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sian" (Trident). This series, excerpted from
the book, gives some insight into the activities of the
Communist party in the Great Basin area of the
United States, including the activities of the
Communist party in the state of Oregon. The
book was written by a member of the Communist
party who served as an advisor to the Oregon
State Legislature during the 1964-65 legislative
d-session. The book is published by the
Communist party in Oregon.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part
is titled "The Oregon State Legislature," and
contains the following chapters:

1. The Oregon State Legislature: An Overview
2. The Legislative Process
3. The Legislative Branch
4. The Executive Branch
5. The Judicial Branch
6. The Political System
7. The Federal System
8. The International System
9. The Oregon Constitution
10. The Oregon Laws

The second part of the book is titled "The
Communist Party in Oregon," and contains the
following chapters:

1. The History of the Communist Party in
Oregon
2. The Communist Party's Role in
Oregon Politics
3. The Communist Party's Activities in
Oregon
4. The Communist Party's Goals in
Oregon
5. The Communist Party's Future in
Oregon

The book is available for purchase through
the Communist party's website or by contacting
the Communist party directly.

The Communist party in Oregon is a member of
the Communist party of America, which is a
national organization with chapters in various
cities across the United States. The Communist
party of America was founded in 1934 and has
been active in Oregon since the 1940s. The
party's goals include the overthrow of
capitalism and the establishment of a classless,
egalitarian society. The party uses a variety of
tactics, including education, organization,
and politics, to achieve its goals.

The Communist party in Oregon has been
active in a variety of political campaigns and
activism efforts, including supporting the civil
rights movement, opposing the Vietnam War,
and promoting workers' rights. The party has
also been involved in organizing labor unions
and advocating for fair wages and working
conditions.

The Communist party in Oregon has faced
opposition from both the mainstream political
parties and the general public. The party has
been accused of being a front for international
communist organizations and of being
subversive. The party has also been involved
in a number of controversial incidents, including
the Portland bombing of 1970, which resulted
da death and injuries.

Despite these challenges, the Communist
party in Oregon continues to be an active
group. The party has a strong presence in the
state and continues to advocate for its goals
through a variety of tactics.

The book "The Oregon State Legislature: An
Overview of the Communist Party in Oregon"
is an important resource for understanding the
role of the Communist party in Oregon and the
activities of the party in the state.
Fritz was able and outstanding. There never was a more successful Member of Congress than Fritz. He was a perfect gentleman, an eloquent orator and a true Christian. The people of Texas and the Nation have suffered a great loss and we all shall miss him. To his wife, Hazel, and all his folks I express my sincere sympathy.

My Country Is Far From Perfect So Why Am I Proud To Serve It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1965
Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the San Diego Dispatch of July 30, 1965.

MY COUNTRY IS FAR FROM PERFECT SO WHY AM I PROUD TO SERVE IT?

By L. R. F. Ball

First of all, have you ever seen or heard of a perfect country? There is no such thing because all countries are organized, governed, and inhabited by human beings and men are fallible creatures. Therefore, recognition, we are not gods, or Founding Fathers attempted the best thing they did held up the Constitution, their goal was to form a more perfect Union than man had ever known before.

The basic idea was, and is still, that men can govern themselves. We do not need a king, a dictator or a small group of “strong men” to tell us how to run our lives. Our Government is designed to reflect the desires of the majority of our individual citizens.

We all know that majority rule would be disastrous for the minority, therefore, in order to protect the rights of the minority, we have our Bill of Rights which establishes individual rights which cannot be taken away from the people.

This unusual and complex concept of majority rule with minority protection will allow us to solve some of the problems in the past and we are going to have problems in the future, but we are always striving towards the best possible way of life for every man.

Admittedly, things seem to go wrong for us at times, and we complain and grumble about it. We know of injustices which go on about us. These problems are not as a result of any basic untruthness of our governmental system. They are the result of a few individuals who are selfish, ignorant or indifferent. Unfortunately, there are a few of these around. Fortunately, there are not too many and they are few because, for the most part, the average American citizen and our basic concepts of the American way of life. No matter how many complaints we may hear about our country, we can be sure that we are always striving, always aiming toward this more perfect union. By exercising our democratic process of participation and private, we can demonstrate our concern and insure the steady aim of our country.

We, as individuals, are not immortal on this earth, but the principles and ideals of our country are immortal. They are worth fighting for and we are proud that we have the opportunity to serve this great Nation.

“We have staked the whole future of America, not on the power of government, but on the capacity of mankind for self-government.” —James Madison, fourth U.S. President.

Eugene Zuckert: Story of Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 5, 1965
Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker. I wish today to join several of my colleagues who have taken the opportunity to express publicly their admiration for Rear Admiral Eugene Zuckert, whose retirement causes us mixed feelings—happiness that he will have a much deserved rest; sorrow that he has left Government service; but above all, gratitude for his tireless and effective leadership, his dedication to his job, and his courtesy and kindness to all of us.

On February 10, the Air Force Times contained an editorial which calls attention to some of his accomplishments. The record of those accomplishments serves as the best tribute I can think of to this distinguished officer. I ask unanimous consent for that editorial to be included in the Record.

The editorial follows:

EUGENE ZUCKERT: STORY OF DEDICATION
WASHINGTON—Supporters of the Air Force are legion, but a likely candidate for the most dedicated Air Force man is Eugene M. Zuckert. Adm. Zuckert, who completed 4 years as Secretary of the Air Force, that record, and all indications point toward Mr. Zuckert’s rearification—most service Secretaries come and go like falling leaves—continuing indefinitely.

Mr. Zuckert first came to USAF in 1947, as a 3-year-old Assistant Secretary under the then Secretary (now Senator) Stuart Sym..
Appendix

Freedom Academy Wins Support
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, now that the House committee in charge of the legislation has unanimously reported favorably on the passage of the Freedom Academy, with the interest and support is rapidly expanding throughout the Nation and it is hoped the House will soon have an opportunity to vote on this vital piece of legislation.

An interesting and informative editorial was recently carried in the Rapid City Sunday Journal, of Rapid City, S. Dak. For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

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

FREEDOM ACADEMY WINS SUPPORT

More war, increasing numbers of young Americans to be involved—that's the program outlined by President Johnson because of the conflict in Vietnam.

Not so much attention was called to action by a committee within the House of Representatives which would establish a Freedom Academy for this Nation.

The Freedom Academy would be the equivalent of West Point, Colorado Springs, or Annapolis in the objective of preserving freedom in a cold war.

South Dakota's Senator Karl Mundt has been a sponsor of the measure. The U.S. Senate passed such a bill in 1960 and no action then resulted in the House. Prospects are brighter now—and the need is obvious this year, just as in the past.

Senator Mundt explains the Freedom Academy would do more in the development of methods and means employable in both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and insurgency while seeking to preserve and build free and viable societies.

Mundt endorses the findings of the House committee which note: "In total war, military defense is only partial defense. Today the major gap in world resistance to communism, the largely undefended front, is the front of nonmilitary or political warfare. The United States has led the organization and development of the free world's military defense in the global struggle. It is imperative that it now take the lead in developing its total defense by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which, in the long run, could be decisive as the military front."

The committee outlined requirements of such a program as follows:

Policymakers and government personnel at many levels must understand communism in depth, with special emphasis on Communist conflict techniques.

At the upper levels of Government we must have, in addition, officials who understand the full range of methods and means by which this Nation and its Allies can meet the Communist attack and work toward our global objectives systematically. This means that they will have to master a broad range of nonmilitary measures which have yet to be developed and systematized.

Below this level, agency personnel must be trained to understand and implement this integrated strategy in all of its dimensions. This public must have greater understanding of communism, its objectives, tactics, and methods, especially Communist conflict techniques and the nature of the global struggle, to prevent the spread of these techniques and to mitigate the effects of the Nation's efforts to counter Communist aggression. More thorough public knowledge of communism will help prevent the spread of the techniques which, frequently arising from misunderstanding or lack of information, creates national dissension and impairs the country's efforts in the global struggle.

The private sector must also be helped in understanding the threat of the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner. It is necessary to assist, and to enlist the support of, other non-Communist countries by training selected foreign nationals. Equal support and understanding among our people and our allies are essential if we are to continue moving forward in a concentrated effort.

A serious gap on the political war front exists when American and Communist techniques and exploitation are compared.

The Freedom Academy would be organized and financed as a Federal training school similar to the colleges which supply officers for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It would be an educational and research institution, not a policymaking agency.

This Nation seems to be at war and the fire is around the globe, and the inroads of crowd Communists are cause for concern.

