

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700390018-7

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700390018-7

**SPECIAL CONCERN FOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL**

"Although the incidents occurring in the lower grades are of particular interest," Professor Sheldon said, "the Center is especially concerned with increasing economic instruction at the high school level."

In addition, the center sponsors a series of educators seminars at Boston College on current economic problems and issues.

Professor Sheldon said, "The idea was so successful that on the suggestion of the teachers we opened the seminars to their high school students in 1960 and now the educators junior seminars are a regular part of our program. Each year they are focused around one specific economic area. This year the area was taxation."

The problem of stimulating more student involvement in economic instruction on the junior high school level through the use of actual business case histories is now being investigated.

**Better To Pass No Farm Bill**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor dated July 27, 1962, had a very interesting editorial entitled "Another Snag for Farm Controls." This publication is, in my judgment, one of the responsible papers in this country. This particular editorial points up a very significant fact to which all of us in Congress should be alerted: If no new farm bill passes in this session of Congress, we probably would be better off than to have the kind of a bill that can pass.

I would like to insert in the RECORD this editorial from the Christian Science Monitor because it does state so well this simple fact:

**ANOTHER SNAG FOR FARM CONTROLS**

Congress is not buying the Kennedy administration program of rigid crop control or "supply management" in agriculture. By a switch of votes in the Senate Agriculture Committee, the committee will not recommend strict controls on grain marketing when the House-approved compromise farm measure comes up again before the Senate.

The House bill proposes continuance of the current emergency programs for support of wheat, corn, and feed grain prices with provisions aimed only at reducing acreage, not at putting limits on producers' sales. Secretary Freeman estimates the annual cost of these programs at \$2,400 million.

Against such extravagance the administration has legitimate complaint. To keep paying high support prices with only ineffective acreage controls is like pouring fuel into a locomotive that's running with an open throttle. The Freeman program of strict controls would try to set the engine brakes but would still pour on the fuel.

That is not the only way of doing it. The American Farm Bureau Federation points out that it would be no disaster if even the emergency programs of last year were allowed to lapse. The laws which then would apply would be the Agricultural Acts of 1949 and 1958.

Under the latter act the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to reduce the support price of corn from \$1.20 to \$1.05, with

corresponding cuts on soybeans, grain sorghums, and other feed grains. And under the 1949 act he could and should reduce the support price of wheat from \$2 to \$1.82.

These changes would take some of the fire out from under the agricultural boiler. They would reduce the likelihood of explosions like the Billie Sol Estes case, they would reduce the evidently unneeded incentives for piling up surplus production, and they would reduce the demands on the taxpayer to buy and store that surplus.

**Spending Makes Taxes Higher**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. GEORGE MEADER**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian, Mich., Daily Telegram of July 27, 1962:

**SPENDING MAKES TAXES HIGHER**

About 2 months ago Secretary of Commerce Hodges testified before a Congressional committee that 10 percent of the jobholders in his Department are performing jobs started 40 years ago that "now are just not needed." What's been done about that? Nothing.

Actually the Federal payroll continued to gain. More than 2½ million people are to be in the Federal agencies in the current fiscal year that started July 1. That's 40,065 more than are on the payroll now, and 131,361 more than a year ago. Federal agencies always grow. None ever seems to get smaller. The Government undertakes new services—and hires new employees. Meanwhile it keeps on those already employed. Some of them, nobody knows how many, must, as Secretary Hodges said of his Department, be performing jobs that "now are just not needed."

Meanwhile the cost of the Federal Government goes up; meanwhile deficits pile up; and meanwhile the national debt increases. The cost of all government—Federal, State and local—increased from 15 percent of the National Income in the early twenties to 27 percent in the forties and it's now close to 35 percent. That increased cost of government—the amount taken out of the national income by taxes—is the basic reason why the national economy is not expanding as fast as it should. Money paid to government does not go for consumer goods nor into investments in industry to create new jobs.

And it is not true, as the administration says, that the principal reason for the increased cost of the Federal Government is for defense. Defense costs certainly are high but nondefense costs also are high. In his 18 months in the White House President Kennedy has sent to Congress some 200 proposals for bigger Federal obligations. He has urged spending, not economy. Of the \$3.5 billion spending increase for the 1963 fiscal year 57 percent has nothing to do with national defense.

The spending advocates in the administration have declared that spending will spur the economy. But the impetus to the economy did not come as expected; instead the stockmarket went into a decline. Now a tax cut is being talked about. That is fine. A tax cut would help. What would help much more would be a reduction in spending to justify the tax cut on sound economic grounds.

**Needed: Simplified Handbook of Farm Laws**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF**

**HON. ALEXANDER WILEY**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation regrettably has not yet found any "magic formula" for solving the problems in agriculture.

For this year, the outlook is also problematical.

In a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss highlights of pending legislation and, as well, make some suggestions which if adopted, would help make existing programs more effective in meeting the challenges of agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the RECORD.

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

**NEEDED: SIMPLIFIED HANDBOOK OF FARM LAWS**

Friends, this is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY. I welcome the opportunity once again to discuss some of the problems confronting us in agriculture.

On the legislative front, the House of Representatives recently passed a bill called the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. Currently, the measure, after some "surgery" by the Senate Agriculture Committee, is pending before the Senate.

Generally, the provisions relate to: extending the existing law on feed grains; a modified wheat program; revising Public Law 480 for shipping food abroad; liberalized farm credit; expanding research for industrial uses of farm commodities; and revised land-use programs.

