

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3509

the Associated Press with the heading "ADA Says Red China Should Be Recognized." Mr. Speaker, the Americans for Democratic Action are up to their old tricks of advocating recognition by the United States of Red China as well as admission to the United Nations.

Many of the people associated with the ADA formed the policies years ago that caused the loss of free China behind the Iron Curtain of communism, as well as the loss of many other countries. Certainly their policies at that time were wrong and the policies they advocate today are just as bad and as detrimental to the interest of the United States and the free world:

ADA SAYS RED CHINA SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED
(By the Associated Press)

Americans for Democratic Action urges a start toward diplomatic recognition of Red China "and its accreditation to the United Nations as the government of China."

This should not be done, the ADA said, "as gestures of moral approval of past actions but as a means of establishing the normal channels of international communication."

The ADA's views on China were in a resolution adopted yesterday before its 14th annual convention adjourned.

PROVISIONS FOR FORMOSA

Recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the United Nations, the ADA said, "would increase our access to information on Chinese affairs and the possibility of affecting Chinese foreign policy."

Admitting Red China to the United Nations, the ADA said, "should be linked to the condition that the inhabitants of Formosa shall themselves democratically decide whether they shall be admitted to the United Nations as an independent nation or that they shall rejoin mainland China."

The Chinese seat at the United Nations now is held by representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government, which is based on Formosa.

On domestic matters, ADA, a self-described liberal organization, said the Kennedy administration was "drifting into the worst mistakes of the Eisenhower years."

The ADA defined them as "improvisations for segments of full employment and economic growth."

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The resolution recommended a number of long-range objectives, including:

Expanded support for neglected segments of the economy, notably housing, urban redevelopment, water conservation, depressed areas and constantly expanding consumer purchasing power for a rising standard of living.

The convention reelected Samuel H. Beer, a Harvard professor, as chairman; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as honorary chairman; Richard C. Sachs, New York, treasurer, and Roy Bennett, New York, assistant treasurer. Paul Seabury, a University of California professor, was elected chairman of the executive committee.

Copy file
The Case Against Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Arthur Krock writes in the New York

Times this morning an article that to me represents a devastating reply to those who contend that this country had not given Cuban Dictator Castro fair treatment.

Frankly, a surprising number of my own constituents persist in arguing with me that we have been too harsh and peremptory in our treatment of Castro. Because this badly mistaken view may be shared by many Americans, I ask unanimous consent that the column in today's New York Times, entitled "The Lively Issue of Castro's Justifications," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE LIVELY ISSUE OF CASTRO'S JUSTIFICATIONS
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 17—Two conclusions reached by this department after an examination of the origins of the currently hostile United States-Castro relations, and published here under date of May 10, have evoked an unusual number of remarkably uniform dissents from readers. These conclusions were:

1. The factual weakness of an advertisement in this newspaper, signed by a number of Harvard professors among other distinguished citizens, which justified Castro's anti-Americanism on the ground that for "at least a year" U.S. policy has been "We must crush Castro," is that it began the chapter of United States-Castro relations in the middle.

2. Castro's unfriendly and illegal acts, and his anti-American incitements of the Cuban population, long preceded the date chosen in this advertisement to demonstrate that the burden of blame is on his government.

In rebuttal of these conclusions the letterwriters generally contended that the United States refused a request from Castro to be invited for talks; rebuffed and snubbed him when he came here in February 1959, to speak to the American Society of Newspaper Editors; and refused his offer at that time and thereafter to negotiate the differences between his regime and the Government of the United States. But the open record is the following:

1. Castro never requested an official invitation. When, on his own volition, he came unofficially to Washington, in April 1959, Secretary of State Herter gave him a luncheon at which no mention of any desired negotiation was made by the Cuban officials present; and, in the absence of President Eisenhower, the Premier was received by Vice President Nixon.

2. On February 22, 1960, Castro did propose—but for the first time—to negotiate with the United States on compensation to American citizens for their property in Cuba that he expropriated soon after his accession to power. However, his conditions were that during the negotiation the United States should bind both the Executive and Congress to refrain from any action which Cuba would consider to affect its interests, while he remained free to negotiate or procrastinate as he chose—conditions obviously unacceptable and, so far as Congress was concerned, constitutionally impossible.

3. From the time Castro assumed power until May 17, 1960, the United States made 9 formal and 16 informal offers to negotiate all differences with Cuba. The first was by Ambassador Bonsal in March 1959. In each note and statement the United States expressed sympathy with the social and economic objectives of the Cuban agrarian reform law under which the expropriation was made.

HERTER'S INDICTMENT

4. At the San José, Costa Rica, conference, August 1960, Cuban Foreign Minister Roa charged that this Government had consistently refused Castro's offers of negotiation. Secretary Herter made and documented this reply: That continuing attacks on the United States by the Castro regime began in January 1959 before the acts it alleges were U.S. aggression. He said also that from this date forward political assaults on the U.S. Government, "and scurrilous attempts to besmirch the characters of its leaders, have nevertheless been consistent and made with increased savagery."