Still help for the cause of freedom could come from such a college.

Education in the Less-Developed Countries
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading a very stimulating speech, a copy of which was sent to me by Mr. John Scott of Time magazine. Mr. Scott delivered this speech before the International Conference of Higher Education held at Oxford, England, on the occasion of the dedication of the Engineering campus of Farleigh Dickinson University in 1965.

I am submitting the text for the Record as John Scott is one of the most perceptive observers I know and a tribute to Time magazine:

Speech Delivered by John Scott of Time Magazine

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my good fortune to appear as one of the last speakers in this conference and to have benefitted from the remarks of the earlier participants as they analyzed the subject of this conference: What are the common elements of a university education in all countries of the world?

On the basis of what I have heard, I have decided to discard the paper I intended to give on the impact of electronic development on university education and to devote the 20 minutes which President Sammartino has placed at my disposal to one aspect of the subject of the conference mentioned several times but still left imperfectly defined and certainly not resolved. This is the problem of the allocation of the limited resources available in less developed countries for higher education, between the demands of science, technology, and resource development on the one hand, and education in the broad humanities so well defined and so eloquently pled for by Dr. Toynbee in his speech on Tuesday. This conference finds its highest expression, Toynbee told us, in man's willingness and ability to make an emotional leap to a national identity and national allegiance with a feeling of identity with, and allegiance to, the human race.

I intend to approach this problem by citing several examples of problems met with in Soviet education. I have decided to do this for three reasons:

In the first place because I have had some opportunity to observe Soviet education at close range.

In the second place because the subject of this whole conference includes the phrase "in all countries of the world." Though nearly half the human race currently lives in countries dominated by one kind of communism or another, no speaker has dealt in any detail with Soviet education.

In the third place because I hope to demonstrate, Soviet experience is relevant to and instructive in analyzing current educational problems in the less developed countries of the world.

I went to the Soviet Union in 1932 as a very young man and worked for several years in a small mill in the city of Magnitogorsk. A week after my arrival another young man arrived in the city about whom I would like to tell you. I met it through his eyes and experience I think I can make several points more clearly than I could with historic generalizations or statistics.

Shinant was a Tartar. He came from an obscure village in central Kazakstan. When he arrived in Magnitogorsk, he had never seen an electric light, a railroad or a locomotive. He had seen a hammer but never used one. He was 14 years old. He spoke almost no Russian. In communication monosyllabically with fellow Tartars in that language. Furthermore, the village from which he came was a backward one and people believed that washing more frequently than once a year was not only dangerous for one's health but very regarded as the sign of being prosperous. He had arrived in Magnitogorsk to get a job and a sort of the lives of those parasites which they considered normal expressions of man's personality. Shinant had many such parasites, and for this and other reasons no one would select as a close associate—if one had a choice.
In this case there was not much choice. For Shalamov arrived in our gang in response to an urgent request by the foreman to the personnel department to see what hands he could find to work in the electrotechnology unit. It was immediately obvious when Shalamov appeared that he was not an electrician. But this did not disturb the foreman who, instead of dealing with Soviet reality, did not need an electrician but in fact only a body—a man to sit in a booth where work was done on passing current for electric welding. There he was to watch an electric light bulb in the ceiling, and as the arc from the electrode flickered, this once a day as the result of breakdowns in the powerhouse or on the line, he was to switch the motors off, then switch them on when the juice came back. The foreman undertook to explain this simple operation to Shalamov in sign language and Shalamov went to work.

During his first day he burned out three or four motors. During the first week Shalamov sat in little booth peering up at the large installations of the mill without any comprehension of what was going on. He had come to Magnitogorsk to get a larger bread ration card—which he had received as the result of his invalid status. But gradually two things happened to Shalamov. In the first place he began to learn the language of the area, Shalamov's intellectual horizon was rapidly expanding. He became familiar with some things which we in the West encounter at an early age but which Shalamov in his twenties had previously been unaware of. He learned, for example, that he lived in a country called the Soviet Union. Previously he had been aware of the language and of its province, but not of the Soviet Union. He learned that there was something called the 5-year plan.

I remember his explanation of the substance of the plan: "You see all those machines over there? And these miserable shoes (pointing to the floor). The last one is a leaker that could have been my shoes was sent abroad to pay for those machines." A simplistic but essentially accurate description of the substance of the first 5-year plan. I remember on another occasion Shalamov's explanation to me of the purpose of our education in general. You see, Shalamov knew that he had come a long way from his village to Magnitogorsk—he had walked about 2 weeks—and he knew that on arrival he had been very ignorant. He had been told by others that he came from America which was even farther away, and he logically concluded that I must have been more ignorant than he had been when I arrived.

On this occasion Shalamov undertook to explain to me what was going on: "You see the idea here is to take that red dirt from the mountain top here and bring it down here and make iron out of it. A simplistic but essentially accurate description of the process of ferrous metallurgy.

Shalamov was not alone. The entire community at this time was going through a similar metamorphosis. Some two-thirds of the population of 20,000 in the plant were going to some kind of school, studying everything from engineering to linguistics, along with obligatory courses in political science. It was a bad week when only a good worker was sent by being sent to a dental school where spent 3 years. She admitted facetiously that she had been sent because "since most of them previously had no dental care at all, I was an improvement;" I myself went to school. I remember vividly the eloquence with which one of my countrymen announced in his lecture that "if I set back 200 to 2000 patients as a result of the dental school, it was all right if 150 of the patients later on to English and Lenin, with no mention at all of Kant. They shrugged and smiled, "Things have changed."

I was impressed by the improvements in Soviet living conditions—material, cultural, recreational, artistic. But perhaps most of all I was impressed at the fact that millions of Soviet citizens are becoming really educated. I mean educated in Dr. Tynbayev's sense of the word. My education did not come as part of the formal schooling, but was acquired in spite of it. It was through reading, thinking, from discussions. Let me illustrate.

I remember being pressed hard by several graduate students on the cate- gorical imperative. As a defensive play, I mentioned to them that when I had attended the University of Kansas, it turned out after 4 years of primary school, then had worked in a factory where she was a political activist and a good worker. It was sent to a dental school where spent 3 years. She admitted facetiously that she had been sent because "since most of them previously had no dental care at all, I was an improvement;"

I myself went to school. I remember vividly the eloquence with which one of my countrymen announced in his lecture that "if I set back 200 to 2000 patients as a result of the dental school, it was all right if 150 of the patients later on to English and Lenin, with no mention at all of Kant. They shrugged and smiled, "Things have changed."

I was impressed by the improvements in Soviet living conditions—material, cultural, recreational, artistic. But perhaps most of
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It would be presumptuous to say what position the United States would take in Vietnam if it were alive today. But the principles which would guide him in making that decision ring true and clear from the record of his public statements.

Speaking at the Republican Convention in Chicago in 1964, he said:

- "We want to live in peace.
- "We want no territory.
- "We want nonamespace over any nation.
- "We want the freedom of nations from the domination of others.
- "We believe that the cause of freedom and because there can be no lasting peace if enslaved people must ceaselessly strive and fight for freedom.

There was no fuzzy-mindedness in his analysis of the cold war. To him the choice between communism and freedom was crystal clear. He said: "The world is divided by opposing concepts of life. One is good, the other is evil."

You could hate the Communist idea the great humanitarian had no hatred for the Russian people. It was his leadership after World War II which helped feed and save the lives of millions of Russian children.

In summary, the principles which Herbert Hoover held so dear in his lifetime that their policy decision could be summed up in one sentence. He wanted peace, freedom, non-intervention, mutualized international progress for all peoples and all nations. America’s critics at home and abroad contended that the American position was diametrically opposite to that of one of these principles. They contend that America is interfering in the affairs of other nations.

They contend that we are fighting a losing battle to perpetuate white colonialism in Asia.

They contend that we are on the side of reaction, resisting the forces of change and progress.

They contend that we are increasing the danger of world war.

Even among the majority of Americans who support our policy too many seem to believe that we had no business getting involved in Vietnam in the first place and that all we can hope or try to do is to make the best of a bad situation.

There is no reason for Americans to be defensive or apologetic about our role in Vietnam. We can hold our heads high in the knowledge that—so was the case in World War II, and Korea—are fighting not just in the interests of South Vietnam or of the United States but for peace, freedom, and progress for all peoples.

This is not a case of American intervention in a civil war. We are fighting to prevent Communist intervention in South Vietnam.

We are not attempting to impose American imperialism in Vietnam. We are there to prevent Communist colonization and to preserve the rights of self-determination without outside intervention for the people of South Vietnam.