Realistically, the bill, similar to a major measure defeated earlier in the session, is highly controversial. On the positive side, there are two features which, if adopted, would be of significance to us here in Wisconsin:

1. Expansion of research for industrial uses of agricultural products, including milk and other dairy products. (Earlier this session, I recommended the establishment of a special laboratory here in Wisconsin for expanding research for commercial—industrial uses of dairy products.)

2. Secondly, the land-use recommendations could prove of value. These include: permanent agricultural conservation programs on a national basis; assistance to producers under long-term agreements (not to exceed 15 years) to conserve and develop soil, water, forest, wildlife and recreational resources; appropriations would be restricted to \$10 million annually; a loan program to State and local public agencies for carrying out more effective land utilization programs; and special assistance for Federal participation in installation costs of recreation projects and in land costs for fish, wildlife and other purposes.

Tourism increasingly is an aspect of Wisconsin's economy. The creation of close-by, on-the-farm vacation spots could provide more citizens—about two-thirds of whom now live in urban areas—with greater opportunities to: get either weekend, or vacation "breaths of fresh air" in the country; acquaint children with nature and animal life; and generally provide an opportunity

Handwritten notes: "Page 6 Cuba" and "X sec 6 Cuba" with a checkmark.

A6106

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 9

for improving the health of our citizens—mentally, spiritually, and physically, through the enjoyment of our out-of-door heritage.

Fundamentally, however, the bill contains seriously controversial provisions—particularly relating to the degree of Federal control over farmers. Consequently, the outlook is problematical on this or any other major legislation this session.

Over the years, the Nation has adopted, if in somewhat "patchwork" fashion, an extensive, complex system of laws relating to agriculture.

Unfortunately, these laws too often, are wrapped or entangled in legalistic redtape and obscured by bureaucratic language.

As a result, programs that might be of assistance often may not be known to farmers; or, if known, the requirement may be too complicated to encourage wide participation. Consequently, these do not adequately serve their originally intended purposes.

For this reason, I am recommending that the Secretary of Agriculture prepare for farmers in clear, not bureaucratic language, a "Handbook of Farm Laws and Programs." The handbook, I believe, could well include: a summary of existing laws and programs; a clear definition of their purposes; illustrations of how these can effectively help the farmer; and simplified ways for participating in such programs.

If this were done, I believe that: (1) many of the existing programs being carried along at the taxpayers' expenses administratively could be of greater help to the farm economy; and (2) the handbook would provide a useful guide for review, revision, and, if necessary, repeal of existing or adoption of new programs to improve the economic outlook of agriculture.

ferings of others, liberated the Cuban people from a cruel foreign oppressor.

From the stirring events of the summer of 1898 in Santiago de Cuba—from our heritage of the past, when the United States, as a "nation under God" was successful in her undertakings—from that heritage, perhaps today, we can draw the strength we so desperately need to cope with the mounting dangers that face us.

I am sure I express the feelings of everyone present as we render our salute to the veterans of 1898.

As the last air attaché to Cuba, I saw our country deceived, insulted, dispossessed, defeated, and our flag hauled down at the American Embassy in Havana. This is an experience one cannot forget. It is why I find myself here, this evening, in this unfamiliar role.

I saw a monstrous process called communism, fasten itself onto the Cuban people; the total eradication of all freedom; the destruction of wealth and industry; the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and the poisoning of minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of the people.

Despite these realities, the stated policy of our Government today is that Cuba is only an island; it is not important to the security of the United States; we had better forget about it and get on with "more important business."

But the world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on "just an island." It was, and continues to be, a direct attack on the United States of America. It is imperative that we, the citizens of the United States, come to realize that this Communist invasion of Cuba is a deadly dagger, pointed straight at the heart of this country.

Lenin's dream has come one step closer to reality: "We shall surround the United States without having to fire a shot. It will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

Why did all this happen? Who allowed it to happen? How is it possible that one of the most prosperous nations in Latin America should become infected by the dread Communist plague?

If you had listened to Communist propaganda emanating from Cuba, there was a pat answer to all these questions. The eternal broken record of Castro propaganda that Cuba was a poor country, that its peasants were starving wretches who groaned under the tyranny of Batista, that Cubans were living in a feudal state before Fidel Castro rescued them.

The picture is false, and the lie deliberate. Cuban labor enjoyed the protection of the most advanced social legislation in this hemisphere. Cuban industries boomed. The currency was as hard as the dollar. Cuba owed not a cent, and asked for no loans.

This points out the fallacy in our assuming that Communists can only win in a country that is desperately poor, and that foreign aid is the cure-all.

Before Castro appeared on the scene, Cuba appeared the least likely of any of the Latin American countries to fall to communism. In Cuba, there existed good will dating back to the era when the United States assisted the Cubans in winning their freedom, and setting up a constitutional government. Through the years, we gave Cuba large-scale economic support through the Sugar Act, paying premium prices for her principle product. And, while neither Cubans nor Americans would voice it openly, Cuba has looked to the United States for leadership.

The fall of Cuba, despite all these favorable factors, emphasizes the falsity of many of our U.S. programs for combating communism.

If we want to give aid for humanitarian purposes, fine, but let's not delude ourselves that this, in itself, is going to save the world for democracy. No country in the world will follow a nation which refuses to lead.