The circumstances that the charges in Castro's justification that this open record refutes are being made by citizens of such quality is strange, disturbing, and mysterious. But it is true, as pointed out in some of the letters, that Castro also can cite grievances prior to the preinvasion programming. For example, the United States did not completely bar arms to dictator Batista until March 14, 1958; sent a marine guard for the Guantanamo pumping station 6 miles into Cuba on July 28, 1958; and concluded a 20-year atomic energy aid agreement with Batista September 9, 1958.

The silly paradox, however, is that all this time U.S. businessmen in Cuba were knowingly financing Castro's revolution by paying their taxes at stations where he could seize them. Prior to that, the taxes on Cuban properties owned by Americans were always sent to Havana, the central collection office, until the other arrangement was deliberately made for the financing of Castro. And meanwhile the State Department was totally ignoring successive warnings from two Ambassadors that the interest of international communism would be served in Cuba by Castro's success.

The John Birch Society—1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a leading newspaper published in Whittier, Calif., a city located in my district, has printed a series of five objectively written articles concerning the John Birch Society. This newspaper, the Daily News, is to be commended for basing the articles on facts which many news media have ignored in reporting on the society. Under unanimous consent I include the first three articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif.,
Apr. 26, 1961]

HOW TO TELL A COMMIE FRONT

(First of a series)

The John Birch Society may be a movement aimed at strengthening Americanism and weakening communism, but it is mysterious and controversial, too.

Mysterious although its meetings are public and its membership open to any good American who will subscribe to its beliefs.

Controversial although its business is Americanism.

It has been subjected to criticism by political officeholders, newspaper editors, church pastors, and the man on the street. There has been clamoring for an investigation of its purpose and organization and its founder, Robert Welch.

IGNORANCE OR MISUNDERSTANDING

Public ignorance or, at least, misunderstanding may be the cause of accusations that have run the gamut from dictatorship to Klan.

But the Birch Society is neither dictatorial nor a form of the infamous Ku Klux Klan, according to Whittier chapter leaders.

Five of the leaders have compiled a five-part series of articles explaining the aims and objects of the society. The series has been jointly written by Augustine Cervantes, of South Whittier; Joseph Coffman, of La Habra; Raye King, V. C. Ramler, and Joseph Sullivan, all of Whittier.

The first article in the series follows:

HOW TO TELL ONE

J. Edgar Hoover tells us in his book, "Masters of Deceit," that a Communist-front organization can be detected by applying the following test:

1. Does the organization espouse the cause of Soviet Russia? Does it shift when the party line shifts?
2. Does the organization feature as speakers at its meetings known Communists or sympathizers?
3. Does the organization sponsor causes, campaigns, literature, petitions, or other activities sponsored by the party or other front organizations?
4. Is the organization used as a sounding board by, or is it endorsed by Communist-controlled labor unions?
5. Does its literature follow the Communist line or is it printed by the Communist press?
6. Does the organization receive consistent favorable mention in Communist publications?
7. Does the organization represent itself to be nonpartisan yet engage in political activities and consistently advocate causes favored by the Communists? Does it denounce both Fascists and Communists?
8. Does the organization denounce American foreign policy while always lauding Soviet policy?
9. Does the organization utilize Communist doubletalk by referring to Soviet dominated countries as democracies, complaining that the United States is imperialistic and constantly denouncing monopoly capital?
10. Have outstanding leaders in public life openly renounced affiliation with the organization?

ATTRACT OR DENOUNCE?

11. Does the organization, if espousing liberal, progressive causes, attract well-known honest, patriotic liberals or does it denounce well known liberals?

12. Does the organization consistently consider matters not directly related to its avowed purposes and objectives?

Let us assume that the average apathetic but patriotic citizen had just read the above 12 items and decided to apply these measures to the organizations in his circles of acquaintanceship. Would he be able to do so effectively? The answer is obvious. He would need to become trained to apply the above measures intelligently. This then requires a thorough education and background in dialectical materialistic communism. How does one receive this type of education so necessary in our defense against internal subversion?

DIALECTIC MATERIALISM

There are a number of organizations usually local in nature which to a pretty good job of teaching dialectic materialism. However, December 1958 Robert Welch recognized the need for a national organization to train and recruit those already trained into an effective coordinated group. This resulted in the conception of the John Birch Society.

Up until the John Birch Society was organized, well-informed and well-trained patriots more or less worked as individuals or

in uncoordinated groups and as such did not worry the Communists except as a nuisance. However, after the origin of the John Birch Society, those thousands of concerned people recognizing their former inadequacy in fighting communism joined the society in such numbers that the Communist Party became alarmed and decided to apply their proven forces against them. It was recognized that at the present rate of growth the John Birch Society could attain almost unlimited power to cope with them and thus destroy 40 years of labor. It should be understood that the present status of Communist power in the United States had, except for a brief but fatal effort by Senator Joseph McCarthy, been reached through almost continuous default on the part of the American people

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 27, 1961]

CONCERNED SHOULD BECOME INFORMED

(This is the second of a five-part series on the John Birch Society. The articles were jointly written by Augustine Cervantes, Joseph Coffman, Raye King, V. C. Ramler, and Joseph Sullivan, all members of the Whittier chapter of the society.—Editor.)

The John Birch Society has tabulated literally hundreds of documented books, tape recordings and reports which it makes available to members and nonmembers alike which will make informed people out of concerned people.