We are fighting on the side of progress for the Vietnamese people; the Communists are fighting against progress. One of the reasons the Communists are fighting is that they believe that the United States will not help South Vietnam, under communism, as an economic slump. The per capita income of South Vietnam is only $100, and this is twice as high as that of North Vietnam.

The greatest fallacy is the contention that U.S. policy increases the danger of war. On the contrary, stopping Communist aggression will reduce the danger of war. Failing to stop it will increase the danger of war.

This is true because, if the Communists gain from their aggression, they will be encouraged to try it again.

It is true because, if aggression is rewarded those who advocate the hard line in Peking and Moscow will have won the day over those who favor peaceful coexistence, and we will be confronted with Vietnam in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is true because, if the Communists gain from this aggression in Vietnam, all of Southeast Asia would come under Communist domination, and we would have to fight a major war.

A crucial issue is being decided in Vietnam: Does the free world have an answer to the Communist challenge? Will the free world band together in the community of nations? If this issue proves unsuccessful in Vietnam, the steady Communist march to world domination will have the green light for conquest by support of revolution all over the world, and we will be helpless to stop it.

This is one of those critical turning points in history. Today Russia and Red China are not a significant military power with no significant nuclear capability. Five years from now the two Communist giant power blocks may be patched together by their mutual ideological commitment, even if they have been divided by defection. Even if they are divided by defection, Red China will then have a larger, more destructive weapon.

It is time, therefore, that we look at the issue of Vietnam in a new light. Too much of the discussion on Vietnam has been in the dreary terms of day-to-day politics, if not the cost involved.

It is time for all Americans to raise their eyes from the purely military goals for which we are fighting in Vietnam.

We are fighting in Vietnam to prevent world war.

We are fighting for the right of self-determination for all nations, large and small.

We are fighting to save free Asia from Communist domination.

We are fighting for the right of all people to enjoy the rights they possessed before the Communist invasion. We are fighting to prevent the Pacific from becoming a Red sea.

The minority of Americans must be united in their determination not to fail the cause of peace and freedom in this period of crisis.

The noisy minority which constantly talks of the need to make concessions to the Communist aggressors in order to maintain peace are costing us the claim to serve. This kind of talk discourages our friends, encourages our enemies, and prolongs the war.

The Communists do not have to be told that we are for peace; they have to convince that they cannot win the war.

We shall agree to any honorable peace but on one issue there can be no compromise: There can be no reward for aggression.

Forcing the South Vietnamese into a coalition government with the Communists would be a reward for aggression.

Neutralising South Vietnam would be a reward for aggression.

Forcing the South Vietnamese to give up any territory to the Communist aggressors would be a reward for aggression.

History tells us that the Communist domination would be only the first step toward a complete Communist takeover.

Neutralisation, in which the Communists are concerned, to be achieved in Laos, would mean—we get out, they stay in, they take over.

Attempting to buy peace by turning over territory to the Communist aggressors would only whet their appetite for more.

We welcome the interest of the United Nations in seeking a settlement. But we must insist that where the security of the United States is directly threatened by international Communist aggression, the final policy decision must be left to the United States and not by the United Nations.

We respect the views of nations who choose to remain neutral to the struggle between communism and freedom. But in evaluating those views let us remember that no nation in the world could afford the isolation that is not for the power of the United States.

The struggle will be long. The cost will be high. But the reward will be victory over aggression and a world in which peace and freedom will have a better chance to survive.

Herbert Hoover was right; we need a Europe also with regard to our future policy when peace finally comes in Vietnam.

The man who hated dictatorship set up the Committee for Small Nations to aid the people forced to live under Hitler’s dictatorship in World War II.

Herbert Hoover took a dim view of trade or aid programs which might strengthen the total power of the Communist regime over the people. That is why he insisted that America aid to the starving Russian people be administered not by the Russian government but by the American Relief Administration which he headed.

We must continue to step up our air and sea strikes on North Vietnam until the Communist leaders stop their aggression against South Vietnam. But completely consistent with our policy would be an agreement giving the people of Vietnam now an American Committee To Aid the People of North Vietnam.

While I am suggesting is not a government-to-government program which would simply strengthen the domination of the Communist Government of North Vietnam over the people of that unhappy country but a people-to-people program. The American people, through contributions to such a committee, would send to the people of North Vietnam food, medicine, clothing, and other materials which would help them recover from the devastating destruction of war.

The government of North Vietnam raised objections to allowing an American agency to administer the program, the distribution of supplies could be undertaken by an international agency like the International Red Cross. Certainly a program of this type would be in keeping with the humanitarian tradition of Herbert Hoover.

As we consider the problems we face, let us not overlook one great fact which is working in our favor in Asia.

Twelve years ago, the Communist propaganda in Vietnam and in other free Asian nations was based on one major theme—choose communism and you will enjoy a better way of life.

Today that propaganda line no longer has any credibility. Those who join the Vietcong in Vietnam do so not because they like communism, but because they fear it.

In the past 12 years only nations in southeast Asia and the Pacific which have enjoyed sustained economic progress are those in which freedom has been given a chance—Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. The economic failures have been Communist China and Communist North Vietnam and Burma and Indonesia, which chose the Socialist road to economic bankruptcy.

There is a lesson in this record for America. After all, when communism is not offered toward freedom, let us not turn away from it.

Herbert Hoover spoke eloquently on this subject at West Branch on his 70th birthday.
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A splendid storehouse of integrity and freedom has been bequeathed to us by our forefathers. It is my duty to see that storehouse is not robbed of its contents.

We dare not see the birthright of liberty to independence, initiative, and freedom of choice bastardized for a mass of a collectivist system.

Again on his 80th birthday he returned to the same theme.

"It is dinned into us that this is the century of the common man. The whole idea is akin to the soul of the Soviet proletariat. The common man is to be whittled down to size. It is the negation of individual dignity & a slogan of mediocrity and uniformity." The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women.

"The humor of it is that when we get sick, we want an uncommon doctor. When we go to war, we yearn for an uncommon general. When we choose the president of a university, we want an uncommon educator.

"The imperative need of this Nation at all times is the leadership of the uncommon men or women." And, just 1 year ago on his 80th birthday, he addressed his fellow countrymen again for the last time: "Freedom is the open window through which pours the sunlight of the future and of human dignity."

We were privileged to have lived in the same century with this uncommon, extraordinary man to whom we owe much to the uniquely American town in the heartland of our country, may we honor his principles as we pay tribute to his memory.

**Freedom Academy Bill Advancing**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. KARL E. MUNDT OF SOUTH DAKOTA IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES Monday, August 16, 1965**

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, unanimous committee approval in the House of the Freedom Academy bill has stimulated greatly expanded interest in and support for the inauguration of this badly needed program for training American youth in the fundamentals of civil war. Likewise, our continuing problems in Vietnam provide a daily reminder of the deficiencies involved in a national program which relies too greatly on runs and bombs: on blood and bullets, to win enduring victories which cannot be obtained without a sharply revised and reinforced approach to the problems of training our friends in South Vietnam on the important and imperative techniques required to maintain a stable, sound, and strong civilian government capable of preserving the victories won in the struggle.

South Dakota newspapers have with great unanimity expressed their approval of the Freedom Academy approach and ask unanimous consent that there appear in the Appendix of the Record a recent editorial from the Aberdeen, S.D., American News under the heading of "Freedom Academy Bill Advancing.

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

**Freedom Academy Bill Advancing South Dakota, aware of the merits of the Freedom Academy proposal that has been advocated for years by Senator Karl Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, are encouraged by the progress it has made this summer.

The Freedom Academy bill, a measure to establish a comprehensive nonmilitary program to meet political warfare needs in the global struggle against communism, has been given unanimous approval by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Although the bill, introduced by Senator Mundt in 1959, had won Senate approval in 1960 it had been victim of a legislative jam in the House. With reintroduction in the House and Senate this biennium the bill's Senate guide—F. E. C. advice—received a helpful recommendation from the committee report.

The report's responsiveness and history of Communist efforts in political warfare and detailed the fact "there is a serious gap in the defenses of the United States and the non-Communist world generally in the political warfare front." It said: "There is a vital and pressing need for an extensive and thoroughgoing program of education, research, and training in this area to close the gap." In additional argument in favor of the bill the committee report said:

"Clearly, if freedom is to remain a distinguishing feature of American civilization, if world peace and the national interests of the United States are to be preserved, committed and well-organized movement on a national scale and checked ** * ** (The Communists have developed) a new form of warfare which has enabled them to render conventional military power ineffective in many situations.

