

March 23, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6323

of the Chicago and Cook County governments to permit "coordinated action on county-wide problems, while leaving to the cities and villages within the county those functions best handled in their jurisdiction." The county now has 457 separate governmental bodies, all with taxing powers.

The committee suggested that the metropolitan area would be better served if such matters as zoning regulations, mass urban transportation and revenue raising were coordinated. Not surprisingly, many suburban leaders are opposed to metro government because it would dilute their political power. But a good many businessmen here have been saying that the whole area depends on the central city, and if this core—Chicago—is weakened, the entire area suffers. Thus, they are calling on the suburbs to help Chicago with its problems.

PAYING CHICAGO'S WAY

Some of the city's services are paid for directly by users, in such ways as water-service charges, motor fuel taxes, a city vehicle license and revenue from O'Hare Airport. But probably the greatest burden for city expenses falls on property owners—businesses and individuals. There is no State or city income tax. From the State sales tax of 4 cents on the dollar the city gets half a cent. Although property taxes have gone up over the years, city hall figures indicate that they still are lower in Chicago than in some of the suburbs.

Mayor Daley sought last year to avoid an increase in property taxes this year by asking the State legislature to double the city's share of the State sales tax and to establish new city taxes on liquor and tobacco. The package would have raised \$50 million. But it was denied.

State controls over local matters, from revenue to minor house-keeping matters, are a sore point in Chicago. Mayor Daley's mighty Democratic machine here often is frustrated by the Republicans in Springfield, the State capital.

Chicago frequently turns to Washington for big amounts of cash—and gets it. Federal money has helped to pay for the expressways, public welfare, urban renewal, education, public housing, health programs and airports.

Admits Mayor Daley: "We couldn't carry on many of our programs without Federal aid."

Chicago has a relatively good debt position. Its net per capita bonded debt—including the city's share of bonded debt of Cook County and other local taxing bodies—is far below that of New York, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, or Detroit.

THE MAN WHO RUNS CHICAGO

Mayor Daley, who is presiding over the changes taking place in Chicago, was born on the South Side. He was first elected to the office 11 years ago and is serving a third term. As a Democratic politician, he runs one of the strongest organizations in the country. A measure of his power says an associate, is that Mayor Daley is a telephone call away from the President. The mayor enjoys the support and cooperation of many of the city's most influential business and professional men, clergymen, labor chiefs, and civic leaders. He is not blamed for all of Chicago's problems, nor is he credited with all of the city's achievements. It's more a team job.

Herbert V. Proehl, now a banker and former president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, says this: "We have had problems in Chicago. Any big city does. But there is a willingness to work on them here, and to put aside politics. The relationship between the business community and the city administration is excellent."

Others have criticized the mayor for one thing or another. To that, he replies: "If you are doing a good job, what's the difference? Government is created to serve the public. The question is, what is good for the people

of Chicago? If my party can give superior representation and service, that's better than if we were politically divided and gave inferior service."

FIGHTING THE ESTABLISHMENT

Opponents of the mayor include, in addition to Republicans, a number of liberal Democrats, many Negro and civil-rights spokesmen. A coalition of civil-rights and peace groups has just been formed to battle the Daley organization and the combination of political, commercial, industrial, labor-union, religious and other powers that is known as the establishment.

Almost everything Mayor Daley does is lambasted by some opponent. In general, the complaints run like this: The Daley machine is patronage ridden. It plays up to white ethnic groups and buys Negro votes with jobs, welfare, public housing, and promises.

Further, these opponents claim: The establishment builds visible things such as skyscrapers, but overlooks the deeper problems in slums and schools. It bypasses suburbanites with the commuter trains and expressways, but allows the lake front and parks to be eaten away. And, when the city does respond to people's needs, its actions are too little and too late.