Communists are not alarmed about concerned people; however, they recognize that informed people are dangerous because they can intelligently inform others.

It is the greatest fear of the Communist Party in the United States that despite their tremendous influence in our Government and over all our means of mass communication, the American people will wake up too soon to what has really been happening right under their very noses.

Communism operates for the most part in this country by utilizing front organization and underground activities.

COMMON ORIGIN

Communist-front organizations are characterized by their common origin, the rigid conformity of these organizations to the Communist pattern, their interlocking personnel and their methods generally used to deceive the American public. Being part of a conspiratorial movement their essence is deceptive.

The tactics of these fronts is to push as far as possible constitutional privileges by enlisting through this deception the cooperation of as great a segment of the public as can be deceived.

When activities of the Communists reach the realm of unconstitutional endeavor then the underground members take over. These activities go so far as to place concealed members in government, education, and industry.

PROPER TRAINING

Only organizations with members who have been properly trained can cope with the pressures brought to bear between these front organizations and those concealed underground. By watching the front groups and their unconcealed programs it is simple logic to connect those places in government, education, and industry where the party line expounded by the front groups receives the greatest reception.

It should be pointed out here that in all localities where the Birch Society is active it is well established in short order by its members and other freedom groups utilizing the above reasoning and J. Edgar Hoover's 12 rules for identifying fronts, where the Communist danger points that need to be watched are.

However, none of these people or organizations are ever labeled Communist by the

society or its members. Instead, a system of defense is set up to reduce to zero the effectiveness of the Communist activity. This is accomplished without fanfare or publicity, thus leaving the subversive group frustrated but aware of who was responsible. Reports of facts as to subversive activities observed are reported to national headquarters where once assembled can point to future trends in the fight.

[From the Daily News, Whittier, Calif., Apr. 29, 1961]

SOVIET PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUE STUDIED

(This is the third article of a five-part series on the John Birch Society written by Raye King, V. C. Ramler and Joseph Sullivan, all leaders of the Whittier chapter; Augustine Cervantes, South Whittier chapter leader; and Joseph Coffman, La Habra chapter leader.)

Everyone who reads the newspapers or magazines, watches television or listens to the radio is aware of the recent great volume of adverse publicity spewing forth against the John Birch Society and its founder Robert Welch.

This is a special type of treatment reserved by the Communist conspiracy for special people or groups that have been really effective and which they cannot directly infiltrate or subvert.

An informative pamphlet printed in the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., on instructions from the 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda" should be read by every man and woman in the United States.

This report is an official document of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the report was relative to the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws.

PRESS INVADED

Quoting from page 6 (a) of the Judiciary Committee report as follows:

"There are in the world few organs of the press, even when bourgeois, in which the Soviet apparatus has no intelligence. The main task of auxiliaries in the press is to manipulate the editor, or if that is not feasible, the reporters, without the editor's knowledge. General notions like 'This paper is conservative' or 'Catholic' are not at all sufficient any longer to recognize the policy it follows toward Moscow. Sometimes the managers themselves are unaware that their newspaper is 'permeated.'"

PROPAGANDA PURPOSE

Quoting further (from p. 14) of the Senate Judiciary Committee report under the heading "Breaking Anti-Communists; Slander, Intimidation, Kidnaping, Murder":

"An important task of Soviet propaganda is not only to circumvent the gullible, but also to reduce those who clearly realize the danger and zealously proclaim it to a state of powerlessness. Against these people are launched campaigns limitless in intensity as in ignominy. The Communists attempt to make lepers of them, to develop veritable reflexes in public opinion so that a halo of hatred will be instinctively associated with their name.

"Communist and crypto-Communist apparatus put all their ammunition to use in this task and shrink from neither slander nor provocation, forgery, nor blackmail. Here auxiliaries play a leading role: that of scandal-mongers.

"Sometimes the Soviet apparatus will denounce an anti-Communist as an underground Communist. Sometimes they will lead the police to believe that he is a terrorist or a trafficker. Slander against the anti-Communist writer Victor Serge reached such a point that even well-disposed police services no longer knew what to think."

May 18

lived for centuries before as inhabitants of the same territory in Austria-Hungary. One visible sign of these efforts is the awarding of the Charles Prize by the Sudeten Germans to the representative of the 2 million Americans of Slovak descent, the president of the Slovak League of America, Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, which takes place on Saturday, May 20, 1961.

The work which the Sudeten Germans have done is a great one. They have gathered material on the work of international communism. They have supplied this material to Members of Congress who have made several CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertions about the system of the Communist state security in the East, the system of agent-provocateurs, and so forth. On May 5, 1957, for example, the Chicago Tribune and the Detroit Free Press reported about a speech which Congressman Timothy P. Sheehan made in the House of Representatives based on the Sudeten German material. On May 14, 1958, Congressman Sheehan made a second speech about communism based on the Sudeten German material again.

If there will be more attention on the part of American statesmen opposing communism, the German expellees can constitute a great share in this anti-Communist fight for preservation and restoration of freedom. They are our best allies. They are united with us by the common aims and the common intelligent understanding of the menace threatening us.