The new form of warfare is variously referred to as nonmilitary, political, unconventional, total, or fourth-dimensional warfare; protracted conflict, etc. ** * ** Communist capabilities in this new type of warfare are the result of a massive development and training program which began decades ago, in secret, conspiratorial meeting and has been continued in and through a vast network of so-called political warfare or political training schools."

"The challenge to the United States and its allies today is not to accent the military installations and capital cities of world communism. Rather, it is to meet the Communist challenge in this new form of warfare and emerge victorious in order that nuclear war may be prevented."

"The United States has the organization and development of the free world's military must. It is imperative that it take the lead in developing its total defense by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which ** * ** could be as decisive as the military front is. It is essential that a thoroughgoing program of research, education, and training in the area of Communist political warfare be established." Developments in world affairs since Senator Mundt introduced his bill in 1959 indicate that the time for action is now. The Committee on Armed Services has announced that it will conduct hearings in Washington, D.C., on the impact of the current security situation on our national defense posture.

Appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Chairman, last November the Department of Defense announced closure of several bases. Among them was an Air Force radar station at Naples in Pacific County in my congressional district in the State of Washington.

The contemplated closure of this 13-year-old Naples air base will remove the personnel (690) and 20 civilian workers and their families with a payroll of more than $1 million—about 8 percent of the annual nonfarm income.

Estimates indicate that about 350 persons will be affected. Naples School District will lose 81 students and undoubtedly also will lose Federal payments for their education as other school districts have lost such funds when defense bases have been deactivated.

Total population of Pacific County in 1960 was approximately 14,000 and the loss of the personnel now manning and serving Naples Radar Station will mean that a substantial percentage of the population will be lost to this area.

For many years Pacific County has been one of the depressed areas under the criteria developed by the Area Redevelopment Administration. On February 1, the unemployment rate was approximately 7 percent. It has not risen above that mark for more than a few months in the last decade. Thus, the significance of the radar site at Naples to the economic health of the community is readily apparent.

The Air Force invested considerable money in this installation. It must be presumed that its technicians knew what they were doing when in 1950 this base was built as an aircraft control and warning installation on top of a 2,000-foot mountain at a cost of about $6 million. These technicians must have known also what they were doing when an additional $650,000 was invested to convert the equipment to a SAOE heavy radar site.

Again, the Air Force technicians must have known what they were doing when in 1962 a further sum of $72,000 was invested in an improved communications system which was placed in service on November 15, 1962.

Further confidence in the Naples site was evidenced by the Air Force when in 1963 the Naples site was selected as a key link in the improved communications system now being built by the Air Force.

At this time, we should be reminded, also, that this Naples Air Radar Station has an outstanding record. It has been opened and closed when suitable temporary test sites have been available and in some way failed to carry out their intended mission.

Consistently, the efficiency of the base has ranked high among similar installations.

I would like also to quote from a letter I received from Mr. Carlson Appelo, manager of the Western Wahkiakum Telephone Co., dated January 18, 1965:
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Appendix

Soil Conservation in West Virginia
EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the July 1965 issue of the Department of Agriculture publication, Soil Conservation, featured a look at Appalachia, its problems, past corrective programs, and future efforts for economic boom. One of the articles in the publication dealt with West Virginia, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There is no objection, the article, "In Perspective," was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A LOOK AT APPALACHIA: IN PERSPECTIVE—West Virginia Flashback: Threes Ears and Flow of People and Prosperity in Highland Area

(By Glendon P. Burton and Ross Mellingon, area conservationist, SCS, Parkersburg and Woodland Conservationist, SCS, Morgantown, W. Va.)

Let's make a trip into a part of Appalachia from the junction of the Little Kanawha and Ohio Rivers at Parkersburg, W. Va. Our flashlight in time will take us over 166 years of land-use history in one of America's unique resource regions.

Starting about 1800, we jump up with the first settlers traveling by boat and on foot eastward along the Little Kanawha River and its tributaries into Wood, Wirt, Ritchie, Calhoun, and Boone Counties. They gain footholds in the wilderness along the stream.

When their first rough shelters are built, they spread out from the stream bottoms to conquer the hills. Their growing families and improving markets for food and timber force them to clear the steep hilllands. They find the soil is good. They can grow corn, wheat, hay, and pasture.

INDUSTRIAL RISE

In the 1860's, the discovery of oil at Burning Springs, Wirt County, sets off a booming oil and gas industry. Oilfield workers establish homesteads farther back in the hills. There is soon a family in every hollow.

Oil derricks along the Kanawha River area what coal mining did to much of the rest of Appalachia and industrial development that left its workers stranded when the resource faded.

Soon lumberjacks move in with axes, saws, and oven to move the timber to the streams. Trees that can't be sold for timber are log-rolled and burned. As there is no current, many three columns are corn.

Food must be grown for home use; and for barter; woodland must be changed to pasture to grow more cattle. There is no current, no grocery store or supermarket. This is a period when each farm is nearly a self-sufficient unit. The land responds to human needs— but at a price.

During World War I more steep land is plowed for grain. Farmers soon begin to notice that the plow often strikes rock where it didn't before. Are the stones growing out of the soil?

PRICE OF THE FLOW

Parts of the field are now red instead of brown and the corn doesn't grow well there. Guilles begin to appear. Even when plowed in or filled with stones, they soon wash out again.

Pasture fields don't green-up as early in the spring; strain grasses and we begin to replace bluegrass. On steep slopes, the land begins to slip and alide in large chunks. The streams run muddy red after hard rains, and they completely dry up in the summer. Dug wells have to be dug deeper. What is happening to the land and water?

This is a period of large farms for hill country. Many are 200 acres or more. Wheat and oats are still often cradled on fields too steep for a binder. Corn is the big grain crop. Hillside plows and sure-footed teams make it possible to plant the steepest slopes. The average mechanization level of this period has a team of horses, hay rake, two-horse mowing machine, a wagon, and a sled.

This is the backbone of the family farm. The whole family works from dawn to dusk. But it is not an unhappy time. Neighborhood visits; exchanges of labor at harvest times; Saturday night in town; Sunday at church; hocking bees; homecomings; picnics and political rallies—these provide social contact and recreation.

THE WEARY ROAD

Roads are a real problem. The soils contain heavy red clay; slips and slides are common. For many years, a walk to the Ohio River at the Brails of May, travel for any distance is a major task. Horses sink to their knees and wagons to the axles when the ground softens. A hard road is a rare treat for the mud-weary traveler.

Following the big family period, farms become smaller. Land is being divided up among heirs, until in the 1890's the average size farm is about 100 acres. About 30 acres is woodland; the other 70 equally divided between pasture and former cropland used as meadow. Farmers need a subsistence level of living, but wants are few. Some folks comment that they made it through the depression years by "lack of expense." Money is not a problem. All farms are plowed and seeded; live-stock prices are riding the bottom; there is little incentive for farmers to invest in large-scale soil improvement measures. In fact, it is almost impossible to find the money, no matter how attractive the promised returns. Yet this period spurs the soil conservation program and the concept of "using land within its capabilities and treating it according to its needs for protection and improvement."

EXODUS BEGINS

During and after World War II, the rapid expansion of industry creates new jobs. Young people leave the farm. The old folks pass away or retire, and many farmsteads are abandoned. Population declines rapidly, and the land starts to revert to its original state of the 1800's—timber.

The farmers who stay see that it takes more and better land, more intensively used, to survive.

Mechanization joined with modern soil conservation to put the trick. But only a few farms can do this because the kind of land needed is scarce.

Now, on long weekends the children and grandchildren return to the old homestead, driving late model cars. The young people left Appalachia to earn the bread of the plains. But there they established a reputation as excellent workers in industry.

A few small industries appear in Harrisville, Grantville, Elizabeth, and Spencer— clothing, rubber goods, metal fabrication, and wood products are manufactured. These help utilize the skills of local people, but there is still a surplus of labor and the industries where possible. They adopt the "drop your bucket where you are" philosophy.

WOOD IS HOPES

With 68 percent of the land now in woodland and with 1.7 billion board feet of timber on good timber-growing soils, wood-using industries are able to provide jobs. Hardwood is being produced from the pine that sprang up on the old crop fields. Trees are being planted. Sawmills and wood-treating plants are springing up in the old highlands. The idea of tree farming for continuous production is catching on.

In the 1960's, soil and land uses problems are still present. After heavy rains, the streams still run red. We see raw, eroded areas in overgrazed pastures; slips and slides on hillsides; eroding road banks and streambanks.