Cuba was taken over by Communist subversion just as other victims of communism have been taken over. As has been said, "the audacious few can take over from the apathetic many." Castro subverted the Cuban nation, and gained U.S. Government support while so-doing, by calling for a program of "socialistic reforms".

The conquest of Cuba had little to do with prosperity, or the lack of it.

A myth that should be exploded once and for all, if we are to fight communism effectively is the importance given to the so-called rising of the masses.

A few pseudo-intellectual liberals, college trained and Communist trained, were the people who subverted Cuba through conspiratorial action, namely; Fidel Castro, Raul Castro, Che Guevarra, Vilma Espin, and a few others.

When are we going to learn something of the true nature of communism and how to fight it?

I mentioned that Castro came to power with a good deal of assistance from the United States. This assistance came from liberal-minded Foreign Service Officers in the State Department in Washington, and the career officers in the political section of the Embassy of Havana.

During this crucial time, the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs was Roy Rubottom, and his assistant was William Welland.

The day before Castro took over power in Havana, Mr. Rubottom reassured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that there was no organized communism in the Castro movement.

It is inconceivable that such an opinion could have been given by Mr. Rubottom, who was with General Marshall in Colombia at the time of the Bogotazo—the Communists first great blow against the United States in the Western Hemisphere. During that uprising in Bogotá, Fidel came on the radio 1 hour after the murder of Guitan, and exhorted the people of Colombia to join in and support this Communist insurrection. The Colombian police files contained irrefutable evidence concerning Castro's Communist connections. The FBI reports on the Bogotazo pointed up his Communist connections.

Mr. Rubottom and Mr. Welland were in the key positions on the Latin American Desk to determine what information was to be used by our Government in the development of Cuba-American policy. They apparently shelved the reports of Ambassador to Cuba, Arthur Gardener, and later, Ambassador Earl Smith, who waved red caution flags to the effect that Castro was going to put in a Communist government if he came to power. Also, Ambassador Hill, at Mexico City, made the strongest of representations concerning communism in the Castro revolution.

The U.S. military attachés and mission chiefs reported on the strong Communist direction of the revolution, as did the FBI reports.

However, at this time, the mutual support between the New York Times and the State Department came into play on this issue. Herbert Matthews of the Times was sent to interview Castro in the Sierra Maestra. Castro only had a handful of followers, and was making little progress. Matthews' subsequent articles praising Castro's program of social reform, aroused great interest in the United States. The articles systematically reported the revolution as a high-minded experiment in social justice, agrarian reform, and emphasized Castro's promises that he would not seek political position for himself.

**A Pro-American Address by Col. Fred D. Stevers, U.S. Air Force, Retired, to the Rough Riders Rally, Disneyland Hotel, California**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JAMES B. UTT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an address by Col. Fred D. Stevers, U.S. Air Force, Retired, given at the Rough Riders Rally at Disneyland Hotel, California, on July 17, 1962.

Here is an address that every American should read in order to be informed as to the Cuban fiasco. Colonel Stevers was the last military attaché to leave the American Embassy in Havana, and he warns the people that the same State Department clique responsible for Castro's takeover is now being moved into strategic positions to simplify the Communist takeover of other Latin American countries.

The address follows:

Captain Barnes, Dr. Del Junco, Mr. Lyons, Spanish-American War Veterans, members of the American Committee to Free Cuba, ladies and gentlemen, tonight, we are here to honor the heroes of the Spanish-American War. Then, the United States, with a conscience, and with compassion for the suf-

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6107

Other news mediums, including leading church magazines, and certain organizations now picked up the pro-Castro line. The sentiment within state grew so pro-Castro that an interview with Herbert Mathews of the Times was required of all key Foreign Service officers before going on station in Havana. (Later, I want to touch more on this mutual supporting of liberal ideas between state and the Times. This is important to you because I understand in the near future there will be a Los Angeles edition of the New York Times.)

How was it that professional Foreign Service officers could be so deceived on a matter of such importance to the security of the United States? Perhaps it can be explained by the fact that to the liberal minded, the appeal of a Socialist Cuba, 90 miles from the United States, displaying all manner of agrarian and urban reforms conforming to Liberal-Socialist goals, held such fascination as to result in impaired judgment in making vital assessments. And here is the thesis of my talk: That the affinity between the goals of socialism and communism is so strong, that it is impossible for a state moving toward socialism; namely, the United States, to fight Communist subversion effectively.

What are the remedies?

A return to American traditions of free enterprise. Renewed belief in the superiority of the American way. And forthright, pro-American leaders.

Castro's victory did not come as a result of success in battle. There was never any significant military involvement. When U.S. military assistance was withdrawn from Batista in March of 1958, it effectively "pulled the rug" from under his regime, and passed the blessing of the United States to Castro. From then on, the easy victory of the 26th of July movement was assured. Our officials saw fit to close their eyes to the arms and supplies being shipped to Castro by sympathizers in this country.

After Castro's entry into Havana, and assumption of power in January 1959, another glaring error of American policy allowed him to consolidate his power. One of his first hostile acts was to "throw out" the American military mission, and denounce the military assistance agreement between the United States and the Cuban Government. At this point, the military mission chiefs forwarded urgent recommendations that all U.S. military planes and other equipment, provided under the agreement, should be returned to U.S. control. Here, again, the State Department did not agree, stating it was best "not to antagonize the revolutionary leader at this time." As it turned out, it was this very equipment which enabled Castro to subjugate the Cuban people, and hold all resistance elements in check—until the arrival of arms purchased in Europe, and later, the massive shipments of Communist arms. Also, it was these same American military planes which were used so decisively by Castro in the defeat of the April invasion.