We have followed until now, policies which have been quite contrary. Certain agencies, especially private ones, believed that they should support and cooperate not with the German expellees, not with the conservative Czechs, Poles, Slovaks, Hungarians, and other exiles, but on the contrary, with the leftwing exiles, the former national front men. This policy has clearly failed in the past and present. It failed in the same way as other support for Communists and pro-Communists, the help to Tito and Gomulka, the initial support for Castro. The support for left-wingers among the exiles has been parallel to the support for Tito and Gomulka. In this way, communism cannot be weakened, but strengthened. So it has been in the past.

Since the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, through the delivery of Central Europe, of the German rocket scientists and skilled workers to the Reds, we have followed the policy which has proven disastrous.

Today, it is high time to realize where our real friends are. We must give up the idea that we can win our enemies by handing over the property of our friends. We must stop believing that the best policy against communism is helping the Communists and the pro-Communists.

The Sudeten German expellees are allies of Conservative anti-Communist men in the free world. They are the hope for the Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians and all others, that these nations once again will be free. I hope that the Sudeten German Day 1961 will be a full

success and the start of an effective work for the freedom in Eastern Europe and the whole world.

CUBA AND CONTAINMENT

(Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have written a report for the news media in my district on the policy of containment of communism. I have been opposed to this policy for many years and in this article the situation in Cuba is one of the most dangerous in our history. Closing our eyes and thinking we can contain communism to the island of Cuba is ridiculous, as explained below:

CUBA AND CONTAINMENT

You can drive 90 miles in less than 2 hours and fly it in half an hour. By boat, it takes just a few hours. Philadelphia is more than 90 miles from Long Island. Fisher's Island, N.Y., is about 90 miles from Lynbrook. Ninety miles is an infinitesimal distance these days. Cuba is 90 miles from the United States.

Less than 90 miles away from our shores, a bearded psychopath is, day by day, entrenching the evil of communism in our own hemisphere—closer to our country than many parts of our own State.

Castro isn't a fad with the Cuban people. He isn't just something we as a country can close our eyes to and hope that when we open them he will have disappeared. He represents the essence of an evil, unscrupulous philosophy that doesn't play by gentlemen's rules. He is a cancer—his beliefs will spread like a cancer until, if we don't recognize the danger signs, it will be too late.

He sits on that Caribbean island while we sit on our decisions. He is not going to wait for us to make up our minds about what to do with him. Every day he spins the web of absolute power a little tighter, a little more difficult to break. Every day that we delay action is another day for him to build his strength and entrench his position.

We have finally realized that he isn't just leaning toward communism—that he is and always has been a Communist and that we have permitted him to establish the first Communist country in the hemisphere.

We have, just a few weeks ago, lost the first move to eradicate this menace. Now it seems that we are going to revert to an old standby measure which has never worked in the past and which will not work now—the policy of containment.

This is the State Department theory that implies that the country itself (in this case, Cuba) is definitely a danger, but that if we just make sure that the country's influence does not spread beyond its borders, it will eventually cease to be a danger—or the even less realistic hope that the tyrannized people themselves will one day revolt.

This theory is just about as ridiculous as the medieval system of fighting the plague by doing nothing more than marking the houses of the sick with a huge red cross. We should have realized by now that this policy of containment is not the way to beat communism.

We cannot permit communism to spread anywhere in the world, but especially in our own hemisphere. When it has already gained a foothold within shouting distance of our country, it is time to act immediately and decisively.

Are we going to step aside—as we did in Laos?

Are we going to refuse to take action against this menace because certain coun-

tries might accuse us of being aggressors? They are accusing us of this now. British Guiana, for example. Over every radio station, night and day, they are conducting a vicious hate America campaign.

In Venezuela, anti-American feeling has reached epidemic proportions.

Is taking action against Castro going to make us any more or any less popular? Survival of our system cannot be considered less important than a popularity contest.

Admittedly, deciding the course of action to be taken against Cuba is a difficult choice. We have struggled for years to erase the "American Imperialist" image from the minds of certain Latin Americans who cannot forget the Marines in Venezuela or Haiti—who remember Mexico and the Gadsden Purchase—who remember Honduras—who feel that the big brother to the north is domineering and tyrannical.

The history of our relations with Latin America is not altogether to our credit, and in recent years we have taken many forward steps toward erasing these unfortunate incidents and living in true harmony and cooperation with our neighbors.

Few if any of the governments of the Central and South American nations are on Castro's side. The Organization of American States (OAS) has often debated the Cuban problem. The OAS is a treaty organization bound to defend member states against aggression and could legitimately act in Cuba.

No matter what the source of the action taken is, however, something must be done about Castro's Cuba. It is painfully easy to see what will happen. If we permit our avowed enemies to remain in Cuba, we will begin losing valuable ground in Latin America—just as we have in Africa and Asia.

We must not—we dare not—forget that there is a certain genius behind the Communist's organizational and infiltration technique. They know how to foment uprisings. They know how to stay in once they've gotten in. They recognize the basic attraction and sympathy people have for the underdog and they capitalize on this at every turn.

They do not and never will play by any rules. Their ambitions are too great for that. Their method of operation has been demonstrated to us time and time again, yet we persist in thinking that we can fight them with diplomatic weapons as outdated as the bow and arrow.

They are not playing for fun. They are playing for keeps, and our very survival is at stake.