Here and there, as we get close to Parkersburg, we see unplanned housing developments as the city moves to the country.

We see thousands of acres of rough, unstable land gradually being taken over by low-value trees and brush. We wonder if good trees will be planted on these areas before it is too late and too costly.

Roads are still a problem. Designed to get farmers out of the mud, hard tops are now bad. They are not suitable for high speed travel and heavy loads. Bridges are small and posted with low load limit signs. We wonder how heavy wood products can be moved to market over these inadequate roads and bridges.

Where roads are good, people who live in rural locales homesite. Some are factory workers in plants along the Ohio River. Some are retirees. Some are former residents returned to the scenes of their childhood. Where roads provide quick transportation, they prefer to live in the country.

BEAUTY REGIONS

The great natural beauty of this land in the spring, summer, and fall beckons the vacationer. The Little Kanawha River is noted for its bass, muskies, and big catfish. In the woodlands, squirrels, grouse, and deer are plentiful and on the increase. A good boating pool is located behind the Elizabeth Dam. All of these make other outdoor activities, recreational opportunities yet to be fully developed.

We wonder what it is going to take to effect the conservation and development of natural resources necessary for better living in this part of Appalachia.
Landowners cooperating with soil conservation districts have succeeded in curtailing erosion and improving land use on individual properties. Some with adequate land resources for profitable agriculture have found a measure of security. But not more than 50 percent of the land has been placed under safe and profitable conservation management.

A small watershed project on Bonds Creek provides protection to valley farmers and recreation facilities for the city of Pennsboro, but its 9,425 acres is just a patch on the mountainous terrain needing such coordinated planning and treatment.

Currently, committees of local leaders are exploring the possibilities of a Resource Conservation and Development program for the counties under the Department of Agriculture program administered by the Soil Conservation Service.

And now, the Appalachian Regional Development Act (ORDA) offers promise of new aids for building a stable economy on the region's natural resources.

Of one thing we are sure—the land enshrines and if the people put their minds and hands to it, they can fashion a good life in Appalachia.

St. Louis Globe Sparks Freedom Academy Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the St. Louis Globe carried a column by Edward O'Brien, a well-known and respected Washington correspondent, bringing attention to a bill which is presently acting in the Committee on Rules and Administration and a bill on which this House will soon be required to act. The column points out the connection between our situation in Vietnam and the need for the Freedom Academy. Had the Freedom Academy been established 10 years ago I would dare to say there would be no need for American troops in Vietnam today. The present premiership of that war-torn land has stated on several occasions that one of the key problems of the war is acquiring and maintaining the support of private citizens. Few would deny that the Communists have created this war through the efforts of trained professional insurgents. Vietnam is no civil war. Vietnam is a legitimate revolutionary war. Vietnam is the result of professional agitation, incitement and directed by Communist powers. Armed intervention will not prevent wars of liberation. Only through concentrated nonmilitary efforts by the United States and the free world can the citizens of the world be afforded the opportunity to choose between self-government and communism; for as it is now, only the other side presents the case. If they can persuade their constituents on their level and in a manner conducive to organization and support.

Without further comment, I recommend the above mentioned article to the attention of the Congress. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place an article from the St. Louis Globe—Democratic written by Edward O'Brien and entitled "Washington" at this point in the Record:

WASHINGTON
(By Edward O'Brien)

WASHINGTON—Topic A in this city is the military conflict in Vietnam and President Johnson's search for acceptable means to turn the Communist victories at least into a stalemate.

But little thought is being given to the larger problem of stopping the Vietnam fighting and percolate and grow in other countries. This is the fact that Communist warfare takes many forms other than military, that these Red nonmilitary techniques are highly developed, and that the non-Communist world has not yet learned how to overcome them.

As the Vietcong reap their victories, there is, however, a new stirring in Congress and the beginning of a genuine effort to understand Communist use of political, ideological, psychological, sociological, technological, economic, and other nonmilitary weapons.

A few days ago the House Committee on Un-American Activities approved a bill, sponsored by Representative Richard H. Ichord, Democrat of Missouri, to establish a Freedom Academy of the United States Government agency that would mount a comprehensive nonmilitary program to meet the Communist challenge.

Though the Academy idea has been lying around in various congressional bills since 1960, this bill was approved only after it had been moved as far as committee approval in the Senate. The Senate approved a similar bill in 1960 but since then the Senate has been stalled, apparently because of opposition by Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, the foreign relations committee chairman.

In a speech in 1961, President Kennedy said he was going to be agreeing to the need for something like the Academy:

"We dare not fail to grasp the new concept, the new tools, the new sense of urgency and action. We must fight the unseen enemy. We are fighting for the future of freedom, and the future of our country. We are fighting for our way of life. We are fighting for our way of living. We are fighting for all the things that make this country great."

"The people of the country have understood what we are fighting for. They have been with us. They have been with us all the way. They have been with us in the battle of ideas. They have been with us in the battle of the mind."

"We must now add this to our battle strategy. We must add to our battle strategy a battle for the minds of the world. We must add to our battle strategy a battle for the minds of the people who are fighting for our ideas."

"We must add to our battle strategy a battle for the minds of the people who are fighting for their ideas."

"And we must add to our battle strategy a battle for the minds of the people who are fighting for their way of life."

"And we must add to our battle strategy a battle for the minds of the people who are fighting for their way of living."

"And we must add to our battle strategy a battle for the minds of the people who are fighting for all the things that make this country great."

"These words were written by the President in 1961. They could be written today."

In the Senate, the proposal has always had support from Democrats and Republicans, Liberals and Conservatives, and the Senate Judiciary Committee said in the 1960 bill:

"This is the first measure to contain a provision that a government agency be established to provide research and training in political warfare. This program must precede a significant improvement in our cold war capabilities. The various programs and agencies must be reorganized and every effort must be made to upgrade all the agencies."

"The Freedom Academy may be a more efficient way to accomplish the objectives of the Senate."

At present, the United States does not even have an adequate library for research and training in political warfare. The Senate Department of Information, and other agencies working directly in the field do no more than brush the subject in preparing their professionalism.

The committee in another bill have operated, for almost 50 years, dozens of first-class political warfare schools for Red of every country. The success of this organization and terror in South Vietnam are a result.

The State Department has always opposed Freedom Academy. But as the record shows otherwise, that the same job can be handled by State or other existing agencies.

The other factor is the belief held by many State Department officials and by Senator Fulbright that the cold war is over, making the Freedom Academy concept obsolete. But reality is the negative. Communists have only to point to Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and dozens of other hotspots to show that freedom is in greater peril than ever.

Shrine Award Presented to O. Carlyle Brock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Imperial Session of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America was held here in Washington from July 18, 1965. During the opening session the Elroy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma of the Elroy International Foundation of the Rotated International Order of the Mystic Shrine was awarded by my friend, shriner, and constituent O. Carlyle Brock who had served as Imperial Potentate of the Shrine for North America during the year 1964-65.

The presentation address was made by Dr. Herman A. Bayer, American Provost of the Elroy Alfaro International Foundation, and the formal presentation was made by the General Valley of Imperial Potentate, Barney Collins. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Bayer's remarks and the acceptance speech of O. Carlyle Brock be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"To O. Carlyle Brock, Imperial Potentate for the Shrine for North America, we are assembled here this afternoon to honor you, our dedicated and distinguished leader for North America. You have been the highest honor of the Elroy Alfaro International Foundation and the great honor of the Shriner's International. You have done a great deal of your outstanding service to mankind, and for your merit and accomplishments in all worthy endeavors, including the shrine's hospitals, and in further recognition of your untiring efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

This foundation, named after the soldier, patriot, statesman, martyr, the former president of Ecuador, at the turn of the century, is for the perpetuation of justice, truth, and friendship among peoples and nations; and seeks to promote the General Valleys with personal integrity, for which General Alvaro de

President Alvaro (1864-1912) established in Latin America, many schools, colleges and universities, as well as hospitals and other welfare institutions; and furthered cooperation among the countries of the entire Western Hemisphere. Under his leadership, the legislature of Ecuador passed laws, separating church and state.

Whenever there was a threat to the peace in the Western Hemisphere, he was the dynamic leader who had the greatest interest in the peaceful settlement of such disputes.

General Alvaro bowed the seeds for Pan American understanding and cooperation. In 1907 he called a peace conference in Mex-

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B0446R000600608010-7
And as one person explained it, neither of the planes on order, the medium-range Boeing 727 three-engine jet or the short-to-medium range engine DC-9 two-engine jet, would appear to be the total answer for the region.

