

1961

ter Trohan to the attention of my colleagues:

WASHINGTON REPORT

WASHINGTON, May 9.—The House Agriculture Committee is holding hearings on an overall farm bill, a most complicated measure with far-reaching implications because it would supposedly let farmers write their own tickets but actually puts final power in the hands of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

The bill, by which the administration hopes to discharge its campaign promises to solve the farm problem, is a 79-page affair which covers the soil front. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, says it will give Freeman absolute control over agriculture.

There is something for every farmer in the measure, from a low interest program to build farmhouses and irrigation ditches to crops themselves. The home and irrigation loans would be paid over a 40-year period with the interest rate no higher than 5 percent.

The measure would expand the power of farm cooperatives, which many businessmen consider too big at present. There is a program for setting up food reserves in so-called underdeveloped countries and much more. Of course, the costs will fall, where they always come to rest, on the American taxpayer.

PLAN REVIVAL OF PAYROLLER VOTE FORCE

Plans are to revive the field committee set up to administer many items of the bill. This spells a return to a program that will replace approximately 50,000 field committeemen on the Federal payroll, where they can be expected to constitute the potent political force they were back in the days of such Democratic Agriculture Secretaries as Henry Wallace, Claude Wickard, and Charles Brannan. The boost in administrative costs would be about \$250 million a year.

Whether or not this will be approved by Congress, it is evident Freeman wants to dictate farm production and prices. His chief economic adviser is Willard Cochrane, of the University of Minnesota, who was Kennedy's farm adviser during the campaign and who proposed the concept of parity income which would be even higher than parity price for farmers.

During the campaign, farm economists in the Department of Agriculture said the Cochrane formula would mean a 10-cents-a-pound jump in the price of hogs, a 17-cents-a-pound increase for chickens, and a 19-cent-hoist in eggs, with other food prices jumping in proportion. The Department said the plan would raise food costs for consumers by almost 25 percent.

The first major piece of farm legislation under the New Frontier was the feed grain bill, which gave the Department authority to control production and price of corn and grain sorghums. If the overall farm bill now under consideration goes through, Freeman will undoubtedly try to promote the farm parity income concept.

VOTE TO RAISE CHICAGO FOOD PRICES

To win, Freeman is counting on the support of many big city Congressmen, who know nothing about the farm problem, but vote regularly for more and more Government domination over farmers, even though the domination means higher food prices for their constituents and less and less free enterprise.

The margin for passage on the feed grain bill last March 9 was furnished by Chicago's Democratic Congressmen. Led by the dean of the city's delegation, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois, all 10 Chicago Democrats went down the line for the measure which passed the House by a vote of 209 to 202. Had the Chicago Democrats voted

against the measure, it would have lost 212 to 199.

Undoubtedly, House leaders are counting on Chicago's Democrats, as well as those of other large cities, to go down the line again when the big farm bill comes up for a vote. In view of the prospective higher food prices, interference with the operations of merchants and traders of Chicago, and damage to the free-trade system generally, it seems strange that Chicago Democrats are so loyal to the ideas of Professor Cochrane and Secretary Freeman.

Each Retreat Under New Isolationist-Pacifist Pressure Increases Danger of War and Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William S. White from the Washington Star of May 17, 1961:

NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST GROUP 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 anti-human 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 anti-human 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 left for the West to turn and stand its ground.

Instead, the neo-isolationists, the neo-pacifists, put the plain meaning 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 headon. 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 of this hemisphere.

So it is with Laos, Laos is not really worth any risk, either. We are held to be inter-

fering there in local politics, or something or the other.

Again, the preconditions 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, 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 fail in Cuba, because we dare not risk direct action and thus the censure of the neo-isolationists, 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, flag wavers 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.

Cuba
 We Must Intervene in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the committee on Pan American Policy, headed by Harold Lord Varney, is making every effort to awaken American people to the danger of a Communist Cuba. The following news release was issued by this Committee on May 2:

WE MUST INTERVENE IN CUBA

The Nation is stunned by the events in Cuba. It is not enough to recognize that we have suffered a shattering prestige defeat. What is important is that we must not accept the defeat as irretrievable.

There is no mystery about why we lost. We have failed in Cuba, just as we failed in Korea, because we did not fight to win. With all the ace cards in our hand, we did not choose to play them. We resorted to the subterfuge of an exile's invasion instead of facing the situation squarely ourselves. And in consequence, we have given the contemptible Castro an opportunity to claim victory over the United States, when we could have crushed him like a cockroach.

Why did we do this senseless thing? The reason can be found in the hangman's noose of treaties, commitments, and renunciations which we have put ourselves into in

Latin America during the last two decades, in an effort to win friendship. In a practical situation, like that of Cuba, these commitments fetter us hand and foot.

Let us face the bitter truth. The whole OAS apparatus, into which we marched so hopefully in 1952, has become a millstone about the neck of the United States. It cannot act promptly and decisively when we need it. It stops us from acting alone.

Moreover, it provides an easy alibi to irresolute men in Washington to shirk hard decisions. To every realistic proposal, they have the ready answer that we must not offend our Latin American allies. And so we flirt with catastrophe rather than hurt Latin American feelings.