We have lost every time we have followed the policy of containment. We know from bitter experience that contained countries become stronger and our position becomes weaker. They can move. We cannot.

This policy has cost the free world dearly. It will continue to do so.

We cannot afford to experiment in Cuba. Nor can we afford to utilize policies that are proven to be ineffective.

Ninety miles is not a very big distance.

SHIPPING OF GRINDING MACHINES TO U.S.S.R.

(Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a resident of the congressional district I represent recently wrote to the Department of Commerce in regard to the export license which was issued, and since revoked, authorizing shipment of preci-

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

7845

of Labor and Justice in moving forward in a united national effort for these purposes.

Specifically, the draft bill would authorize a 5-year program, beginning with the fiscal year 1962, as follows:

1. **Demonstration and Evaluation Projects:** Grants would be available to any State, local, or other public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution for projects for the evaluation, or demonstration of the effectiveness, of techniques and practices which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses (including the treatment of juvenile delinquents and youthful offenders).

Major emphasis would be given, under this program, to the selection of a limited number of communities or States that show promise of having programs for the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses that might be useful or applicable in other parts of the country. These communities or States would be given funds for financing part or all of the cost of evaluating or demonstrating the effectiveness of such programs and reporting on the findings. These findings would then provide a body of information that could be disseminated on a nationwide basis so that all parts of the country could benefit from the successful experience of those communities and States.

2. **Training of Personnel:** Grants would also be authorized for the training of personnel, employed or preparing for employment in programs for the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses. These grants would be available to any State, local, or other public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution, to carry out programs which held promise of making a substantial contribution to the prevention or control of delinquency or youth offenses. These programs may include, among others, the development of courses, and fellowships and traineeships.

Those provisions would make possible an intensive effort in meeting the acute shortage of trained workers in this field—such as probation officers, police, social workers, institutional house parents, youth gang workers and others. This not only would begin a flow of urgently needed trained personnel but would also improve, through inservice and other short-term training programs, the background knowledge and skill of existing personnel.

3. **Technical assistance services:** In addition to studies relating to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses, including the effectiveness of projects carried under this bill, the draft bill would authorize technical assistance to State and municipalities and other public or private agencies in such matters, and the provision of short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to the prevention or control of delinquency or youth offenses (again including treatment of the individuals involved).

The bill would require that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare consult with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youthful Offenders on matters of general policy under the bill and consider any recommendations of the Committee on project applications or proposed studies under the bill.

The additional cost of the proposed bill for the fiscal year 1962 is estimated to be \$10 million.

Faithfully yours,
ABRAHAM RUBICOFF,
Secretary.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10940

ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH CRIME

Whereas the U.S. Government has an obligation to maintain and develop programs

No. 83—14

and policies to promote the welfare of its younger citizens, and

Whereas the steady growth in the incidence of juvenile delinquency and youth crime has long been recognized as a national problem of major concern, and

Whereas there is a demonstrated need that the resources of the Federal Government be promptly mobilized to provide leadership and direction in a national effort to strengthen our social structure and to correlate, at all levels of government, juvenile and youth services; that training of personnel for juvenile and youth programs be intensified; and, that research to develop more effective measures for the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency and youth crime be broadened: Now, therefore,

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (hereinafter referred to as the Committee). The Committee shall be composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Each member of the Committee shall designate an official or employee of his department as an alternate member who shall serve as a member of the Committee in lieu of the regular member whenever the regular member is unable to attend any meeting of the Committee; and the alternate member shall while serving as such have in all respects the same status as a member of the Committee as does the regular member for whom he is serving. The Chairman of the Committee shall be the Attorney General.

(b) The Committee may invite representatives of the Judiciary to participate in its deliberations.

SEC. 2. The Committee (1) shall review, evaluate and promote the coordination of the activities of the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government relating to juvenile delinquency and youth crime; (2) shall stimulate experimentation, innovation and improvement in Federal programs; (3) shall encourage cooperation and the sharing of information between Federal agencies and State, local and private organizations having similar responsibilities and interests; (4) shall make recommendations to the Federal departments and agencies on measures to make more effective the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

SEC. 3. There is hereby established the Citizens Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the Council) which shall consist of not less than 12 and not more than 21 members, who shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) who are recognized authorities in professional or technical fields related to juvenile delinquency or youth crime, or persons representative of the general public who are leaders in programs concerned with juvenile delinquency or youth crime, and who shall be designated by the Chairman of the Committee after consultation with the Committee and serve at the pleasure of the Committee. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the Chairman of the Committee.

SEC. 4. The Council shall furnish the Committee advice and recommendations with respect to the matters with which the Committee is concerned under section 2 of this order and any other matters relating to the functions of the Committee on which it may desire information or advice.

SEC. 5. The Committee shall make reports to the President from time to time with respect to its activities and shall make recommendations to the President regarding policy, programs, and any additional meas-

ures including legislation which it deems desirable to further the objectives of this order.

SEC. 6. All executive departments and agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Committee and to furnish it such information and assistance, not inconsistent with law, as it may require in the performance of its functions and duties.