Think how different the situation in Cuba might be today, if a forthright and adamant stand had been taken for the return of this U.S. military equipment to U.S. control, as provided for in the assistance agreement.

Another act by Castro immediately following his assumption of power was the destruction of the former Government's extensive files on Communists and their activities. Here was another indication of the direction the revolution was taking.

Now, the communization of Cuba proceeded at an increasing tempo.

The almost complete destruction of the regular military services was pushed ruthlessly. Executions were particularly heavy amongst the officers of the Air Force and Army and in their place, a people's militia was formed. The Communists had learned

their lesson in Guatemala, and were not going to leave any nucleus for organized resistance in the military.

These executions have not gone unobserved by the military in other Latin American countries, as evidenced by the strong stand which is taken in country after country to thwart Communist takeovers.

The revolutionary government next imposed its will over all unions by placing selected Communist leaders in the top positions. This was done in spite of the violent resistance of the membership.

As harsh police state controls were imposed, the resistance of the Cuban people began to grow. Dedicated, patriotic Cubans who were being forced to choose between submission to communism or their freedom, began joining counterrevolutionary groups. They set up several fronts in the mountains. Fellow Cubans flocked to these areas.

Now, the only limiting factor was the amount of U.S. support available. Castro threw everything he had at the principle front in the Escambray: Paul went there and failed; Che stated he would never return to Havana until every counterrevolutionary was dead. But, he, too, failed. The insurgency grew. Castro was scared. I firmly believe that at this point, in the fall of 1960, if the policy of our government had been to vigorously support the insurgency within Cuba, that Castro would have been defeated by the Cubans, themselves.

But our support failed. The counter-revolutionaries in the mountains were dependent on supplies delivered by air drop. At the camp of the Cuban Liberation Air Force in Guatemala, aircraft crews and supplies were available, but the American officials in charge would allow only occasional missions. The briefings were so bad, and the means for identifying the drop zones were so poor, that most of the supplies were lost. The Cuban flyers at the camps told me later that they felt there was no interest in succeeding with the aerial resupply.

As the Communist complexion of the Castro regime now was apparent to all, the United States, as a nation, certainly had every moral right and obligation to support the resistance within Cuba.

Foreign Communists, in the guise of advisers, technicians, military instructors, were arriving in alarming numbers, in addition to the arrival of massive shipments of Communist arms. In this first Soviet arms package, \$100 million worth of weapons were delivered. Incidentally, Raul Castro and the same defense ministry officials are in Moscow again negotiating the second arms shipment. This shipment undoubtedly will include missiles and the latest jet aircraft.

The Air Attaché Office was successful in reporting the first shipment of Soviet arms arriving in Cuba. It came at the time of Hurricane Donna in September of 1960. When we evacuated the Embassy aircraft from Havana, we spotted the Soviet cargo ship being unloaded in the Casa Blanca navy drydock. As evidenced by the elaborate security precautions taken, the Russians expected a severe reaction from the United States. Here was the time we should have stated that the Monroe Doctrine was not dead and we were not going to stand idly by while the Western Hemisphere was invaded by a foreign power. But instead, we did nothing.

The U.S. policy of trying to placate Castro was carried to a ridiculous degree. Despite the wholesale confiscation of American property, including U.S. Government property, all strictly on the Communist timetable, abuses to American citizens, insults to the American Ambassador, and torrents of anti-American propaganda, we continued to try to appease Castro in the hope he could be won over to the democratic viewpoint.

In October of 1960, purchases under the Sugar Act were finally canceled, but not

before most of that year's production had been purchased at premium prices.

Castro now felt that he had received about all the help he needed from the United States to bridge the gap from the former economy to the new state socialism. He increased pressure to try and get the United States to initiate a break in diplomatic relations. He achieved this when he stipulated that the American Embassy would have to be reduced to a total of seven people.

At that New Year's, when the American Embassy closed and the flag came down, the United States suffered another major defeat in the cold war.

After the break in relations, the military attachés moved to Miami. It was soon apparent that all was not well in the training camps of the Cuban Liberation Forces in Guatemala. Cubans were defecting from the camps and returning to Miami in increasing numbers, stating that morale was breaking because of lack of confidence in their leaders, and the growing realization that they were not being allowed to do the job for which they had volunteered; namely, to liberate their country. Relations between the Cuban Revolutionary Council in Miami and the CIA became very strained.

The Cuban exiles' only contacts were through "nameless" CIA agents, who dictated all terms. Many able Cubans resigned from the council. Martin Ellena, the capable and experienced officer who was slated to be in command of the military operation, resigned when he was not allowed to inspect his men at the camp.

The results of the Cuban invasion on April 17, 1961, are generally known. By the time of the belated decision to go, the Castro forces had been brought up to 300,000 trained and equipped troops. A liberation landing force of only 1,300 men seems pitifully small for the task they were expected to perform. The liberation air unit in Guatemala was given the impossible task of flying close support missions for the invasion landings. The long round trip necessitated removal of all defensive armament from the B-26's.

The weak and vacillating U.S. support, which, at the last moment stopped the pre-invasion bombing of the Castro Air Force, and canceled the planned use of U.S. fighter support, doomed the operation to failure.