The Boeing ship, of course, isn’t meant for short-haul operations. And the DC-9, although designed for local service, or regional routes, can be flown profitably only on routes of 300 miles or more outside of the two major New England airports served by Northeast.

The carrier has about 1800 passengers—on the way from one New England airport to the other, to go—on a typical run and it has the option of a third regional service which it may need if the service is profitable enough.

Then, again, the DC-9 ordered by Northeast isn’t a “small” jet in any sense, even though it can operate on routes as short as 160 miles.

It is a plane that will seat up to 110 passengers—and easily suited to the limited traffic loads of the second string New England market. But if it is to be used on the more heavily traveled, and longer routes, it is the plane that will provide the better service.

Furthermore, it seems likely that the carrier has decided that the aircraft offers a better balance to the overall New England market than the DC-9, a fact which they acknowledged in their announcement.

The new DC-9 will be introduced in the fall of 1965, with a projected increase of service. But the carrier does not have a definite date for the introduction of the new aircraft.

On the whole, the new DC-9 is the plane that will provide the better service for the consumer.

The New England market has been permitted to wither. But it is ripe for development, in the opinion of the New England communities. Whether or not the new New Englanders will decide to invest in the new DC-9 is another story.

The New England market, however, seems to be the most promising of any area in the country.

 Legislative Reapportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the August 16, 1965, issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, entitled "Revered Dirksen Amendment."

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

REVERED DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Senator Dirksen’s determination to get through Congress a constitutional amendment modifying the drastic one-man, one-vote rule of the U.S. Supreme Court on legislative reapportionment...is commendable. Whether he can succeed in securing the adoption of this revised version is debatable. Even if he manages to obtain the necessary two-thirds’ majority in the Senate, despite the threatened filibuster by “liberals”...who consider the filibuster an instrument of American democracy, but which, in truth, is a tool with which the Senate, by itself, has to call a two-thirds vote in the House. Then three-fifths of the State legislatures must approve.

All this is extremely difficult, given the amount of pressure that has been applied against the Dirksen amendment, especially by civil rights and labor organizations. Senator Dirksen’s revised version should take care of most of the objections, but whether it will or not is uncertain.

Dirksen was quoted, after he failed by seven votes to get the required two-thirds in the Senate, as saying:

"I do not know what will happen," Senator Monongahle said, "but I think it advisable to give me a vote, and that something may develop that they didn’t expect it." An absolute requirement that there be a reapportionment of both branches of every State legislature every 10 years, to take account of the census, is a feature of the revised Dirksen amendment. It would have to be approved by both branches, and then by the voters of the State in a referendum. If one branch were apportioned on any basis other than population, Senator Dirksen stresses the thought that it must be done on the basis of the entire population of the State.

There is always the possibility that if this method of writing an amendment to curb the one-man, one-vote principle fails, two-thirds of the State legislatures may recommend to Congress to call a constitutional convention. Such a convention would not be limited, and, as Senator Flourney said, in 1965, "It might open a bucket of eels." So it appears that if the one-man, one-vote principle is to be modified, the only way is through the referendum.

But the prospect that a convention called by petition of the States would be wide open, and once free to rewrite the Constitution, may well prevent any such convention from ever being brought together.

Academic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. EDWARD J. PATTERN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. PATTERN. Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey many of our leaders have a problem involving the remarks of a professor which many of us feel very distasteful and repugnant to our beliefs and I was impressed by an editorial in the Advocate on academic freedom I thought my colleagues would like to read.

The editorial follows:

[From the Advocate, July 22, 1965]

ACADEMIC FREEDOM—I

In our democracy, free and open discussion is essential to assure mature action. The administration policy in military matters is enthusiastically supported by some and energetically questioned by others. An instance was the vigorous exception to the administration policy in Vietnam taken by a Rutgers professor.
V-J Day and Our Fighting Men in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, second highest ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, recently gave an analytical firsthand report on the accomplishments and objectives of America's fighting men in Vietnam. He gave this presentation on August 13 to the Allied Veterans Council joint observance of V-J Day at Milwaukee where the theme was "A Tribute to Our Fighting Men in Vietnam."

The close and accurate knowledge that Congressman Zablocki has of the free world's commitment against the spread of communism is of such great import to all Americans that I take exceptional pleasure in inserting into the Appendix his worthwhile address to the council, which relates to veterans organizations in Milwaukee County.

The address follows:

V-J DAY AND OUR FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

(Speech of Hon. Clement J. Zablocki at the Allied Veterans Council V-J Day Ceremonies, Milwaukee, Wis., Friday, Aug. 13, 1965)

It is indeed a privilege and an honor to have been asked by the Allied Veterans Council of Greater Milwaukee to participate in the events of this evening.

These V-J Day observances, sponsored by the council, have become an important anniversary for our community. They have reminded us of the sacrifices which so many made in World War II in order that we might enjoy freedom and prosperity in our great land.

The Allied Veteran's Council is particularly to be commended for planning this evening's program to the American fighting men in Vietnam.

It is entirely fitting as we observe the 50th anniversary of the victory over Japan and the end of World War II, that we pay tribute to those who are fighting and dying to preserve freedom against Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

This occasion also affords an excellent opportunity to make certain meaningful comparisons between World War II and the present conflict in Vietnam.

Many of us recall the protests which accompanied increasing American involvement in World War II before Pearl Harbor. Each attempt by the Roosevelt administration to strengthen the Nation's defenses and assist our traditional Allies in Western Europe was met with criticism. Mother's marches and peace demonstrations were organized in an attempt to dissuade the military buildup which had later proved so necessary, yet vital to the security interests of our Nation.

In 1939 and 1940 it was fashionable in Washington for our leaders to say: "any boy can be a soldier." Others quoted President George Washington's advice about avoiding foreign entanglements. Who were these peace-at-any-price advocates for the most part they were well-intentioned, genuinely concerned individuals. They lacked, however, any real appreciation of the basic principles of the American system and these include freedom of debate and freedom of expression.

What is the purpose and objectives of the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy?

The formation of such an agency could be a step toward bridging the much-criticized gap between freedom after so many years of hard endeavor to enact a comprehensive law against communism in the United States and the free world in the global struggle against the swelling tide of communism.

The purpose and objectives of the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy would be to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other countries to compete with and to struggle against freedom and communism: to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens so they can more effectively implement this federal body of knowledge; and to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas under appropriate conditions.

There is a crying need in our country today for such an institution as the Freedom Academy "to assist in the development of a strong, recognizable enterprise by both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and nonviolent espionage, while seeking to preserve and build free and viable societies."

The companion bill to Congressmen Her-"
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ing, the time seems to be now—or perhaps never—for the evolution of a stronger spirit from which growth and change can spring: a stronger spirit to carry it, in the next years of its history, into a position of equal partnership and leadership among all elements of a total housing program.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is my intention to address the Senate briefly each week in order to emphasize our need for legislation patterned after our Freedom Academy bill (S. 1232). I intend to present timely evidence supporting the contention behind the bill that we are yielding ground which we need not yield in our efforts to stem the expansion of aggressive communism.

To the many observers who support the Freedom Academy concept, this attitude that we are not so successful as we might be has required no argumentative support; and, naively perhaps, we have thought we needed no considerable evidence to emphasize our case. Our own side of the world is not prepared to fight in the specific arena where the battle between Communist aggressors and their victims is being fought. This arena is really the nonmilitary or only quasi-military area. We Americans, who exhibit pride in our historic guerrilla-type warfare capabilities which we demonstrated so effectively during the French and Indian War, our American Revolution, and the conquest of the West, inherit from our ancestors a contempt for the arms and techniques like Braddock who refused to recognize the impotence of continental-type enemies against backwoods guerrilla bands, now find ourselves the ones who send million dollar jet aircraft armed with thousands of pound bombs against an ephemeral enemy whose operational capacities are so adroit that he may well not be there when the bomb arrives.

But the guerrilla game has gained sophistication, too, since we left it. Its political side is far more thorough now. Psychologically, warfare is mounted against a propaganda effort and the enemy within to soften their resistance to the more tangible guerrilla or quasi-military operation conducted in conjunction with it at any of the battlefronts.

And we seem to stand by, wringing our hands, wondering what is going on as we see the will to resist among an ally's people waning away like much smoke.

The L. L. Sulzberger column in Wednesday's New York Times testifies to our need for the Freedom Academy. To listen to his observation, we find ourselves from this gifted observer of foreign affairs.