WHAT A NEGRO THINKS

Edwin C. Berry, a Negro who is executive director of Chicago Urban League, is familiar with the city's most difficult problems—race relations and the plight of the Negroes. He also knows the powerful men in Chicago, and their opponents. He says:

"In the last 10 years, progress in race relations in Chicago has been remarkable—mainly because we had so far to go. Now, we are on the verge of major breakthroughs that may make Chicago the most progressive major city in the North. This has come about for various reasons.

"The major reason is the recognition of our problem by decisionmakers in the city's power structure, and their determination to do something about it. That goes for every decisionmaking person or organization, except for the school board and school administration. Religious leaders, business leaders, the city government and labor unions are committed to help.

"Now, a lot of criticism can be aimed at all these groups. Many people, including leaders, have thought that just because we are a little less unjust to Negroes today, everything's OK. I am sure we rate favorably with other cities—because their records are so bad. That's an odd comparison. We can't be proud of being way ahead of the worst. The question should be: How near are we to what we ought to be? The important thing is whether we've begun to work toward progress."

Mr. Berry thinks Chicago has begun. So do many others, who know what this city's problems were a decade ago—and the improvements that have been made since then.

(Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOUNTAIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

"FACELESS" VIETCONG

(Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an

editorial in the Baltimore Sun of March 21, 1966, which deals with the "Faceless Vietcong."

The editorial quotes from an article, written by George A. Carver, Jr., which appears in the April issue of Foreign Affairs magazine.

As the Baltimore Sun points out:

Mr. Carver's article supports the general position of Secretary Rusk and other officials of the Johnson administration in that it finds that the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are, basically, instruments of the Communist party of North Vietnam.

They were inspired largely in North Vietnam, he (Carver) writes, and are controlled and energized from North Vietnam. It is incorrect, he feels, to think of either the Liberation Front or the Vietcong as non-Communist to any important extent, even though some non-Communists may be represented in them, and even though they are exploiting a social revolution which goes back a long way.

The editorial in its entirety will be of general interest, and it is with this in mind that I have asked permission of my colleagues to have it inserted in the Record.

The article follows:

"FACELESS" IN VIETNAM

The leading article in the April issue of Foreign Affairs is a useful addition to our knowledge of the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. The article, called "The Faceless Vietcong," was written by George A. Carver, Jr., who is identified by the magazine as a student of political theory and Asian affairs and a former officer of the U.S. aid mission in Saigon.

Mr. Carver's article supports the general position of Secretary Rusk and other officials of the Johnson administration in that it finds that the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong are, basically, instruments of the Communist Party of North Vietnam. They were inspired largely in North Vietnam, he writes, and are controlled and energized from North Vietnam. It is incorrect, he feels, to think of either the Liberation Front or the Vietcong as non-Communist to any important extent, even though some non-Communists may be represented in them, and even though they are exploiting a social revolution which goes back a long way.

Thus he writes that "the current struggle in South Vietnam is an historically rooted, political phenomenon of infinite complexity, particularly since it involves an externally directed Communist drive for power interlarded with a genuine indigenous social revolution. In analyzing such a phenomenon 'truth' is often a function of one's angle of vision, and myth is not always easy to distinguish from reality. Despite the fact that there are many aspects of the current situation in Vietnam concerning which confident assertion is a mark of ignorance or disingenuous intent, there are certain aspects of the insurgency, and of the Vietcong structure through which it is being waged, which are not open to intellectually honest dispute."

"There are unquestionably many non-Communists heroically serving in various components of the National Liberation Front out of a desire to redress genuine grievances or in the honest belief that they are thereby helping to build a better political structure for their native land," he goes on to say. "As an organization, however, the National Liberation Front is a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots, subject to the ultimate control of the Lao Dong (Communist) party in Hanoi."

In this analysis the Vietcong is identified essentially as a field command of Hanoi, and the National Liberation Front has no serious

claim to be considered the sole legitimate voice of the people of South Vietnam. The Vietcong has been kept faceless, to the public, to mask its dependence on North Vietnam.