Although there was a U.S. Naval Task Force in the area, it was not allowed to either support the operation, or rescue the landing force when it was pushed back to the beach. Never had the United States been involved in such a weak and callous operation as this.

The invasion was, in fact, so short lived, that it was no test of whether the people inside Cuba would have actually supported the liberation army to depose Castro. The numbers of Castro's militiamen in the beach-head area, who, in the initial stages did defect, gives some indication of what might have been expected in a larger scale, better supported, operation.

Civil disturbance was certainly anticipated by Castro, as evidenced by the massive round-up and detention of Americans and Cubans throughout the land. But the invasion effort was so marginal in size, and the element of surprise deemed so necessary by the U.S. invasion leaders, that the keymen of the resistance within Cuba were not informed, and the entire underground was caught up in the mass arrests by the government.

Here, again, U.S. action proved to be much too timid.

The returning Cuban flyers, after the invasion attempt, found none of their former U.S. contacts in Miami. They turned to my office for information on their casualties, on their future, and to register their disgust with those who had lied to them about the promised U.S. air support.

I did advise the U.S. Air Force headquarters that the Cuban liberation air force should be held together, and constituted

A6108

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 9

the most important asset left to us; that it was the key to any future steps to free Cuba. There was agreement on this within the Air Force, but the action was frozen while future U.S. policy toward Cuba was being reformulated.

That policy decision was soon apparent. The local CIA man called me and said he had received word from Washington for our office to stop interviewing Cuban air force personnel immediately.

The defeat in Cuba was to be made permanent.

In the dismal aftermath of the invasion failure, this subject became so distasteful, that all official discussion of it was suppressed. This suppression extended into the military, in areas, where, in my opinion, there was a need and a right to know for the proper performance of duty. At the Latin American Conference of Air Attaches and Mission Chiefs in Panama in June of 1961, I was scheduled to talk on Cuba. At the last minute, the subject of the invasion was not allowed to be mentioned on orders of Richard Goodwin, the presidential adviser for Latin American Affairs. The explanation given was that President Kennedy had ordered an investigation of the debacle by General Taylor, and that pertinent information would be released at the proper time. More than a year has now passed and no announcement of the results of that investigation have been forthcoming.

The same people who were in positions of influence around the President still remain. Mr. Rubottom's name is up before the Senate for promotion. The charges of the former Ambassadors that our policy toward Cuba involved serious questions of judgment and loyalty, should be answered. It would seem to me that now is the time for a thorough investigation of our entire United States-Cuba policy.

I mentioned the New York Times earlier, and now I am going to relate a personal experience concerning the disproportionate influence of the Times in Government policy formation. At a conference in Panama in 1960, 2 years after Castro had come to power, my superior officer said to me: "Stevens, be sure and read the New York Times every day and send me the answers to any articles on Cuba, because on my morning intelligence briefing for the Air Staff, the questions I get are those posed by the Times." Imagine that. After the Times was one of the principal influences in the loss of Cuba. But, the Air Staff in Washington were being questioned by the civilian Secretaries concerning the Times articles, many of which were inspired by Government officials on subjects they would hesitate to put in memorandums.

In this way, the brainwashing of the military continues.

What has happened to President Kennedy's stated policy, in his speech after the invasion failure, in which he said: "Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction, if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of this Nation."

The President referred to the commitments contained in the Rio Pact of 1947, and the Caracas Declaration of 1954, which provide the collective teeth to oust communism.

Contrast our President's statement with the present administration policy stated recently by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY during a TV interview in Miami after his return from a Presidential factfinding tour of Latin America, I heard him state that Cuba is just a small island constituting no threat to the United States, and that the way to fight communism in Latin America is to "speed up

our economic aid under the Alliance for Progress." This same attitude has also been more recently expressed by Mr. Adlai Stevenson, as he recommends "that we get on with more important business."

My feeling is, that if we cannot work out policies and actions which can gain freedom for Cuba, with its proximity and other elements favorable to the United States, how can we hope to do so in remote areas all over the world?

My contact with the Cuban disaster, and subsequent events, have raised serious doubts in my mind as to the effectiveness of our U.S. programs in combating the spread of communism. If Cuba were the only country affected by our ineffectiveness against the Communist advance, we might allow ourselves the calloused luxury of "passing it off" as unimportant. But the Red tide is seriously threatening the rest of Latin America, and our attitude of tolerance, and solitary weapon of economic aid is sorely inadequate.

Arms shipments are arriving regularly at remote places of the South American coasts. Czech machineguns have been shipped to Red elements in Colombia where they control large sections of the interior of that country with total impunity. The Cuban radio periodically announces the graduation of classes from a school for saboteurs.

Guerrillas are being trained in Cuba to infiltrate Venezuela from the friendly borders of the Communists in British Guiana. Northeastern Brazil is blazing with the Communist torch. Chilean military and educational circles are hotbeds of communism. An enormous segment of the student body and faculty of the University of Mexico is all for the Soviet and the Red Chinese. And so it goes, in every single country of Latin America. The whole of the southern continent is being rapidly undermined by the Red termites.

Our public information program has been almost completely lacking in these areas. There has been no effective news medium reaching the people in Cuba to counter the incessant anti-Americanism preached by the Castro Government beamed at both Cubans and the rest of Latin America.

The urgent need has always been for hard-hitting U.S. information programs on the broadcast band, as few Cubans can receive the 1-hour USIS broadcast via short wave. Without U.S. rebuttal, it must appear to all of Latin America that we have no answer for Castro's many charges against us.