President Kennedy is not to blame for the Cuban debacle. He inherited the whole fantastic spider web of treaties and self-imposed restraints from his predecessors.

But now that he knows that he cannot win battles hog-tied to the OAS, he has no other practical choice but to go it alone. To do nothing, to allow the virus of Castroism to continue to spread in this hemisphere, would be the most craven form of defeatism. President Kennedy must act, and he must be prepared to act alone.

Cutting through all the moldy phrases of the ideologues, the logic of the situation is plain.

Notwithstanding his statement of April 12, President Kennedy must intervene in Cuba with American forces. If we stop to haggle over legalities, we are lost. If our Latin American allies will intervene with us, we will welcome them. If they will not, we must act alone. Above all, we cannot wait for a decision in the OAS, for it will never come.

We must intervene in the full knowledge that our action will be denounced and abused by the whole professional anti-Yankee wolfpack in Latin America. But if we lose to communism—which we certainly will if we do not immediately clean up Castroism—we will be abused even more venomously, and despised to boot. At least we can now have the compensation of victory.

President Kennedy can place his name in the illustrious roll of Presidents who were not afraid to act in a crisis. He has the opportunity in Cuba.

Income Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives two bills which, in my opinion, will do much to provide some small measure of relief to the American taxpayer.

The first bill provides that an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions, up to the amount of \$2,500, would be granted. This legislation is introduced with the thought in mind that our elder citizens must be given a helping hand in meeting the current high cost of living. Many of them have been endeavoring to live on fixed incomes for a number of years, and with the continued upward spiral of living costs, this has made their situation a desperate one. Many of them

have been forced to seek work to supplement their annuities or pensions, and with the unemployment situation as critical as it has been in the last several years, finding a suitable position has not always been possible or easy.

The second bill would increase the present personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$1,000, including the exemptions for a spouse, a dependent, and for old-age and blindness. The present \$600 exemption is absolutely outdated and totally unrealistic today, having been put into effect a number of years ago when living expenses were considerably lower.

The tax laws have placed a heavy and onerous burden on our taxpayers, particularly those in the lower- and middle-income brackets, and I believe that a liberalization of these laws is long overdue. To increase the present exemptions will place more money in the hands of the consumer, and in turn will stimulate our economy.

A Salute to the Memory of Senator George W. Norris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by J. L. Robertson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, in Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1961.

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

A SALUTE TO THE MEMORY OF SENATOR GEORGE
W. NORRIS

(By J. L. Robertson, Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961)

This is that unusual occasion when one can use a hackneyed phrase with genuine meaning and sincerity, as I do in saying I am very glad of the opportunity to join with the rest of you in paying tribute to a great man—a man who on a number of occasions was singled out by that knowledgeable group, the Washington press correspondents, as the Nation's most effective U.S. Senator.

I am glad to be a part of a gathering of people who seek to honor this man and at the same time recall to all Americans the character, the foresight, imagination and wisdom, the courage, integrity, and tenacity that were his, in the hope that more people will be inspired to follow the example he set for us.

Senator Norris is known chiefly for his efforts in the fields of conservation and development of natural resources, his tireless work in behalf of the "common man," his powerful espousal of the cause of labor in days when it was downtrodden and fighting for greater recognition and greater participation in the fruits of productivity, and his valiant and never faltering battle for good government.

Everyone then on the scene remembers his famous spider-web speech, in which he traced the interlocking ties of large institutions and the resulting concentration of power in the hands of a relatively small number of persons, his efforts in support of the antitrust laws, his ferocious castigation of Government officials who flirted with conflicting interests, and his long and bitter fight to prevent Muscle Shoals from being turned over to private interests for private gain, which culminated in the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Everyone knows of the role played by Senator Norris in connection with the TVA, the REA, the Norris-La Guardia Act, Teapot Dome, the impeachment of Judge Robert W. Archbold, the lame-duck amendment to the Constitution, which was designed to prevent Members of Congress from legislating after others had been elected to replace them, and the unicameral legislature of the State of Nebraska.

Everyone knows of all these landmarks of his career, and not one of them is especially associated with banking. Hence, you may wonder how a governor of the Federal Reserve System fits into the picture.

Certainly I am not here because of the fact that my hometown, Broken Bow, Nebr., was, I regret to say, also the home of an obscure grocer with the same name as Senator Norris, who was persuaded by unscrupulous politicians to try to run for office against the Senator and thus confuse the voters enough to bring about the election of a third man. Fortunately for the country, that effort failed and the other George W. Norris went to jail.

I knew Senator Norris better than most of you because of an interlocking relationship between the Norris and Robertson families. During the most formative years of my life, I had the privilege of listening to him tell of the experiences of his life that left on him the greatest imprint, as well as those things that concerned him most: the spelling bees in the country school, the rural debating societies in which he developed his forensic abilities, the difficulties (and pleasures) of working his way toward a legal education, the roughness of his teaching experience in the far northwest, the hardships involved in eking out a bare living as a young lawyer, and his trials and tribulations on the bench and in Congress.