As Mr. Carver says, truth is hard to pin down. We would add that informed opinion, in a matter like this, becomes all the more valuable.

HAVANA MANIFESTO

(Mr. PUCINSKI, at the request of Mr. RONCALIO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, here on the floor of this House I called the attention of my colleagues to an ominous conference which was held in Havana, Cuba, during the first 2 weeks of January of this year and which was attended by more than 600 leading Communists from the 3 continents of Asia, Africa, and South America.

I warned at that time that this Havana meeting constituted the revival of the Communist Internationale and that at this 2-week meeting the Communists had laid plans for a series of aggressions similar to what we are now experiencing in Vietnam, with subversion and terrorism as the main weapon in these bold attempts for Communist victory.

I said that one of the tragedies of our time is the fact that the American press has paid so little attention to this historic meeting wrought with danger to the entire free world.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to point out today that during the ensuing 6 weeks, more and more attention is being paid to the full significance of the Havana conference by some of America's most responsible publications. I have already included in the Record an excellent editorial which appeared on this subject in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Today, I would like to call attention to a penetrating article which appears this week in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, and also the very searching article prepared by Paul D. Bethel, which appeared in the current issue of the Reporter.

Because I consider this Havana conference so extremely important as a prelude to a better understanding of why we cannot abandon South Vietnam to the Communists, I am inserting both of these articles in the Record today.

I hope they will help our Nation better understand that what we are doing in Asia today is not fighting for a piece of real estate known as South Vietnam, but actually blocking the pattern of Communist conquest spelled out in Havana for three continents and the Communists should succeed in South Vietnam.

The two articles follow:

[From Barron's, Mar. 21, 1966]

HAVANA MANIFESTO: THE UNITED STATES AT WAR WITH A NEW COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALE

"Cuba is the new world headquarters for a master plan to subvert Latin American governments and accelerate guerrilla warfare in this hemisphere. The plan, drawn up at the three-continent Communist conferences in Havana last January, calls for the use of every form of struggle necessary, including armed battle . . . Although the Soviet

Union managed the conference, the 'stars' attending were the guerrilla leaders of 'national liberation movements,' including those from the four 'fighting zones'—Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru. Latin American governments are so alarmed that the organization of American States has condemned the conference's policy of aggression and intervention. Brazil's OAS Ambassador declared that except for the Soviet missiles in Cuba, 'no event threatens more dangerously the territorial and political integrity of our continent.'"

One publication rarely quotes from the pages of another, let alone from its publicity blarbs. Hereville, however, Barron's is pleased to reproduce the first paragraph of the release summarizing the contents of the current issue of The Reporter. Though open to the world press, as the magazine quietly observed, and followed closely in Europe, the Havana Conference "received little or no coverage in the major U.S. newspapers." Thus, the New York Times considered only one short, unilluminating dispatch from Reuter's fit to print. Time somehow succeeded in briefly mentioning the Conference without even hinting at its menacing import. (The same journal, however, last week managed to devote a cover story to "Eastern Europe—Life Under a Relaxed Communism.") CBS News apparently chose to ignore the whole affair.

Unlike the Iron Curtain, which supposedly isn't soundproof, a wall of silence has kept most Americans from learning the truth about Havana. Yet, despite the remarkable lack of interest shown by so many great media of communication, the tricontinental conference was momentous news. With monolithic unity worthy of Stalin himself, the leaders of the global Communist conspiracy—including the "relaxed" East Europeans—in effect declared war on the Western Hemisphere.

Thereby the Communists willy-nilly did more. They served notice that the great achievements of private capital, such as the oilfields of Venezuela and the copper mines of Chile, have become prime targets in a class struggle which honors neither privileged sanctuaries nor national boundaries. They exposed the dangerous folly of the Fulbrights and know-nothings who refuse to acknowledge that the United States is fighting for survival. Finally, by haunting their purpose in Havana, the Reds have flung down the gauntlet to a government which has vowed to prevent Cuba from becoming a base for revolution. "Don't worry," satirically proclaimed a bumper sticker in the fall of 1964. "They're still 99 miles away." But they're getting closer all the time.