American defense plans during the past decade have carefully and expensively prepared to fight the only kind of war we are least likely to face. And we have not in any major sense prepared to fight the kind of war both Russia and China surely intend to press.

When post-Stalinist Moscow endorsed peaceful coexistence it always reserved one vital area. It openly promised to support, whenever possible, wars of liberation. "Khrushchev tried to play a trick on us in Cuba, but he had to back down because he was patently not engaged in a liberation war—only in directly threatening our vital interests. Our strategy was prepared for such a showdown."

However, when the Communists stick to their own rules they have a demonstrated ad. (Continued from previous page)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is it my understanding that the debate is concluded, and that the Amendment offered by Senator Goldwater is the only order of business before the Senate?

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. President, I think it is not on the order of business, and I understand that the Senator from New Jersey is not voting on any proposition of a senator other than Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I understand that the debate is concluded. Is the Senator from New Jersey, if he wishes, free to vote on the amendment of Mr. Goldwater?

Mr. DAVIES. I believe that is so.

Mr. MUNDT. If I understand that correctly, I would like to join with Senator Goldwater in voting for the amendment; but I do not wish to speak on the floor at this time.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to announce that I am giving up the chair but that I am remaining in the chamber.
war on poverty. Senator Williams' fine work with America's migratory farmworkers has given him a great knowledge of the problem of poverty and what can be done to solve it. In his speech, the Senator from New Jersey pointed out that our attack on poverty is motivated not only by humanitarian concern, but also by sound common sense. The point Senator Williams made—that we must take the poor off the relief rolls and put them on the payrolls and the tax rolls—should be interesting to all of us. I think most of us will be interested in Senator William's remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the Record.

"If there is no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WILLIAMS FOR CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 4, 1965

For too many of us, the phrases "Great Society" and "war on poverty" are gibberish, often used to mean nothing, but I am not among them. The biblical thought that "the poor are always with us" is still as true today as it was 2,000 years ago.

To a great degree it is still true today. With growing prosperity, the percentage of farmers or workers—men or women, for profit or for subsistence—has reached an irreducible minimum and whether the number of poverty levels will be maintained, remains a problem. In the absence of any international barrier which even our great and expanding economy will be unable to cross.

I do not think that this is true. As a Nation, we have made, and will make, a tangible commitment in hard cash that it is not true. This year the President will ask for one and a half billion dollars to be spent on the war on poverty. In other words, the war on poverty is not a campaign slogan—it is a billion-dollar pledge by the United States that the age-old problems of poverty are not immutable and that with the right approach we can solve the problem.

The war on poverty is a way of life. It is a way of life which will make it possible for the poor to lift themselves out of poverty's grip and to live decently. It is a war against the conditions that make poverty inevitable.

The idea of a war on poverty is both amazing and exciting. It is amazing because we are the first nation in history to turn our great resources and wealth to a practical attempt to lift the poor and the disadvantaged from the rut of despair. And it is exciting because we have set aside the interests of society and decided to put the interests of the poor first.

If we are to win this war, we must make sure that the poor do not lose their right to a decent life. If we are to win this war, we must see that the poor do not lose their right to a decent life.

There is already good evidence that a concerted attack on poverty is not only a moral imperative, but also a practical imperative. One aspect of poverty that I know well is the living and working conditions of the migratory farmworkers. The story of the Sultana disaster, the story of the long, hard journey from the fields to the cities, the story of the child labor, the story of the loss of dignity, the story of the lack of a home, the story of the lack of a decent job. These are the stories of poverty, and they must be told.

The war on poverty is not only a war against poverty, but also a war against the causes of poverty. It is a war against the conditions that make poverty inevitable.

The war on poverty is a war against the conditions that make poverty inevitable. It is a war against the conditions that make poverty inevitable.

"BONANZA IN SUGARBEETS ELUDING KANSAS FARMERS"—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEARSON

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the February 20 issue of the Kansas Farmer featured an excellent article by Senator Pounds of Kansas [Mr. Pearson], in which he ably outlines the problems our present sugar policies are creating for farmers, not only in his own State, but in all areas interested in, and capable of, producing sugar beets.

Under present policies, the U.S. consumer is dependent upon foreign producers for 50 percent of his sugar supply. Our State Department has been consistent in maintaining this policy, even though the cost of such a course was clearly demonstrated when a world sugar shortage developed in 1963.

It makes little sense to require the American sugarbeet producer to reduce his plantings, as is being done for the 1965 crop, while continuing to seek the same high level of sugar supplies from foreign sources.

We are attempting to control the build-up of surpluses of many of our crops, chiefly wheat, feed grains, cotton, and peanuts, but only a small portion of the crops that are currently being produced in many areas now devoted largely to these crops. Additional acreages of sugar beets can increase the income of farmers, and the surplus problems we face with other crops, and provide the United States with a stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices.

Mr. President, the article written by Senator Pearson, one of the most knowledgeable and understanding Members of the Senate, is a clear presentation of the problems faced by the American sugarbeet industry. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

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

"BONANZA IN SUGARBEETS ELUDING KANSAS FARMERS" (By James B. Pearson, U.S. Senator)

Sugar beets can give Kansas' agricultural economy a fresh new look.

The potential that exists for increased production of sugar beets. Yet in 2 years, we have been able to change all that. Today basic medical care is available to the migrant workers who came to do the work. The migratory workers are no longer treated as remnants of a medieval past.

Our war on poverty is not only a moral imperative, it is an economic imperative. If we can take the poor off the relief rolls and put them on the payrolls and the tax rolls, we will become the first time in our history to lift the burden of a large segment of the population from a financial burden into a productive asset. But more importantly, we will have fulfilled the dream of the men who came to this nation and who were the true founders of the Great Society. The Great Society is not a new deal. It is a new form of hope for a better tomorrow.
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This action by Young Americans for Freedom was called irresponsible pressure. Does that mean that anyone who disagrees with administration policy is irresponsible? Should we do away with our Bill of Rights and order to secure unity in our foreign policy?

Young Americans for Freedom is a group that represents the best of our youth. They number many Philip Kappur, early presidents, and leaders among their membership. They have supported President Johnson in his Vietnam policy. How many other so-called groups in the Nation have spoken out in support of our policy in Vietnam?

It was said that the rubber company incident was "a case study in the defeat of an important and carefully considered policy of the U.S. Government by irresponsible private interests, aided and abetted by the failure of Government officials actually to support the the President's established policy.""

Now all the policies of our Government are important and presumably carefully considered, but this does not mean they are necessarily correct. There were many in the Congress that held that the policy of the then administration with respect to Cuba was correct in 1962, and that certain Republicans were being irresponsible in their criticism of that policy, until it was discovered that our good friend Nikita Khrushchev had planted ICBMs in Cuba. Then suddenly that policy was changed.

It is a well-known fact that the Executive, and in particular our State Department, constantly send out people and information designed to secure public support of our official policies. Should this right be denied to private citizens and organizations?

The right of individuals and groups to protest has been upheld in the courts time and time again. And this does and should include foreign policy. The Constitution specifically upheld the right of our American maritime trade unions to boycott merchandise from Communist countries or ships which trade with our Cuban Communist neighbors.

What is perhaps even more astonishing, another rubber company was attacked for its decision not to build a synthetic rubber plant in Romania. Should not any company have the right to choose whether or not to build bridges to satellite Europe, and especially so when they state that they were acting, in their opinion, in the national interest?

Many of us feel that this avowed policy of building bridges to the Communist world is open to serious question. Should it not be that the Communist world ought to build the bridges not we? The Young Americans for Freedom feel, as do many of us, that by aiding Communist governments, we may betray our highest ideals. We certainly do not help the Rumanian people by assisting their Communist government to maintain itself in power. Who truly speaks for the long-term peace? Is it not totalitarianism? World peace? What should we lend respectability to a government imposed upon them by force?

Now it is contended that Young Americans for Freedom has stopped two industrial giants in their tracks and upset the whole State Department. Actually, I wonder if perhaps there is not a little more verification of the idea that the rubber company should be in Cuba, or not? Does not this action really represent the opinion of the majority of our people?

It now is popular in Washington to refer to a consensus. Does this mean we shall all march like lemmings down to the sea for the sake of accommodation with the Communist world? Young Americans for Freedom may not espouse a line of thought popular with this administration, but they speak realistically in a world where one system or the other is bound to prevail because the Communist definition of peace presupposes the extinction of the free nations. If these young people do not understand why we should bolster the economy of Communist nations, then I confess I do not understand.

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of criticism we should express pride in the understanding of the world situation and patriotism demonstrated by Young Americans for Freedom.