I often wish I had a tape recording of his tales of the infighting that accompanied his efforts to curb concentrations of power and to save for the Nation its vast reservoir of natural resources. I can still hear him telling about the way he was chastised by his party when he bucked and defeated the machine that had, until then, enabled Uncle Joe Cannon to rule the House of Representatives like a czar. And I never will forget his description of the pressures brought to bear, to dissuade him from crossing party lines and supporting the nomination of Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court. Later, of course, everyone came to understand that Senator Norris was not amenable to pressures.

The stories he told of his childhood, his early law practice, his years as a judge and as a legislator, were entrancing. They were more than that. They inspired one and left him with the conviction that public service is one of the highest forms of human endeavor—frustrating at times, but highly rewarding. This is perhaps the real reason why I feel fortunate to have been able to serve the people of our country for 34 years; why I feel sure that if I could relive my life I would again try to follow in his footsteps by using whatever abilities I possess in the interests of efficient public service.

Senator Norris was one of the noblest men ever produced in this country, certainly the greatest Senator to come from Nebraska, and one of the Nation's greatest. In his day, he

1961

of the Constitution they want now are the first three articles under which to organize, the welfare clause under which to legislate, and the fifth amendment behind which to hide. There are some of us who seriously wonder whether our democracy can survive the misuse of the Constitution by enemies of our society who, under the guise of rights and privileges, hide behind it; who, under the guise of freedom of speech, press, and assembly, castigate and vilify it; and who, under the guise of humanitarianism and the welfare clause, would legislate its destruction.

The people of this Nation must stabilize themselves, inform themselves as to what's happening and then decide what they want in Government. Do we want a welfare state, socialism, x-ism, call it what you please, or do we want a return to constitutional government as decreed by our forefathers, tested for over a century by its political enemies, and survived and prospered over the years guided and sustained by a great and freedom-loving people.

Norman Thomas gave up years ago joyously and victoriously stating that it was no longer necessary for the Socialist Party to exist because the two major parties had already accomplished its aims. Much more implementation has been made since then by legislation and Supreme Court decisions. Decisions not based upon stare decisis but upon changing times and the changing of our social order; by legislation which bypasses the concept of jurisdiction between Federal and State but ostensibly bottomed upon the so-called welfare clause; by laws that tend to relegate our States to mere vassals of a Federal bureaucratic regime; by pseudolegal violence to the constitutions of our States in actions to dictate the control of State funds and the State's right to spend these funds for the continuation and preservation of State institutions; to dictate changes in voting qualifications; to dictate intrastate wages and hours; to dictate whom you must employ before you are eligible to bid on a contract with your own Government; and many other usurpations of States rights too numerous to mention.

If this is what the people want let them make a thoughtful and final decision. Final because once made to accept socialism there is no return. The choice must be between loyalty to our selfish interest and loyalty to our individual freedom—loyalty to social and political expediency and loyalty to principles and ideals—loyalty to a materialistic abundance and loyalty to a fiscally sound economy. The choosing of one's expression of loyalty is but to exercise the genius of democracy which still remains the type of government which men who are less than men seek to avoid. It is the most demanding system that has ever been created. It is not something created for soft man but a society and a way of life which our forefathers worked, fought, bled, and died for and can be maintained only with courage, work, sacrifice, and determination—courage of our convictions; work to acquire knowledge to nurture our convictions; sacrifice of selfish desires for patriotic citizenship, and determination to keep our Nation safe for a God-fearing and freedom-loving people.

The era in which we now live is fraught between two camps—democracy as we know it—and communism and other isms. These are probably more a political expression than a philosophy and the real intellectual war that is being waged within our world society is whether we can evaluate the true nature of man and history—whether man is free to create history or whether history will shackle man to the status of a soul-less creature dominated by the state.

We the people must awaken from our opiates of self-indulgence and regain our perspective. "What is America?" not the academic concept of geographical and material

existence but—what makes it tick—why a declaration of independence. Why a Constitution. Why a Bill of Rights. These profound questions can only be answered by an intelligent, courageous, and patriotic people after a soul-searching admission that what they stand for cannot survive on apathy, ignorance, and irresponsibility. We must never take our freedoms and liberties for granted. I wish every native-born citizen could look upon the face of the foreign-born when he finally becomes a naturalized citizen of these United States; could see the tears of joy—could sense the great soul-filled pride of those who know what it is to be deprived of the rights we enjoy and take for granted. If we could regain from some of them the real value of American citizenship what a great lesson we could teach in our everyday lives.

We the people must determine the kind of America we want for the future.

I think I can speak with a unanimous voice for Americans when I say that we want an America for the future that lifts its head high in the world, not because of its military might, or its material achievements, but because we are morally right and sound, and because America is a living symbol of the rights and dignity of man. We want an America so constant to its principles, and so resolute in honoring its responsibilities to the free world that our friends all over the globe will never have reason to regret the trust that they have placed in us. We want an America ever prepared to meet any challenge or any competing ideology with great breadth of courage, and great depth of purpose.

Can this be done? Of course it can. The pattern was drawn with the first sketching of the framework of America in the Declaration of Independence. We need only reawaken to the challenge. This America of the future will demand citizens who recognize that the true greatness of our Nation does not lie in its high standard of living, but rather in its high standard of life. We shall need citizens who realize that the security of our Nation is the responsibility of each individual citizen. We must prove that a free people, through voluntary, cooperative effort, can achieve a better standard of life than can be gained in the regimented society of the Soviet Union. Communism and socialism require people who can be told what to do, who can be managed, democracy demands people who have self-control, who can manage themselves.

