

by the USSR and other Communist states of Eastern Europe.

WHAT OF OUR BOAST OF FREEDOM?

Currently the American press, TV and radio media are righteously attacking the CIA for its financing of a number of American youth organizations in their anti-Communist work. But the same media persist in ignoring the plight of the captive nations, thus revealing both moral and political short-sightedness. That distresses them is that the "American image" has been "distorted" by the operations of the CIA, which did not ask for this particular job in the first place.

To our mind, what did distort our image as a beacon of freedom was refusal by our officials to admit Miss Stalin, or Mrs. Aliluyeva, for fear of "upsetting" present Soviet-American relations.

This was confirmed by State Department officials:

"According to officials, a final decision not to admit her to the United States has not yet been made by the Administration. For the indefinite future, however, the Administration, in the interests of promoting good United States-Soviet relations, would prefer that she not come to the United States..." (Cf. *The New York Times*, March 15, 1967).

We can imagine what would happen if the situation were reversed, if, say, a Miss Truman, a Miss Eisenhower, or a Miss Kennedy would defect to any Communist country! The Soviet Government does not hesitate to make much ado over even insignificant defectors from the West, for it knows that propaganda-wise defection is a powerful psychological weapon against "capitalism."

We talk loudly about our dedication to freedom, but we fail to act out our dedication. We can possibly claim acting like humanitarians—for when the Hungarian freedom fighters, who believed in our talk, finally struggled over the frontiers of their besieged country, did we not promptly feed and clothe them?

One of these days, perhaps not far off in the future, we may find to our consternation that our ideal of freedom, unexercised and more and more unappreciated, shall have ceased to exist at all.

Mr. Speaker, it would be in the national interest for the House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct a practical review of this entire case so that we could ascertain the fundamental policy and purpose of the State Department on major defections of this nature.

FOLLOWING THE PARTY LINE

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. BRESTER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has been following Communist publications here in the United States is aware that a current tactic of the CPUSA is to merge the anti-Vietnam movement with the civil rights issue. For instance, the People's World a Communist newspaper on April 15 stated:

The most influential spokesmen of the nation's ghettos now oppose the war, and perceive the need for vigorously fusion of the civil rights and anti-war movements.

Various Negro leaders are well aware that merging the two issues is a Communist tactic, would be detrimental to the advancement of civil rights, and have accordingly opposed this proposal. One glaring exception is the case of Dr. Mar-

tin Luther King who, unfortunately, has fallen for this Communist tactic completely. Although he denied any attempt to combine the two issues, he was reported by the press on April 23 as calling for a "Vietnam summer" in which he "expected to see a trained field staff of about 200 workers from the civil rights and peace movements."

I wonder how many of the Negro soldiers now in Vietnam and doing such a fine job would go along with Dr. King's statement that the Vietcong is "the only party in real touch with the peasants." I wonder how closely Dr. King has studied the public record of atrocities committed against these peasants by the same Vietcong. It will be interesting to hear what Dr. King's answers will be when Negro soldiers with firsthand experience in Vietnam return with the true facts of Vietcong brutalities.

For several years Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., was in charge of a Negro mission and is certainly familiar with, and solicitous toward the problems of the American Negro. I would venture to say that, judging from his May 7 column in *Our Sunday Visitor*, a Catholic publication which is the largest national Catholic weekly, he is just about fed up with Dr. King's support for the Vietcong. Father Lyons, as I have pointed out before, has been to Vietnam twice at the request of the Defense Department and has coauthored a book, "Vietnam Crisis," which deals extensively with the Vietnam problem. I include his column of May 7, 1967, in the Record at this point:

Dr. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

On my many visits to Vietnam I often wondered why Dr. King was so indifferent to the fate of the 15 million people there. He has repeatedly complained about our defense of the Vietnamese people because it "costs a lot of money," and he wants the money to go into the poverty program here at home. With these thoughts in mind I went to see this famous Christian leader when he spoke at the Riverside Church on April 14, in New York City. I was never more shocked in my life.

Dr. King preached the straight Communist line. In elaborating on "the madness of Vietnam," Dr. King praised Ho Chi Minh as the only true leader of the Vietnamese people. He condemned the United States as "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today." He called Ho Chi Minh an independent democratic leader, and condemned the late President Diem as "one of the most vicious modern dictators." "We may have killed a million, mostly children," he said. I wondered when he dug up the strange statistics. He obviously crossed the line between responsible dissent and irresponsible divisiveness. Everyone would like to see the war ended, but Dr. King's five-point proposal simply amounts to surrender. Of course we can give up, but that would solve nothing. It would merely lead to more and bigger wars, as did our peace treaty over Laos in 1962, when we trusted Ho Chi Minh and his promises.

Dr. King praised the Viet Cong as "the only party in real touch with the peasants." He charged that "none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved..." We have no honorable intentions in Vietnam... Our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony... We are on the side of the wealthy... Our war is against the people of Vietnam... We must

all protest... Only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit... If we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values."

Dr. King condemned our defense of South Vietnam as a "tragic attempt at re-colonization." He urges that strong protests should be made about the governments of Guatemala and Peru, Thailand and Cambodia, Mozambique and South Africa. He urged that committees should be formed to cooperate with revolutionaries in those six countries. Anyone familiar with Communist designs knows that he could not have picked countries that the Communists are more anxious to take over.

The following week the noted SNCC, the "non-student, violent coordinating committee," brought Stokely Carmichael to Birmingham, Alabama, where he told the students: "To hell with the laws of the United States." Meanwhile, CORE, the Congress of Racial Equality, ran half-page ads saying: "Vietnam is a tough problem, but De Gaulle faced a far tougher problem in Algeria. But he had the guts to face the problem. He lost Algeria." It really takes courage to surrender!

For several years, as a seminarian, I was in charge of a Negro mission. I am as anxious as anyone to see the Negro progress. But I cannot understand how Catholic people, and especially priests and nuns can continue to back such groups as SNCC and CORE, or get behind such persons as Martin Luther King. They are disloyal to their country and traitors to their people. Surely the Negroes in America deserve better leadership than this!

MORE AMMUNITION FOR MINK IMPORT CONTROL

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. BRESTER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, having introduced legislation to protect American mink farmers from the price-depressing deluge of mink imports, I was disturbed to note another article which indicates the extent to which our producers are being shortchanged by mink import promotions.

If there is no objection, I hereby insert this pertinent and timely article from the current issue of *Northeastern Mink Farmer* in the Record at this point:

GIVE US HELP, NOT OPPOSITION

From time to time we read in our trade papers and in the public press of the help which foreign governments give to their mink producers both in the field of production and in the promotion of their export sales.

We are aware of the fact that every country apparently wants to build up its exports and cut down on imports. And so, in their own self interest, the mink producing countries periodically send their royal princes and princesses, dukes and duchesses to America to preside at fashion functions, teas, and give awards for pushing their products. And why not? One expects a government to promote the interests of its people.

When Canada Mink Breeders decided to expand their export trade, they held receptions for members of the fur trade and the fashion press in leading European cities and in New York. The support which they received from their government would ill American mink farmers with envy. Not only did their government permit the use of the Canadian coat of arms on the engraved invitations, but the gatherings in many instances were held in the Canadian consulate