax relief purposes.

But if an actor invests cash and work in a career and gets a break the third year after earning very little previously, he can't spread anything but his waistline.

Actors' Equity wants the international theater exchange program revived. On our side it is dead. Next year not a single professional American theater company will be abroad under Government auspices. However, the Soviets will be touring their Moscow Arts Theater and other quality performing groups.

Actors' Equity also decries "the increased invasion of the American stage by foreign actors." They come in greater numbers these days. The Immigration Service is lax with awaiting actors, says Equity. Stars from abroad such as John Gielgud, Lawrence Olivier and Vivien Leigh are welcomed.

But the actors' union objects to those of lesser ability coming here, getting stage jobs "not on the basis of their talent, but mostly because they will work for less or because they appeal to the snob set that will flock to the theater to hear anyone—good or bad—from abroad."

On the other hand, very few American stage people are permitted to work in England. The London Government protects its players. Americans who do land theater jobs in Britain after a short time, are told to pack up and leave.

Yet the American actors are reasonable. They have a strong union. They have struck only twice since they were organized in 1913.

But the public takes Equity's members for granted—as though acting was an obsession, a hobby, and not a profession chosen for life.

These actors deserve a great big hand. Let's give it to them to help get what they want from the Government.

NEW YORK RAIL RATE CASE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday the Supreme Court put an end to railroad rate differentials that have traditionally favored the ports of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Norfolk. This represents a great victory for the State of New York, and, in the long run, for the national interest.

Since 1877, shipments from the Midwest to the so-called southern ports have enjoyed lower rates than shipments to New York and the New England ports, so far as these goods were destined for the export trade. The same rate differential has also been in force with respect to import shipments traveling in the other direction.

The result of yesterday's decision will allow the rail carriers serving the ports of New York and New England to lower their rates to the level of the roads serving the southern ports.

Such lower rates had been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1956. The Commission failed to approve

these, but a three-judge Federal court in Boston reversed this decision. It was the judgment of the Boston district court upholding rate equalization that was sustained yesterday when the Supreme Court affirmed by equally divided vote.

This development, Mr. President, will be of enormous benefit not only to the citizens, the businesses, and the railroads in and around the port of New York, but also to the import-export trade of the United States, which is expected to expand considerably under the historic legislation enacted last year.

Elimination of the archaic rate differential will put a finish to the diversion of considerable commerce from the port of New York that has worked great hardships on workers and business alike. Today, we in New York can look forward to reinvigoration of the port of New York's historic role as the great entrepôt on the North Atlantic trade route.

Great credit for this victory is due the Port of New York Authority and the New York Central Railroad, and the brilliant legal representation that they received throughout this long fight. In the end, I am sure that the southern ports will not regret yesterday's decision, for they, too, have an immense stake in the overall expansion of the import-export trade that yesterday's decision will surely foster.

TEACHER RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller has designated today, Tuesday, May 21, as Teacher Recognition Day in New York State. He has urged all to join in expressing the appreciation that is due teachers for the inestimable contribution they make to our society.

It is fitting that New York, with a tradition of excellence in education should honor the devoted men and women who have given their lives to teaching the future generation. But the honor which is due to the members of this profession cannot be confined to any one State, and the recognition of their contribution to our society should not be confined within the geographic borders of any one section of this country.

During the last session of Congress, I introduced a joint resolution to designate a National Teachers' Day. The resolution was passed by the Senate in the last days of the session, but was never considered by the House of Representatives.

Early during this 88th Congress, I reintroduced the same resolution which would authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the second Monday in April as National Teachers' Day, inviting the people of the United States to display their esteem and respect on such a day in schools and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies. The teachers who are charged with the responsibility of providing higher standards of education for the American people are called upon to perform vital service to our Nation. If we are to compete with other countries in science and technology and if we are to move forward in the fields of economics and technical as-

sistance to the world's underdeveloped lands, we must provide our children with the finest schooling available anywhere in the Western World. This goal cannot be achieved unless we are willing to recognize, honor and end encourage our teachers.

I have asked the Senate Judiciary Committee to move forward quickly in reporting this bill and take occasion today, on Teacher Recognition Day, to salute the teachers not only of my own State but of the whole Nation, and to promise them that I will do all within my power to see to it that a national day in their honor is proclaimed and celebrated.

EXTREMIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN WEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, throughout history there have always been many people quite willing to say and to believe that "it can't happen here." This has usually been the case when extremists, from either end of the political spectrum, threaten to warp our political system to their own ends.

Such was the case, at least until recently, in my area of the country when the John Birch Society and its fellow travelers and front groups stepped up their campaign of fear and hysteria.

Mr. President, I am confident that it will not happen here, that the dedication to truth and fairplay, the reliance on facts and democratic process will continue to characterize western politics. One reason for this is that the activities of the Birch Society have been and are being exposed for what they really are. And like all activities that operate in an undercover fashion, the light of exposure is a severe handicap for these societies.

Therefore, I would like to commend the Washington Post and Reporter Julius Duschka for a very excellent series of articles which began Sunday on the extremist activities in the Rocky Mountain West. The first three of these articles have already appeared, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

BIRCHERS AND ALLIES OUT TO WIN THE WEST (By Julius Duschka)

SALT LAKE CITY.—It's springtime in the Rockies and the Birchers are blooming in the valleys. The John Birch Society and other radical rightwing groups have found fertile soil in the thinly populated, highly individualistic and extremely conservative Mountain States of the West.

Western conservatives and liberals alike are concerned over the efforts of the Birchers and their rightwing allies to intimidate opposition and to take over State legislatures and the Republican Party as well as parent-teacher associations.

From the wind-swept high plains of North Dakota to the hot deserts of Arizona, there is mounting evidence that America's rightwing radicals have picked the Mountain States as their political target for 1964. What disturbs responsible Democratic and Republican political leaders in the West is the farmomgering of the rightwing movement