Yes; we can have this America of the future, but only if every citizen of the United States accepts his responsibility and fulfills his role in the spirit of self-discipline. You cannot say, "Let George do it."

Democratic government is a shared responsibility. It implies that every citizen, as well as every public official, make a career of citizenship. Only in this way can democracy be strong. Its strength rests whole-souled on the fact that we have on this soil the incredible phenomenon of 180 million people who are ruled by themselves. It is the people who tell the Government where it gets on, and where it gets off. It is the people who hire and fire the Government, through our system of elections. This is an immense responsibility that rests upon you and me and every individual American citizen. In a nation as large and complex as ours, only an intelligent, perceptive citizenry could accomplish this task without the machinery of democracy simply falling apart.

We can no longer escape the fact that our personal destinies are deeply involved with the actions of the Federal Government. If we fail to assume our individual responsibilities. We shall have surrendered our integrity as American citizens, and we shall have no cause for complaint. But if we are ever aware that government is a shared re-

sponsibility, and if we maintain an alert, unselfish, and participating citizenry, then our institutions will be safe and our freedom secure.

I would encourage each of you to look to the America that you want for the future, and to remember that there is no distinction between what is good for your future, and what is good for the future of the country. I would encourage you to exercise every act that is within your power to enrich and preserve the heritage that is ours, and to prove to the world that constitutional democracy is not a dying society, but a vibrant and rewarding way of life that holds the dignity of the individual on the highest pedestal. This task will require the effort and dedication of every single one of us.

Last, but not least, don't be ashamed to be patriotic, don't hide your face if a tear of pride comes in your eye when Old Glory is unfurled and the national anthem is played. Raise your head high and look at America—listen, and you'll hear her say to you: "I'm just what you make me, no more or no less."

Cuba file
The Cuba Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the following editorial from the May 10 issue of the Indianapolis News, by Morrie Ryskind:

WHY EXEMPT INTELLECTUALS FROM BLAME?
(By Morrie Ryskind)

By any standards, James Reston—agree with him or not—is one of the ablest and saltiest reporters of the American scene. Though he quite obviously favored Kennedy in the presidential campaign, his is no blind loyalty, and he has not hesitated to point out some of the errors of this administration.

In a recent column, for example, he places no small portion of the blame for the Cuban fiasco on some of the professors the President lured way from the colleges. But he concludes with a solemn warning that the academicians must not be attacked too vigorously, lest the country develop a spasm of anti-intellectualism.

Reston readers are entitled to better than that, for it is surely one of the moldiest cliches in the liberal lexicon. Every time a professor utters a bunch of balderdash—and many of them do, even as the rest of us—any criticism of it meets an immediate countercharge of anti-intellectualism. Do you disagree with some of the conclusions of Galbraith, the younger Schlesinger or Linus Pauling? Well, then, you probably know what you are: A dirty anti-intellectual and a know-nothing to boot.

This is a curious notion in a country where you are free to criticize your baseball manager, your policemen, your legislators, your President and, on rare occasions, your wife's cooking.

What, in heaven's name, makes an intellectual, anyhow? The self-anointing? What gives the group that peculiar aura of sanctity that robs the rest of us of the right to call attention to the plain fact that some of their ideas have no clothes on? If they have come directly from Sinai or Olympus, we are at least entitled to see their passports and not accept their mere say-so.

The mere fact that a man is an authority in a given field does not, regrettably but undeniably, make him an authority in all

branches of knowledge. Henry Ford was, beyond doubt, an authentic genius who changed the face of America, and no one questions Einstein's place in higher mathematics.

Once they stepped outside their ken and discussed politics, however, neither had the faintest idea about what he was talking.

Neither my best friends nor my worst enemies have ever ranked me with the scholarly elite, but I have occasionally managed to be on the fringe. It happens that I know and admire greatly Max Eastman and William F. Buckley, Jr., both of whom pass for intellectuals in conservative circles. But once they get out of their own fields, they, too, like Ford and Einstein, are mere babes in the wood.

I have been to the races with both of them and am prepared to testify, under oath, that their tips are worthless. I'm not certain that either knows just how many legs a horse has, and they have absolutely no notion of how many furlongs there are in a mile.

And, if this is anti-intellectualism, let Reston make the most of it.

Prospective Revolt in Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Communist Joseph Alsop is raising a lot of eyebrows by persisting in arguing that Red China may revolt. He is not contending that it will. He argues that it may. The Alsop point is that the kind of oppression the Chinese people are suffering under Dictator Mao is far crueler and more terrible than has been generally recognized. The task of communizing China is infinitely more troublesome than the Lenin-Stalin task in Russia.

Alsop shows that evidence has been mounting that there must be millions of Chinese who would just as soon die—end a miserable existence—as subsist in the starvation and torment that is their present lot. Of course, this could result in simply a passive sitdown strike. Or it could provide the spark for revolution.

In any event, it underlines the wisdom of our continuing our frequently derided and denounced policy of providing aid and assistance to the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa. There freedom enjoys an exceedingly tough and well trained armed force of Chinese with excellent morale and a burning desire to free their homeland. Here, too, is the source of leadership that could give a Chinese revolt shape, direction, and reality.