FREEDOM ACADEMY PLAN BACKED

(MR. ICORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. ICORD. Mr. Speaker, last night's news of the Washington Evening Star contained an editorial by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick entitled "Freedom Academy Plan Backed." As the sponsor of the bill which is now awaiting a rule I can testify to the non-Cong of Mr. Kilpatrick's statements. He has captured the essence of the proposal in a brief but comprehensive description of some of the history and by culling some of the objectives of this legislation. H.R. 9713 is a bill which deals with national security and the cold war. It deserves the attention and consideration of the Members of this body.

I commend this editorial to the Congress and hope it will be studied and reflected upon by each Member.

NEIL MacNEIL ON CONGRESS AND THE INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY

(MR. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. MacNeil granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Neil MacNeil, congressional correspondent for Time magazine, has made one of the most perceptive and compelling statements I have seen on Congress and its intellectual role. The occasion was the George Washington University American Assembly at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., on May 14. I am not sure that he would have any colleagues to read and study it—and I am taking steps to see that it is circulated widely in the intellectual community:

...
critics tend to regard struggles over legislation in purely moral terms, rather than as power struggles between competing political philosophies. The rigors of debate tend to praiseworthy or denigrate Congress, depending on whether Congress passed or rejected their favored bill. This, in turn, creates an atmosphere of acrimony, which they confuse with the realities of congressional life.

The Members of Congress have valid cause for reaching with suspicion to much of the intellectual and political activity within their ranks that is hostile toward Congress perceives the thinking of many leaders of public opinion outside Congress. It is evident in many of the books of political scientists, in newspaper editorials, and even in the vitriols of our humorists. It is most evident of all in many of the reforms of Congress that are suggested. Too often, proposed reforms smack of an obvious intent to reduce Congress from its status as a separate and independent branch of the federal government. The Members of Congress, who are the Republicans or Democrats, are jealous of the prerogatives of Congress, and they fight tenaciously to maintain them.

This dichotomy between Congress and the intellectual community is no new thing. It has been around for decades. In 1859, Charles Longworth, of Ohio, Speaker of the House of Representatives, referred to this long-standing animosity toward Congress in his annual address to the House during the night of the election time. Longworth said, "we have been attacked, denounced, despised, hunted, harried, and flayed. And then he added, significantly, "I refuse to take it personally.

The critical attitude has taken the critics personally was not mere intransigence. It was the reaction of a man who felt keenly that the criticism was not warranted, that the assessment of Congress on which the criticism was based was not valid. His words summarized the feelings of Congressmen since time out of mind, and they summarize the feelings of Congressmen now.

Members of Congress, as a whole, normally do not belong to the political scientists, but the political scientists do not listen to the politicians on Capitol Hill. This has produced a fundamental disagreement between Congress and the intellectual community. Its roots lie in a fundamental disagreement on judgment and the method of determining what is true. To the political scientist's understanding and description of Congress many are incomprehensible to the Members of Congress, and their behavior is frequently incomprehensible to the political scientist. The mutual enmity, borne of this disagreement, has prevented a meaningful dialog between the two. The resulting animosity and recrimination have made it difficult for anyone to stand between them as revere or as friend of the court, for he faces assault on one side as an apologist for incompetent and on the other for moralistic sophistry.

The hostility is at every hand, in speeches in the House and Senate, as well as in newspaper editorials and the books of political scientists. Take the American Assembly's current volume, "The Congress and America's Future," on which this conference is based. In his introduction, David Truman has specified the thesis of the type of the American Assembly's conference by the intellectual community. "The cartoon symbol," Professor Truman wrote, "of the bewitched, frustrated politician familiar to all newspaper readers, effectively illustrates a persistent stereotype. But Truman was concerned that the stereotype was less than he intended, for it will serve as well for the Congressman's image of the typical political scientist: A bewhiskered, fog-coated, bungling old man.

The Congressman repays the intellectual for the intellectual's criticism with a scornful retort. If the intellectual regards the word "politician" as an epithet, the typical Congressman regards it as a synonym with the petulant. "If there is justice in both views, at least in some cases, the effect is to expedite any reform, preferring a second-rate or third-rate rather than the academic. And this, in turn, has created that dangerous chasm between Congressman and intellectual. In plain terms, they do not understand each other, and too frequently they do not bother to try to understand each other.

The loss of the nation's law for Congress needs help in meeting the challenges of today and the promise of America's future. Congress needs the help of the academic world: The imagination, the skill, and the talents of men and women who can help Congress in the depths of its institutional needs, and then bring forward viable remedies to meet them.

Parliamentary procedure, like law, is based not on logic, but on experience. It is pragmatic, rather than scholarly. It is not concerned with what is true, but with what is likely to be accepted. The logical meaning of Congress and its ways is to be the heart of a free society. If Congress tolerates the mountebanks and demagogues in its ranks, on Congress, that they too were elected, it re- quests only its men of character, industry, ability, and sincerity.

The Members of Congress share a sense, if not the same sense or to the same intensity as the academic world, that Congress must change, but not in a sudden rush, to meet new conditions and new tasks. It is this sense that prompted Congress this year to organize a study of its procedures and organization. The formal hearings for this congressional reappraisal began this year. It is scarcely possible for the academic world and Congress to contribute to this change, so long as political scientists think of Congress as a hopeless thing and Congressmen regard professors as merely mis-informed cranks. There is a pressing need to build bridges across the chasm that separates Congress and the intellectual community and to develop, eventually, a working partnership between them.

In this essay I do not for a moment endeavor Congress from its share of the blame. Frequently, the Members of Congress have been the victims of self-perpetuating complacency about Congress and the rules and practices of Congress. They have been governed by a working parochialism and root-hog-or-die attitude toward projects for their districts and States. Too often, Senator Cocken, Senator Fulbright once called "the swiftest blight of anti-intellectualism." The Members of Congress, members of their party for the ill repute of Congress in the intellectual community.

But largely the blame falls also on the academic community, and on none more importantly than the political scientists, who are most responsible to interpret for us all the manifold substance of Congress. In large part, I suggest, the political scientists are to blame for the discrepancy between the Congressman's understanding of Congress and that of the intellectual community. Here, it seems to me, the fundamental fault lies in the method of many political scientists in their examination of Congress. It is an important to intellectual discipline and validity.

From the beginning, many political scientists have approached Congress with techniques strikingly at variance with those of other academic disciplines. I have always suggested that this approach has been ethical and moralistic, rather than scientific. Too many political scientists have examined the Acton calling the lesson of intellectual detachment. Often they have seemed more intent on recting the irony of reform than in describing the place with precision and understanding. They have seemed more anxious to devise new ways to alter Congress than to learn how it truly functions. Too many have not followed the dictum of Thomas Huxley a century ago: "Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up something you have considered true."

Every discipline has its methods, its techniques, and its canons of intelligence and to make judgments from that intelligence. In Shakespeare's play, "King Henry V," the night before the battle of Agincourt, a messenger reports to the Lord High Constable of France that the English are camped within twenty miles of his tents. The Constable of France has but one question: "Who has measured the ground?" He wants to know not the military tactician, or the historian or the political scientist. In rough terms, I would like to see specifically the ground found in the methods of many American political scientists and those of American historiography, the discipline in which I was trained.

The American historian reflects a tradition running back to Francis Parkman, whose great history is still being republished. As a young man in the 1840's, Parkman began to prepare himself to write the history of the struggle between England and France for the North American continent. As a Protestant, he went to Rome to study the Catholic faith and religion. He lived with the papal not only the broken tribes of the East, but the wild savages of the Great West. He examined the records of the Conquerors, admired Montcalm's battle lines. He visited and explored the All places on the continent that was part of his history. He measured the ground.

Parkman spared nothing, least of all himself, that he might know his subject totally. He would not be satisfied with mere book learning, although here too he exhausted all known sources of information that might help illuminate his theme. He would not, however, be satisfied with secondhand accounts. "It is evident," Parkman once said, "that other story than that of the closet is indispensable."

Parkman wrote a history, nine volumes that remains one of the great landmarks of American letters and scholarship. His books still ring with the authenticity of the events he studied, and the spirit of the time he described. His books still shout with the excitement of that vivid "now," that breathes in the very sound, and Indian—who shaped it. Parkman thus set the tradition of American historians.

One of Parkman's heritage, American historians scorched the men, and superficial. At the same time, they view with contempt the pretensions of the pale anti-Parkman who has never been. They revere the scholar whose sympathies, as Henry Osborne Taylor once wrote, quiver to hear and feel as the men and women before him.