They're also growing bolder. In Havana, indeed, the Communists didn't trouble to conceal their aggressive designs. To head a 34-man delegation, the Kremlin sent Sharaf R. Rashidov, candidate member of the Presidium of the Central Committee. Mr. Rashidov quickly set the tone. "The Soviet delegation," he said, "came to this conference to promote in every conceivable way the unity of anti-imperialist forces of the three continents, so as to unfold on a still greater scale our common struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism headed by U.S. capitalists." The Conference then proceeded to accept resolutions which some reporters might have thought worth noting. One called for recognition of the National Liberation Front (the Vietcong) as the legitimate government of Vietnam. Another urged "the most powerful support" for the U.S. civil rights movement, adding that "the uprisings in Watts, Los Angeles, and Chicago, the Afro-Americans openly declared that they were fighting . . . in a common cause with their Vietnamese brothers." The Conference demanded "total eradication of Yankee military installations in Puerto Rico," and urged maximum effort by those "who are fighting with arms in their

hands against the forces of domestic oligarchy which are in the service of the United States, as in Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Guatemala, or are being subject to brutal persecution under military tyranny, as in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and other countries."

Long before the latest call to arms, Red-inspired violence had flared up throughout Latin America. Three years ago, according to the Reporter, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee listed 10 known guerrilla training camps in Cuba; today over 40, capable of turning out 10,000 activists yearly, are functioning. In Venezuela Red terrorists have captured and held as hostage U.S. military personnel; last December, the wife of a Caracas lawmaker was killed by a bomb concealed in a statue of the Virgin Mary. Communist bands roam through Colombia and Guatemala, where they have raised kidnaping to a high criminal art; in Peru Red guerrillas launched a near revolt which Lima has had trouble putting down. Last week President Eduardo Frei, of Chile, denounced an illegal walkout which recently shut down Anacondia's El Salvador mine and triggered a clash costing more than a dozen lives, blaming the strike and ensuing violence squarely on the Communists.

To both open provocation and hidden aggression, the United States, which officially clings to the myth of "good" and "bad" Communists, has largely failed to respond. True, mounting congressional hostility has persuaded the administration quietly to shelve some of its plans for expanding trade and otherwise "building bridges" between East and West. However, despite such atrocities as the death of Salesman Newcomb Mott, Washington still promotes travel and hopefully pushes so-called cultural exchanges with Iron Curtain countries. Other Western Hemisphere capitals have learned better. In 1962, after suppressing a Castro-inspired uprising fanned by the Czech legation, Ecuador severed diplomatic relations with Cuba, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Two years later, upon discovering the source of the rebellious tin miners' arms, Bolivia broke with the busy Czechs. Tracking down the perpetrators of the Caracas bombing, the authorities found them to be "specialists from Havana, Moscow, and Peking who are trying to penetrate Venezuela and carry out terrorist operations."

Last month the Organization of American States laid it on the line. OAS roundly denounced the Havana manifesto as "an act contrary to the peace and security of the hemisphere." It also declared that sovereign states must answer "not only for the open use of force against another but also for giving support to any of the indirect forms of aggression, such as the promotion of civil strife in another state, or the organization of armed bands and the furnishing of war material or elements of combat and of money with offensive intentions against another."

In a press conference on September 13, 1962, the late President Kennedy flatly stated: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies." To judge by all the foregoing, that time has come. The United States is at war not only with the Vietcong and North Vietnam, but also with a new Communist Internationale. Until it learns to recognize the enemy, it cannot hope to win.

[From the Reporter, Mar. 24, 1966]

THE HAVANA CONFERENCE

(By Paul D. Bethel)

During the first 2 weeks of January while President Johnson was still conducting his "peace offensive," a tricontinental Commu-