A successful Chinese revolution against communism could gloriously turn the tide for freedom and against communism. Regardless of the remoteness of its achievement or the obvious difficulties that stand in its way, American policy should do everything possible to keep this hope alive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Joseph Alsop,

entitled "Can China Explode?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CAN CHINA EXPLODE?

(By Joseph Alsop)

HONG KONG.—Among all the experiments made by governments of men, the experiment now being conducted by the Chinese Communist government is certainly the most ruthless and perhaps also the most interesting that has been attempted in modern times.

To be sure, it is not a novel experiment. As already pointed out in this series of reports, Mao Tse-tung is clearly following Josef Stalin's book in the most literal fashion. Beginning with the first 5-year plan, Stalin made the Russian peasantry pay for the forced industrialization of Russia. Mao is now trying to do precisely the same thing in China.

For this purpose, however, Stalin had to organize the countryside in a quasi-military manner. In order to free resources for his investment program, he also had to force down the standard of life of the Russian masses, by one half. And in the end, he had to condemn no less than 18 million of his people to death. Five million died in a single year in the fearful Ukraine famine, and 13 million more succumbed to hunger, or expired under the lash of the police, or were quite simply shot before the second Soviet 5-year-plan ended in 1939.

In these respects, too, Mao is imitating Stalin. The Chinese communes, like the Soviet agricultural collectives, were started in order to take the countryside in an iron grip. The drop in the standard of life of the Chinese masses after the communes were started was at least as grave as the drop of the Russian masses' living standard after the collectives were set up.

But right here we encounter the factor which makes it necessary to ask whether China may not explode as a result of this ruthless experiment. For the Russian masses were living not too badly when Stalin launched his program of forced industrialization; whereas the Chinese masses were only eking out the barest subsistence when their government decided to double its exactions. Cold calculation suggests, therefore, that Mao's forced industrialization may quite possibly reduce the population of his much poorer, far more crowded country by as much as 150 million.

This need to be so much more ruthless than Stalin, and more ruthless, too, over a longer period of time, clearly makes Mao's experiment more risky than Stalin's experiment. When any Government has embarked upon a course that appears to require tens of millions of human sacrifices per annum, one must surely consider the possibility of failure. And in this reporter's opinion, which is still admittedly a minority opinion, the creeping famine in China is already beginning to cause very massive annual population losses.

A government edict has been published threatening punishment of any party cadre in which commune the death rate rises much above normal. A leading Peking planner has also promised recently that in 10 years the individual ration will be raised to no less than 1,500 calories per day—or less than Western nutritionists regard as absolutely needful for any working man or woman. This, after a full decade of further toil and hunger. After two bad crop years, grain is being imported to maintain the rations of the army and the showcase cities. But there is no discernible sign that the Government intends to mitigate its harsh policy.

Here in Hong Kong, there are those who say that the agony of the Chinese masses will come to an end if there is a good crop

this year. But in the first place, it is very doubtful whether a really good crop is possible, even if nature is kind, when more than 20 percent of the farmers in the fields are showing the first symptoms of beriberi. And in the second place, unless the policy is changed, the Government's exactions to pay for forced industrialization will continue as before.

To this blood-chilling résumé one must also add the point made in the last article in this series. A mass of recent eyewitness testimony from the Chinese mainland points to a serious breakdown of discipline, both a breakdown of the strict discipline of the party cadres, and a breakdown of the public discipline of the drilled, intimidated people.

The breakdown of discipline must mean that the conditions are beginning to exist in which a small spark can light a gigantic fire, as has happened before in China in comparable circumstances. Thus the question whether China can explode boils down to the question whether China's army will always be ready to put out the fires that chance sparks may light. It is an interesting question.

On the other hand, this is a peasant army drawn from the very class that is suffering most sorely. And the wives and families of the officers and noncommissioned officers were sent back to live in the peasant villages at almost the very moment when the worst ordeal of the villagers began. On the other hand, political control and police surveillance of the army are both intensely strong. And the army is recruited, not from conscripts, but from young men specially selected for military duty by the party cadres in the communes. The duty is a privilege because of the soldiers' higher rations.

Thus one can only say that even if the agony of the masses is prolonged and the breakdown of discipline is progressive, the army may well remain dependable. But the other result is far from unimaginable.

One can also say that the chance for an explosion in China will be immeasurably increased if the Government attempts a foreign military operation in the present state of the countryside. And this is an immediately significant point, in view of the present situation in southeast Asia.

Proposal for Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements of the Small Business Association of New England, at a meeting today with the Members of Congress from New England on their proposal for congressional action: SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND PROPOSALS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, 1961

Gentlemen, we speak for small business, a segment of the economy which produces approximately one-third of the gross national product. Since the economic well-being of small business is essential to the welfare of our Nation and its citizens, we have an obligation to provide recommendations for congressional action.

As we see it, solutions to the major problems which we face today are dependent on these three interrelated needs:

1. We must expand employment opportunities.

Mr. President, I have urged the administration to approve plans for development of this superrocket proposed by the Thiokol Chemical Corp. This concept apparently offers our best chance to overtake the Russians in the field of manned space flights, and can be accomplished at far less cost than several alternative plans. I sincerely hope that the administration will not delay in making a decision on this important matter because the United States has the know-how and capability to surpass the Russians in the development and use of outer space if we do not let this opportunity slip from our grasp.