As stated previously, despite serious provocations, the United States was slow to apply economic pressures to Cuba. The suspension of the United States-Cuban Sugar Act was not effective before the revolutionary government had sold much of the 1960 crop to us at premium prices. And even as late as November 1961, less than a year ago, we were still authorizing the shipment of millions of dollars worth of food and drugs. Stringent trade restrictions in the initial stages of Castro's regime could have been a decisive weapon.

In the political field, we showed the most incredible weakness. Despite our experience with tactics used by the Communists in the subjugation of the Chinese, we were again taken in by the same old slogans of "Agrarian and social reforms". When the Communists find a successful formula, they use it over and over again. Of course, Fidel Castro continuously denied his intentions of setting up a Communist dictatorship until success was assured. This is a Trojan horse gambit, which is now being repeated in a number of other Latin American countries.

In looking back on the stages of the communization of Cuba, a successful solution could have been achieved in the early stages merely by making the correct assessment of Castro's intentions. The information was available for a correct assessment to have been made.

Through the middle and latter stages, courses of action open to us became more and more limited, costly, and dangerous.

But now, let's take a look into the future.

With the ever-increasing numbers of Communists pouring into Cuba from Red China, the European satellites, and from the Soviet Union, it is probable that the Soviet Union will be in complete control of Cuba in the near future. Massive modern weaponry will then be installed on this small island capable of dominating and blackmailing all of the Western Hemisphere. This is certainly in line with the nature and past performance of this enemy and must be expected.

At some point, we, as a Nation, must turn and take a stand.

To understand the defeat in Cuba, it is necessary to know "defeat in Washington." The fiasco at the Bay of Cochinos was only the outward manifestation of the lack of faith in ourselves as a nation and in the justice of our cause. We have become so entangled in our commitments to the internationalist organizations at the U.N. and the OAS, that we can no longer act in our own national interest, nor in that of the free world. Our enemies, with no moral or spiritual restraints are not so affected.

This defeatism is finding expression in new policies that compound our ineffectiveness. One such is the so-called no-win policy. This holds that victory over the Soviet Union must be avoided; that by making massive concessions in unilateral disarmament and on cold war issues, we hope that the Soviet Union will reciprocate. Dr. Rostow, who authored the plan, is Chairman of the State Department Planning Council.

Some of our recent concessions have been: (1) A slow-down in the B-70 bomber program; (2) insistence on a Communist-dominated coalition government for Laos, and agreeing to pay for its upkeep; (3) a pledge that we will not cross international boundaries in guerrilla warfare, even though our enemies do; (4) that in future conflicts we will bomb only military targets; (5) and, during the last few days, our offer to enter into an uninspected test ban.

So far, there has not been much evidence of the hoped for reciprocation. Mr. Khrushchev appeared to be delighted and encouraged with the concessions in Laos, and immediately afterwards stated that some day the hammer and sickle was going to fly over our Capitol, and that the Americans themselves would haul it up.

There is really nothing new to Mr. Rostow's no-win policy. Since the 1930's, when we closed our eyes to the brutality of the regime and recognized Russia, providing technical assistance to restore her shattered economy, we have been making massive concessions and contributions, and it has only assisted the Communist drive for world domination, not altered it.

Socialism is the first stage leading to communism.

How strong is the drive toward socialism within the present administration. Special Presidential Assistant, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. is in the key spot within the administration.

In the May 1947 issue of a periodical, the Partisan Review, an article by Mr. Schlesinger states this opinion: "There seems no inherent obstacle to the gradual advance of socialism in the United States through a series of new deals \* \* \*. The classical argument against gradualism was that the capitalist ruling class would resort to violence rather than surrender its prerogatives \* \* \*. Here, as elsewhere, the Marxists enormously overestimated the political courage and will of the capitalists. There is no sign that the capitalists are putting up a really determined fight. The active agents in effecting the transition will prob-

0001377

001080953

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6109

ably be, not the working class, but some combination of lawyers, business, and labor managers, politicians, and intellectuals, in the manner of the first New Deal. Moreover, workers, as a mass have rarely had the impulses attributed to them by Marxism. They too often believe in patriotism or religion. Thus they are rarely swept by the proper mass emotions."

In a recent memorandum by Mr. Schlesinger entitled "The Big Decision: Private Indulgence or National Power?", I quote: "We will have to abandon the illusion that the free choices of millions of individual consumers can solve all our problems \* \* \*. We shall have to begin purposefully to focus our national energies in ways which will give us the things a great Nation must have—defense, foreign assistance, education, medical care, scientific research, elimination of private property, and so on, even if these things don't make profits for private business in the market."

I wish I had time to read all of this article by Mr. Schlesinger, but do so for yourselves. Recently, when asked if he had changed his mind about these views, his reply was "I neither apologize nor withdraw."

These views are quoted to help us understand the current trends in Washington. This is socialism.

Getting back to Cuba, the loss of one skirmish at the Bay of Cochinos is no reason to make defeat in Cuba permanent, for us to assist in the maintenance of a Communist tyranny 90 miles from the United States.

There is real hunger in Cuba today. Daily the rumblings of rebellion grow louder. On June 16 the people of Cardenas surged into the streets beating their pots and pans and shouting: "We're hungry," at the tops of their voices. This small edition of Budapest was not quelled until tanks forced their way into the town, and Russian Mig's roared overhead threatening annihilation.