SEC. 7. Consistent with law, the Departments of Justice, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, shall as may be necessary for the effectuation of the purpose of this order, furnish assistance to the Committee in accordance with section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691). Such assistance may include the detailing of employees to the Committee to perform such functions, consistent with the purpose of this order, as the Chairman of the Committee may assign to them. One of such employees may be designated to serve as Executive Director of the Committee. The necessary office space, facilities and supplies for the use of the Committee shall be furnished by the three departments concerned as they shall agree.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 11, 1961.

SUDETEN DAY

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in the days of May 20 till May 23, the Sudeten German Day is taking place in Cologne, Germany. The Sudeten German expellees who were forcibly deported from their centuries-old homeland in Bohemia and Moravia/Silesia by the Communists in 1945, constitute now the main part of the 13 million of German expellees and refugees living now in the free West German Federal Republic. There were 3.3 million Sudeten Germans in their ancient homeland; over 2 million of them live now in West Germany, the rest in Austria and the Soviet Zone of Germany—many of them come again as refugees from the Soviet Zone to West Germany.

The issue of the German expellees and refugees and of the Sudeten German expellees is not only an old one, but a very present, actual one. Thousands of new refugees from the Soviet Zone of Germany arrive daily in West Berlin and in West Germany.

They are the main anti-Communist force in Germany and probably the world. They are an asset for anyone in the free world who wants to save human freedom. They are the anti-Communist wall—in the same way as if half of the United States were occupied by the Reds and American anti-Communists would flee from the occupied zone to the still free territory—they would be the same anti-Communist wall as are the German expellees and refugees today.

The Sudeten German expellees have always strived for the cooperation with conservative anti-Communist American statesmen in the Congress. They have, moreover, always striven for a close cooperation with the Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians, living now also in exile, with whom they had lived for the long 20 years in one state, Czechoslovakia, erected in 1918, but with whom they had

from the design, construction, and operation of the large nuclear-power stations already assured.

The long-range outlook for the uranium industry is bright—of this I am certain. The intermediate period may be difficult but difficulties have been, and can be, overcome. I still am an optimist.

SUPPORT OF JAVITS-COOPER AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am a supporter of the Javits-Cooper amendment. I support it because it provides a far more acceptable formula for distributing Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries than the committee bill.

I was led to this position, first, by the problem of my own State of Connecticut and, second, by my concern for the national picture.

The committee bill provides only \$9.26 for each Connecticut school-age child, the lowest amount granted to any State under the committee bill. At the present time, the average educational expenditure per child in Connecticut is around \$420. Action pending before the State legislature will raise that figure to about \$450, and local action in many of our 169 communities will raise that figure closer to the \$500 mark.

Against these figures, the \$9.26 per school-age child provided by the committee bill is insignificant. It will scarcely make a dent in the educational problem of Connecticut. And to get this marginal aid, the taxpayers of Connecticut will be required to spend several dollars in Federal taxes for each dollar of aid they receive.

As a small sweetener, the committee bill permits private and parochial schoolchildren, which number about 18 percent of Connecticut's school population, to be counted for Federal-aid purposes. The private and parochial schools, of course, will not receive this money. Their children will merely be used as justification for raising the total which goes to the public schools.

This violates basic equity since it provides Federal money to States for financing education for which the States bear no expense. And it adds insult to injury to parents of private and parochial schoolchildren who not only receive no aid, but also find their great effort and sacrifice recognized only as a basis for increased aid to public schools.

Under the committee bill, Connecticut is at the bottom of the list in aid received, and at the top of the list in taxes paid to finance this aid.

Connecticut, though it has many serious economic problems and around 80,000 unemployed, ranks as the most prosperous State in the Union. I am, of course, happy about this. Our relative prosperity does not arise because we have any unusual natural resources. We have practically no natural resources. The prosperity of Connecticut has been built over long decades by the thrift, ingenuity, know-how, and hard work of its people. And frankly, our people are getting a little tired of having

their achievement used as a basis for discrimination in a variety of Federal programs.

I have voted on occasion for programs which tax Connecticut citizens disproportionately for the benefit of other sections of the country. I have done it because this is one country, one people, with one common cause. I believe that when we help Americans anywhere, if the program is reasonable, we help Americans everywhere.

Because of Connecticut's high standing in personal income, the people of our State stand to be taxed more for Federal programs than any other State. There are many programs of vital interest to the Nation such as conservation, agriculture, public power, reclamation, irrigation, and others which by their nature have little application to Connecticut. Yet we are willing to support these programs with our tax dollars because they are important to the Nation and Connecticut is a part of the Nation.

But we have before us today a problem which does apply to Connecticut. Our State, like other States, needs help in the field of education and it is entitled to get that help on an equal basis with other States.

Even if the allowance per school child was the same in every State, Connecticut would still be giving more than it gets because of its high income position. But on top of this inherent disproportion, there has been added a discriminatory formula under which Connecticut receives the least though it pays the most. This is unfair.

The Javits-Cooper amendment provides a reasonable formula for dealing fairly with all States and dealing adequately at the same time with the national interest. It provides a basic payment of \$20 per pupil to all States. It does not abuse commonsense by paying the public school system for the expenses borne by private and parochial schools. And for the several States which, because of their relative poverty, have special educational problems, the amendment provides extra money.

This is a formula that I can support. Under it Connecticut would receive almost \$8.4 million as opposed to the \$5.2 million under the committee bill. And as a matter of principle, it would treat Connecticut on an equal basis with most other States, making special allowances for the grave problems of the States least able to help themselves.