Mr. Cliff Thompson, reporter on defense matters, had an excellent story in the April 16, 1961, issue of the Ogden Standard Examiner, which presents a concise review of the Thiokol proposal and an analysis of other space projects presently under development by NASA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Mr. Thompson.

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

DRASTIC OVERHAUL NEEDED—EXPERT OFFERS MOON IN 2½ YEARS

(By Cliff Thompson)

There is a serious doubt in the mind of at least one of the Nation's rocket experts that the United States can overtake the Russians in space with its present program.

He is Dr. Harold W. Ritchey, Thiokol Chemical Corp. vice president, who has proposed a development program he says will give the United States rocket power to duplicate the Russian man-in-orbit feat within 9 months and put an American on the moon in 2½ years.

His program calls for a drastic overhaul and redirection of the present U.S. program for space travel and exploration. And it, naturally, is based on the use of solid fuel Thiokol used so successfully in the Minuteman program.

The spectacular success of the Minuteman missile earlier this year gives added weight to the Thiokol proposals. Thiokol engineering and production staffs produced the large first stage of the Minuteman, the largest solid propellant booster flight tested to date.

CHALKED UP "FIRST"

It was the first missile to perform perfectly on its maiden flight and also marked the first time all stages of a multistage rocket were used in an initial flight test.

Dr. Ritchey outlined details of his proposals to this reporter during an interview in the Thiokol Rocket Operations Center here from which he directs the firm's vast research program.

He began with a briefing on the current U.S. space program which he said "is not designed to do what we have to do to catch the Russians."

"We have developed the technology to leapfrog the Russians in space but we are not using it," Dr. Ritchey said. "If we started right now using all our scientific potential, the United States-Russian race to the moon would be extremely close." If the United States continues its present program, he expects the Russians to beat us to the moon by 4 or 5 years.

The U.S. space timetable has an American scheduled to arrive on the moon in 1970. Dr. Ritchey expects the Russians to have a man there before 1965.

FIRST TO MOON

And he believes the first nation to the moon probably never would be overtaken in

the race deeper and deeper into the outer regions of the universe.

Dr. Ritchey says the big U.S. effort must be made in the first, or booster, stage if we are to catch the Soviets.

The first, or booster, stage along with two or three additional stages would put a vehicle into orbit or into escape velocity. In the manned space vehicle, the stages above the booster would be used to maneuver the vehicle in space and return it to earth.

In previous space shots, all stages have been used to put a payload into orbit, primarily because of the lack of a booster that can develop sufficient thrust to lift the necessary loads.

Most space authorities agree the United States is ahead of Russia in most space fields except the large boosters necessary to lift large boosters necessary to lift large payloads into orbit or escape velocity. "Possibly we also lag in our knowledge of how to keep men alive for extended periods in space," Dr. Ritchey said.

LARGE BOOSTERS

The Russian superiority in large boosters can be traced to the different approach the two nations took in overcoming the first big problem encountered in their initial space programs.

When the United States and Russia began space-missile programs at the end of the World War II, the payloads developed were too large for the rockets they were then capable of producing.

The United States refined its payloads to a size compatible with its rocket power. The Russians concentrated on building rockets powerful enough for the big payloads.

To offset the Russian lead in rocket power, the United States needs a dramatic breakthrough in its big booster program—both in size of the booster and the time it takes to get it ready for use.

Thiokol has four proposals to provide these big boosters.

The first and simplest is the one Dr. Ritchey says would give the United States the rocket power to surpass last week's Russian space flight.

CLUSTER OF SEVEN

By clustering seven slightly modified versions of the Minuteman, Dr. Ritchey says, the United States would have a booster capable of putting 25,000 pounds into orbit. This is about twice the size of the Russian payload.

Dr. Ritchey said Thiokol can develop this propulsion system in 9 months. He estimates its cost at about \$1½ million per copy in production quantities.

Thiokol also proposes using the Minuteman principle to produce larger rockets that could be clustered in sevens to develop 21 million pounds of thrust. This system could put 300,000 pounds into orbit or 120,000 pounds into the velocity needed to send a man to the Moon.

Dr. Ritchey reports this booster can be ready for test firing in 18 months and for actual manned space flight within 30 months. The intervening 12 months, he said, would be used in working on the booster and in development of the rest of the vehicle. It is possible the 12-month period could be reduced.

PROPULSION PROBLEMS

The other Thiokol proposals are for different sized rocket boosters using the Minuteman principle.

"Of course I am talking only about the propulsion problems," Dr. Ritchey said. "There are others."

Primarily these involve the development of the vehicle and guidance controls that would take a man into space and back including the protection needed to keep a man alive in space for extended periods of time.

The producer of the propulsion system and the space vehicle would have to work together closely.

The United States is currently pinning its hopes for space travel on three programs:

The first American is expected to go into space sometime this year powered by a Redstone rocket. This plan calls for sending an astronaut some 100 miles or so into the air and back—not put him into orbit.