There have been defections amongst the militia units. There will be larger ones. Let us be prepared to free Cuba when the opportunity comes.

We should support the underground. We should allow the Cubans to reactivate their liberation forces; form a government in exile; allow them to maintain their patriotism and their resolve to free their enslaved and suffering countrymen.

If we believe in ourselves; if we believe in the justice of the liberation of the Communist enslaved peoples, Cuba will be free in the near future.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us free Cuba and release a wave of pro-Americanism and anti-communism that will sweep the hemisphere.

Let us win our first great victory of the cold war.

### Leading Doctor Favors Medicare

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I read a very interesting letter on the editorial page of the Philadelphia Bulletin of August 8. It was written by one of the leading physicians of Philadelphia. His views refer to the position of one-third of the medical profession as favoring the King-Anderson bill.

I have known Dr. Leon Solis-Cohen for a great many years and have observed his outstanding contributions to the public welfare. He has been very active in civic and fraternal affairs and has frequently participated in matters affecting the welfare of the people.

His observations are contained in the remarks by the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, who has included the newspaper report. I wish to commend Dr. Solis-Cohen for his views and for his strong statement in favor of medical care for the aged under social security.

### James A. Farley: Rainmaker in Elmira Bustling in Batavia

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, with the refreshing effervescence associated with the product for which he has won worldwide acceptance, former Postmaster General James A. Farley is receiving a glad hand wherever he travels in New York State. In Elmira, the general, who has credit due him for many great gains, is now attributed a power to affect the elements. In Batavia the general walked in the sunlight of many old friendships. Sun and rain germinate good growth and the State of New York would welcome more of that. There is no question that General Farley could make an immense contribution in that direction.

I submit herewith two editorials from the Batavia Daily News of July 20, 1962, and the Elmira Star-Gazette, of July 21, 1962, attesting to the continuing high regard our communities have for this great American:

[From the Batavia (N.Y.) Daily News, July 20, 1962]

MR. FARLEY HERE

Although a bit further from the limelight than in the bustling days of the early Franklin D. Roosevelt administrations, James A. Farley remains a striking figure.

Mr. Farley made his first official visit to Batavia Downs as a member of the New York State Harness Racing Commission and was well pleased with what he saw.

Long known for his excellent memory of people and places, the former Postmaster General recalled the late Albert F. Kleps, longtime Democratic political leader here and a personal friend of Mr. Farley for many years.

Mr. Farley, who for years was "Mr. Democrat," still is highly regarded in his party, and in the State. His declining to talk politics seemed to indicate strategy of the moment. For a man of his stature with politics in his veins, he is certain to have something to say later.

[From the Elmira Star-Gazette, July 21, 1962]

FARLEY AND RAIN—BOTH WELCOME

Jim Farley always brings something welcome to town on his all-too-rare visits.

That's a warmth and glow of a man who counts friends across the world and in every station in life.

Wednesday's flying visit was true to form, for Jim's thoroughly at home in Chemung County and has friends here by the score.

Wednesday Jim brought something more than his welcome presence. A badly needed shower rode into town with him, and friends stood gladly in the rain to greet him and a token gift from the skies.

### CAP Dinner for International Air Cadets

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 6, I had the great honor and pleasure of attending a dinner at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington by invitation of my good friend Col. Barney Breeskin, special assistant to Col. Paul Ashworth, national commander of the Civil Air Patrol.

This dinner is an annual event sponsored by the Pan American World Airways for the air cadets and their escorts from 21 foreign countries. These cadets visit Washington each year, after having been guests of the United States, touring most of the States in groups of 5 and in several instances even as many as 25.

On this particular occasion, at the dinner on August 6, Colonel Ashworth presented a plaque award to Adm. Harold Miller, retired, vice president of Pan American World Airways, for meritorious service in the international air cadet exchange program.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Senate majority whip, made a wonderful address on the merits of the cadet exchange program. I, too, had occasion to express some views regarding this program which I consider very important to the free world.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Pan American World Airways on their great contribution to this worthwhile exchange program. For the past 10 years this company has consistently sponsored projects of great benefit to this program and thereby was instrumental in bringing together many fine citizens of this country in the common bond of brotherhood, thus resulting in a successful exchange of ideas and a better understanding of problems. Mr. Juan Trippe, president of Pan American World Airways, has long been known for his efforts in the cause of international good will.

We, of New York, are very proud of the fine work being done by the Civil Air Patrol and we are particularly proud that our fair city of New York is one of the host cities, just as is Washington, for these foreign cadets visiting the United States under the exchange program.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to list the States that have served as hosts to the foreign cadets. They are as follows:

A6110

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 9

Alabama, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

The following is a list of the countries that participated in the program: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey.