I congratulate my colleagues for offering this amendment, and I am privileged to join with them in its support.

Cuba file
NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST THREAT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Evening Star carried an article by the distinguished columnist, William S. White, which was one of the finest nutshell summaries I have seen of the crisis we face.

Mr. White describes as neopacifists and neoisolationists those who today argue that we cannot do anything about Cuba, that we cannot do anything about Laos,

that we ought not to be involved in Quemoy or Matsu, that we should try to gracefully withdraw from the Berlin situation. He describes these groups as the real descendants of the America Firsters and the isolationists of 20 years ago.

Mr. White points out that the neoisolationists and the neopacifists are far more influential and, therefore, far more dangerous, than their forebears in the late 1930's, because their arguments are less frank and more subtle.

Whether our country will succeed or fail, in my judgment, depends in large measure on whether our Government, our press, and our universities can free themselves of the influence of these latter-day pacifists.

I ask unanimous consent that the column by William S. White, appearing in the Evening Star of May 17, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST THREAT—GROUP SEEN PERILING NATION IN DELUSION THAT ALL FORCE, EVEN FOR RIGHT, IS EVIL

(By William S. White)

American foreign policy stands at the most fateful crossroads since the old isolationists and pacifists narrowly failed two decades ago to prevent this country from joining in the resistance to the Nazis and Fascists.

This movement honestly believed itself dedicated to "peace" and to America First. But had it had its way America would have finished not first but rather third—the third victim, after Britain and France, of an antihuman force centered in Adolf Hitler.

Now there has arisen to frightening influence a new American isolationism, a new American pacifism, which may well destroy the capacity of the United States to resist the equally antihuman force of international communism.

In one way, indeed, the danger is greater now than then. For the old isolationists, the old pacifists, at least did not deny their isolationism, their pacifism. But the new isolationism will not acknowledge itself for what it is. The new pacifism will not admit, even to itself, that the inevitable end of its reasoning is the surrender of one anti-Communist position after another until there will be at last no place for the West to turn and stand its ground.

Instead, the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, put the plainmeaning of their policies under a bland, superior cloud of self-deluding talky-talk. They do not simply say flatly that we should take no risk in this world—not in Cuba, not in Laos, not anywhere—and let it go at that.

With that kind of candor, the issues could at any rate be met head-on. Rather, they argue, for example, simply that Cuba is not really a threat to the United States, in spite of the public alliance with the Soviet bloc publicly proclaimed by Fidel Castro. Cuba is only "peripheral," though Cuba lies 90 miles from the American shoreline and though for the first time in our nationhood an aggressive international power has an undeniable lodgment in this hemisphere.

So it is with Laos. Laos is not really worth any risk, either. We are held to be interfering there in local politics, or something or the other.

Again, the pre-conditions for fair debate are denied for lack of candor among the new isolationists, the new pacifists. For nearly all those who now declare that Castro offers no great danger to us were in the forefront of those who built up the dictator

May 18

Castro, with almost hysterical hosannas, in the first place. He is in part their own creation. This truth they cannot admit without admitting their share of responsibility. So what is a truth becomes, to them, no truth at all.

The new isolationists, the new pacifists, have honorable motives. But at the very bottom they are also men caught by a dangerous and shallow myth exploded way back in Hitler's time for all mankind to see. This is the delusion that all force is always evil (and all generals always stupid) even when only force is left to defend right and justice. It is the delusion that only "diplomacy" and "negotiation" are acceptable weapons.

So we fall in Cuba, because we dare not risk direct action and thus the censure of the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, in this and other countries. So our Secretary of State refuses one day to sit down at Geneva with Communist gunmen and next day agrees to sit down with them, under pressure of the neopacifists in England, in France and here.

It is easy to laugh aside those who object to these surrenders. It is only necessary to suggest that we are simply naive, excitable men, flagwavers and warmongers. But just as Hitler tragically fooled the old isolationists and pacifists, Khrushchev is tragically fooling this new lot.

So President Kennedy faces a great imperative of history. He must soon free himself of every shadow of the influence of this new lot, or this country is going down the drain—and so is his administration in the long book of that history.

ITALY'S ECONOMIC RENAISSANCE— EDITORIAL BY A. N. SPANEL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, only the unity of the free world can save freedom's cause on this planet, a theme that has been so consistently underscored to the people and to the statesmen of the West in persuasive editorial advertisements of the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del.

In repeatedly emphasizing the need for true unity among the nations of the West, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder of that company, has maintained that initiative plus the aggregate strength of the nations of the free world are the most dependable insurance we have against planned Communist aggression. In this framework there appeared an informative article in the New York Times of May 17, 1961 by Mr. Spanel entitled "Italy's Economic Renaissance" in which is clearly traced the economic emergence of that nation, and its importance to the West.

Mr. Spanel and his company have rendered great public service over the years not only to Americans but to freedom-loving people everywhere. Indeed, the notice we now make of their contribution in the public interest is but a modest forward to the unity which they have pleaded for so long, and which can be so decisive for our survival and growth.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel which appeared in the New York Times on May 17, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ITALY'S ECONOMIC RENAISSANCE

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

Visitors to Italy are deeply impressed by palpable evidences not only of a new prosperity but of a new spirit. For those who have personal memories of the country's virtual collapse only 15 years ago, this rebirth of a great nation has a touch of the miraculous. And they have, too, the special satisfaction of knowing that the miracle was wrought by freedom.