LIQUID FUEL

The Saturn, a cluster of eight liquid fuel rockets, is expected to be ready in about 3 years. In power and objective this booster compares to the rocket Thiokol says it can develop in 9 months.

The F-1 rocket, a single engine that would develop 1½ million pounds of thrust, expected to take 6 years to develop and test. The F-1 timetable has been delayed, however, because of severe technological problems.

The Nova project in which Dr. Werner Von Braun proposes to cluster four F-1 rockets to produce 6 million pounds of thrust. This project has not been funded and is considered too expensive to begin until after 1965.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration officials are basing their hopes for space travel primarily on the Saturn program.

ASSEMBLY IN SPACE

Dr. Von Braun proposes using six Saturn launchings to send equipment and fuel into orbit from which a space vehicle would be assembled for further travel.

Rocket authorities say this plan has two significant drawbacks—time and cost.

It would cost about \$120 million just to build the six first stage booster rockets necessary to send an unassembled spaceship into orbit with the Saturn. Cost of the Thiokol proposal to develop one super rocket capable of sending a vehicle into escape velocity from earth is estimated at \$12 million.

And rocket experts say the problems of assembling a ship while its pieces are floating around in space would be tremendous.

The John Birch Society—2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today three articles of a series of five relative to the John Birch Society which have appeared in the Daily News, a widely circulated newspaper in the area of Whittier, Calif. My district includes this area. The articles are commendable for their objectivity. Under unanimous consent I include the remaining articles of the series in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Whittier (Calif.) Daily News, May 2, 1961]

SOME RELUCTANT TO BE ANTI-COMMUNIST

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

Some democratic Americans have been trying to convince themselves "that there is something reprehensible in being a sys-

ACCUSE OTHERS

"The apparatus of Moscow said that Leon Blum was a police auxiliary and purveyor of convicts, charges De Gaulle with having worked for German intelligence, and Soustelle with being a Nazi spy; Syngman Rhee with having sold his country to Japan (charges to be found in the Soviet Encyclopedia or signed by leaders like Maurice Thorez.)

"One of the worst infamies has just been flung at Guy Mollet: he has been accused of nothing less than having denounced people interned with him to the Gestapo. Essentially, these and similar attacks are fabrications from beginning to end; devoid of any foundation and made in the full knowledge that they constitute unmitigated lies.

"In the easygoing atmosphere of the democracies, the endless repetition of abusive attacks has a devastating effect. Indeed, it is not too much to say that there are few people who, having become the target for Communist attacks, did not eventually either lose heart or become suspect themselves to world public opinion," the Senate Judiciary Committee report says.

Economic Hashish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economic Hashish," published in the Wall Street Journal of May 15, 1961.

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

ECONOMIC HASHISH

Sometimes the statistical theorizings of economists get so involved they're funny. But when the economic policies of the U.S. Government come to be based on woolly theories, the thing ceases to be a joke.

We have in mind the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which has propounded an elaborate theory of an "output gap" between the economy potential and its actual performance. The theory, described on this page recently by Mr. Otten, is a masterpiece of algebraic triple talk. It is designed to prove a gap, reckoned at \$40 billion at the end of last year, and so it does—assuming all its assumptions and mathematics.

Having "demonstrated" the gap, the Council logically concludes that the country faces not only temporary economic problems like the recession now evaporating, but a persistent slack in production and employment, a slowdown in our rate of growth. We have, it seems, a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce. Especially since 1955, we learn, the gap has shown a distressing upward trend.

If this were all just idle chatter, no one would particularly mind. But this great and growing output gap naturally becomes part of the justification for the Federal Government to fill it—with the tremendous new domestic spending the administration has already embarked on and with the even more massive public-works spending it has in mind. And since the slack is persistent and chronic, the Government has an excuse for trying to take it up indefinitely.

Fortunately the United States still has respected economists who can recognize economic hashish when they smell it. One such is Columbia Prof. Arthur Burns, himself a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Mildly but nonetheless devastatingly Dr. Burns has taken apart the gap his successors have so painfully constructed out of thin air.

Among other things, Dr. Burns shows that the Council is not relying on sound, far-reaching historical evidence in projecting its output gap. It rests its case importantly on the fact that unemployment at the business cycle peak in 1960 was slightly higher than at the business cycle peak in 1957. The Columbia economist suggests that this "gives fragile support" to the theory that "the gap between actual and potential output has a distressing upward trend."

Moreover, Professor Burns quietly notes that it matters a good deal at what period you start drawing a curve of potential output. The Council chose mid-1955, for no more valid reason than it could have chosen the second quarter of 1957 or the second quarter of 1947—all periods of high employment. If the Council economists had chosen 1957, their own reckonings would show a gap of only \$20 billion instead of \$40 billion.

And, Dr. Burns goes on, "if the curve had been started in the second quarter of 1947, when we likewise had a full-employment output, the gap would have vanished. In fact, we would then have to say that actual output in 1960 exceeded potential output by more than \$2 billion."

We hope the Council has the grace to say "touche" to that.

But perhaps the most significant part of the Burns analysis is not in exposing the Council's statistical juggling to prove the point it wanted to prove. There is also the attitude behind such "output gap" theorizing. It is reminiscent of the dominant economic thinking of the thirties, which was that the U.S. economy had become stagnant or mature and therefore required increasingly heavy Federal spending to keep it going.