Finally, I want to include also the names of the distinguished guests at the head table at the dinner given by the Pan American World Airways:

HEAD TABLE SEATING ARRANGEMENT, CIVIL AIR PATROL DINNER, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 6, 1962

1. Mr. Ira D. Mackler, Wilson Co.
2. Col. Dan Evans, wing commander, National Capitol Wing.
3. Col. Edward F. McGinnis, American Legion.
4. Col. Daniel F. Boone, deputy regional commander, Civil Air Patrol.
5. Mr. C. William Martin, Jr., president, Pepsi Cola Bottling Co. of Washington.
6. Maj. Gen. Walter Agee, former national commander.
7. Mr. John R. O'Brien, vice president, Touchdown Club.
8. Mr. Robert G. Baker, secretary to the majority, U.S. Senate.
9. Representative JAMES MORRISON, Louisiana.
10. Col. Paul Ashworth, U.S. Air Force, national commander, Civil Air Patrol.
11. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, majority whip, U.S. Senate.
12. Adm. Harold Miller, vice president, Pan American World Airways.
13. Commissioner John B. Duncan, District of Columbia.
14. Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York.
15. Mr. Fred Black, Blyco Corp.
16. Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland.
17. Mr. Glen B. Eastburn, New York Airways.
18. Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, former national commander.
19. Mayor Frank Mann, Alexandria, Va.
20. Col. Milton Kronheim, old friend of Civil Air Patrol.
21. Col. A. Paul Fonda, office, Assistant Chief of Staff of Reserved Forces.
22. Lt. Col. Wm. H. Schulle, special assistant to the national commander, New York phase.
23. Col. Barnee Breeskin, special assistant to the national commander, Washington, D.C.
24. Mr. Lincoln White, press officer, State Department.

## The Colombian Lotteries

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprise the Members of this House about the Colombian lotteries.

Colombia is a small and poor country, yet, it realizes the worth of lotteries.

The gross receipts from said lotteries in 1961 amounted to over \$12 million of which about \$3 million went to the Government.

The income received is used for hospital development, homes for the poor, the blind, deaf mutes, the aged and other charitable institutions.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time that we stopped being reckless and careless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery? If we would have the courage to wipe out hypocrisy, we could raise over \$10 billion in additional revenue which would help to cut our high taxes and reduce our mounting national debt.

## Farley for Governor

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of our "greats" in the Democratic Party is the Honorable James A. Farley of New York. He is not only considered "great" by the membership of the Democratic Party, but he is considered "great" by the people of his community, his State, and this Nation. He has set an exemplary example as an American, as a public servant, as a businessman, and in all phases of civic and social life. For these reasons, he has received acclaim all over the country.

As an illustration of the high respect in which he is held, I insert the following article from the Chemung Valley Reporter:

[From the Horseheads, N.Y. Chemung Valley Reporter, July 12, 1962]

## FARLEY FOR GOVERNOR

(By Jim Smith)

A few days ago a letter to the editor of another newspaper from William J. Murtaugh of Elmira proposing Jim Farley as the Democratic candidate for Governor of the State of New York was published. We are extremely happy to second that proposal.

James A. Farley, former postmaster general and now chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corp., is without a question, the best known Democrat in the State and, we do not hesitate to say one of the most popular.

Mr. Farley is a man of outstanding qualifications: an administrator of proven ability, a man of keen judgment, a man admired by both Democrats and Republicans, and we predict that, should he be nominated, he would be elected by an overwhelming majority.

He has always championed the rights of the common man; he is of unimpeachable honesty and integrity, the type of man needed in the Governor's chair during these difficult and perilous times.

It has been our privilege to meet Mr. Farley personally on several occasions and we have always found him to be the same congenial, down-to-earth gentleman, whom it is a pleasure to meet.

A true friend to all mankind, to business, to labor and all others of the commonwealth, James A. Farley is our favored candidate for Governor of New York State.

## Fitting Tribute to George P. Miller

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 9, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to share the representation of Alameda County, Calif., in the House of Representatives with a truly dedicated public servant and a great American, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER.

Chairman MILLER has received many deserved and glowing tributes during his 18 years in Congress but none, I am sure, more gratifying than the very appropriate editorial which appeared in his hometown newspaper, the Alameda Times Star, on August 3 of this year.

Mr. Speaker, every Member will vicariously enjoy this editorial which lauds the quiet and effective work of a dedicated Member of the House of Representatives.

WHY CONGRESSMAN MILLER HAS WON HIGH PRAISE BY GOP PAPER

When a political figure draws praise from a publication whose editorial viewpoint is that of the opposite political party—and especially when that publication happens to be the Chicago Tribune—one may be assured that he has more than partisan political actions to his credit.

Such a man is GEORGE P. MILLER. On page 5 of today's Times-Star is a feature story, reprinted from the Chicago Tribune, dealing with the career of the Alameda Congressman. The story traces his career from his employment as an Alameda streetsweeper during the days of the depression to his present distinguished position as Chairman of the House Space and Astronautics Committee.

The chairmanship of such an important committee, while awarded on the basis of seniority, is held only by ability, and MILLER, in effect chairman during the final illness of the former chairman, has both then and since he took formal possession of that post, repeatedly demonstrated a tremendous grasp of what the job requires, plus an extraordinary ability to carry out the work the job entails.

What that work consists of is not generally known to the great majority of the public, but the heart of it is concerned with determining what is the best legislation for our space program and then proceeding to make that proposed legislation into law. In other words, any man who does this job so well as MILLER must have not only a vast fund of advanced knowledge, but he must also possess both political know-how and executive ability. Needless to say, such an extraordinary combination is rare indeed.

But quite aside from these all-important points is the fact that during his long tenure in the House, Congressman MILLER has never forgotten that he has been chosen by his constituents of the Eighth Congressional District as their personal representative in Washington, D.C. A request to MILLER's office always brings an immediate reply, and action, whether the request comes from Democrat or Republican.

And as one might suspect he has given ample evidence of the courage of his convictions. For example, during the height of the hysteria fomented by the late Senator