The cold statistics, and reports by long-time American observers on the Italian scene, confirm the visitor's impressions.

The Rome correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Walter Lucas, writes in the New Leader about "Italy's continuing economic miracle." Our former ambassador to Rome, James D. Zellerbach, writing in the Saturday Review, attests that "Italy is not only emerging as an industrial nation of the first rank; it is also enjoying a major cultural renaissance whose impact extends far beyond its frontiers." The Fortune correspondent reports that in Italy "good times have arrived and may have come to stay for the next decade."

To grasp the magnitude of this victory, it should be recalled that in the short span of three decades—1914 to 1945—Italy was embroiled in two disastrous World Wars. For 23 years it was held in the paralyzing strait-jacket of fascism. In the second of the wars it was caught in the strangling pincers of the Mussolini-Hitler alliance.

The end of these tribulations saw the nation's economy in a shambles, its currency virtually valueless, its spirit at low ebb. Deep social conflicts were impelling the country toward civil war. Exploiting idle hands and empty bellies with zealotry were the Communists, who dominated the internal liberation forces. Small wonder that the experts sadly prophesied doom.

But today, though the country is still beset by economic and political problems, there is no doubt that the prophets were wrong. The Communists, true, are still the second largest political party; but, in the words of Mr. Zellerbach, they "now try to present themselves as the advocates of mild reform rather than of violent revolution."

The fact is that Italy today is busy, booming, optimistic. Even in relation to its most desperate problems—excessive population, unemployment, the underdeveloped Mezzogiorno or Italian south—the old defeatism is evaporating. The creative energies of a wonderfully gifted and industrious people are again in full eruption.

The national economy, initially pumped by generous American dollar aid, has been growing by 6 percent a year; the trade balance is favorable; the lira is stable. According to official figures, 1960 scored, as against 1959, an 18-percent rise in industrial investment, a 10-percent rise in employment, 6 percent more consumption.

The providential discovery of oil and gas in north Italy and Sicily helped trigger the economic upsurge. Italians entered the international market and became outstanding merchants in the petroleum world. By now it is the automotive industry that paces the new prosperity, with an almost fourfold expansion since 1950. Steel production tripled in the same decade. Smaller yet striking growth has been registered in rubber, synthetic fibers, chemicals.

The rise in living standards is visible to the naked eye. Italians are spending more than ever before not only for necessities but for luxuries. Once a land of bicycles, Italy has become a land of motor vehicles, its roads and streets jammed by everything from motor scooters and Italian-made automobiles to big foreign cars. Television antennas have become commonplace even in remote mountain villages.

In this economic renaissance, American investors and industrialists are playing a large and wholesome part. Already over 300 U.S. firms operate in Italy—usually in partnership with local capital—and their numbers keep growing. More and more of them, attracted by favorable tax and other incentives, find this land ideal for branch factories.

Most significant, as one surveys the Italian social scene, is a deep awareness among the people that the miracle of rebirth has been made possible by the climate of freedom and cooperation with the great democracies. The country plays an important role in the European common market. Undemonstratively and without histrionics, it stands resolute in devotion to the free world coalition. Italy has proved itself consistently as a loyal ally. Her people old in civilization, are ever aware that nations, like human beings, are endowed with strengths and weaknesses, and they knowingly accept us as we are, with all our strengths and all our weaknesses.

Italy has risen from the depths of defeat and defeatism to become master of its own destiny. Forewarned by a hair's-breadth escape from the clutches of communism, the Italians appear determined to preserve human freedom. In this resolve they merit the understanding and unstinting cooperation of all their allies, and America especially.

It is altogether desirable that Italy's leaders and its special genius be given ever bigger roles in all free world alliances and enterprises. They have won this right by magnificent performance under the most adverse conditions.

The Italian people are the custodians of a glorious heritage of history and culture. Their contributions are in the marrow and at the heart of our Western civilization. It is cause for profound satisfaction, therefore, that their new renaissance is enabling Italy to contribute measurably once again to the world we cherish.

"THE PROFILE OF COMMUNISM: A FACT-BY-FACT PRIMER"

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there is now a very considerable library on communism, prepared by pro-Democratic sources. But, there are not enough works in that library that combine scholarship, balance, and readability, so that they will impress at the same time the authority and the man in the street.

I am happy, therefore, to bring to the attention of the Senate a new book which does just that. "The Profile of Communism: A Fact-By-Fact Primer" has just been published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The league's contributions in this field were hailed in the past by J. Edgar Hoover in his, "Masters of Deceit," as some of the most effective opposition to communism in the United States.

This book presents the basic history, aims and techniques of the Communist movement in Soviet Russia and in the free world. In simple question and answer form, the book analyzes the strategy of this empire-building, totalitarian program and exposes its inconsistencies. It is designed for use in the schools and by community organizations.

"Profile of Communism" is a publication of the Anti-Defamation League's freedom books series. It is indeed a contribution to freedom.