That theory was proved resoundingly false by events, but here it is again in different form, once again an alibi for massive Federal intervention. The urge to control the private economy never dies.

Not many of us are trained in the intricacies of economic theory, but it takes only commonsense to see through the Council's unamusing fun and games. We hope the President and Congress are not bemused by the latter-day stagnation theorists. Otherwise some of these people may at last succeed in bringing about Government-managed economic stagnation.



Castro Shows True Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been naturally concentrated on the reoccurring problems with the Soviet stooge, Castro, in Cuba. On many occasions I have directed the attention of the Members to the grassroots thinking of the American public as expressed in our local newspapers throughout the country. One of the outstanding weekly newspapers in my district, the Park Forest Reporter, on

Wednesday, May 3, presented an editorial entitled, "Castro Shows True Color." It is truly "Main Street, America" thinking and worthy of our serious study.

CASTRO SHOWS TRUE COLOR

Our hemisphere neighbor, Cuba, officially turned Red this week. Fidel Castro took advantage of the May Day celebration to announce that his nation has gone Socialist.

Whatever the name, it's merely a synonym for communism. Cuba is now another link in the orbit of Soviet satellites. Some of the weak and misinformed still say, "so what?"

The announced status of this Nation only 90 miles from our shores can have tremendous repercussions in this Western Hemisphere.

Other Latin American countries are vulnerable to the same type of revolutions which brought Castro to power. In the eyes of their poor and ignorant, which comprise the masses of these backward nations, Fidel has become a Spanish speaking hero. His denunciations of the United States are not beamed for our ears, mainly for theirs.

His boasts give this uneasy populace courage. The taunts that he has held the mighty Yanquis at bay, are echoed through the hills of the Andes and across the broad expanse of Central and South American lands.

Beyond any doubt, his presence is a serious handicap to the future peace of our hemisphere. By outlawing elections, which although meaningless are even held in Russia, he is carving an ignoble niche for himself among the political tyrants of all time.

Fidel's actions bear even greater scrutiny now. Our administration's attention to this problem and its aftereffects is certainly warranted at this time.

Expert Offers Moon in 2½ Years—The Development of a Superrocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the U.S. defense program received a big shot in the arm early this year when the first Minuteman missile achieved complete operational success on its first firing at Cape Canaveral. This marked the first time in history that a missile had performed perfectly on its maiden flight.

Another historical first might be achieved for the United States if the administration takes action on the recommendations of Dr. Harold Ritchey, vice president of the Thiokol Chemical Corp. which produces the first stage of the Minuteman. Dr. Ritchey recently appeared before the House Science and Astronautics Committee and testified that if Congress would provide the necessary funds, the United States could have a man on the moon within 2½ years. This feat would be accomplished by clustering a number of solid-fuel rockets produced by the Thiokol Co., and which, according to Dr. Ritchey, are capable of developing up to 21 million pounds of thrust sufficient to power manned flights to the moon, or to other planets and return.

A3562

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend Mr. Welch's essay to the Congress and to the entire country:

AMERICA'S INFERIORITY COMPLEX
(By Thomas C. Welch III)

The United States has progressed a long way in many ways since we gained our independence from England. We have become the symbol of wealth, well-being, and good times. We have, and still do, lead the world in many fields, such as medicine and high living standards. True, we have lagged behind in other areas—for instance, rocket production.

However, in my opinion, our most tragic shortcoming may be classified as our failure to nurture and develop the spirit of self-respect, self-confidence, and fundamental belief in God that really made the United States what it is.

This country has developed an inferiority complex of alarming proportions. We have become obsessed with the fear that other nations around us will be able to find fault with the conditions that exist here. We let other nations, Russia in particular, back us into a corner every time the question of the Negroes' rights is raised, even though the whole world knows that the atrocities Russia committed in Hungary vastly overshadow any injustices Negroes have been subjected to in the United States. We quake at criticisms that our grandfathers would have refused to consider.

The visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country some 2 years ago exposed many pitiful conditions. Our people and our beliefs were insulted time and again by the so-called statesman from the Kremlin, yet Henry Cabot Lodge was admonished by the State Department when he attempted to speak out in his country's behalf. It was too risky to offend the honored Mr. Khrushchev—he might revert to his small-boy tactics and threaten to go home if the game didn't go like he wanted it to. Eventually Khrushchev did just this; in threatening to end his "good will" tour he affected his audience so badly that reporters have described the fear that existed in the hall as a tangible and present thing. And even more pathetic was the relief evident in the audience when Khrushchev relaxed his belligerent attitude. The fawning behavior that characterized our leaders when they were confronted with this situation is a vivid example of our loss of self-respect.

Another prime example of our loss of self-respect is the foreign aid program we operate. Each year fantastic amounts are given to countries in an attempt to create a buffer zone between the United States and Russia. Actually, the majority of these countries are available to the highest bidder—we are buying their friendship. It is very hard to imagine our forefathers, who issued such statements as "millions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute," subscribing to such action.

Taken as a whole, the United States is in the best military condition in its history; it should be, in view of the billions of dollars spent annually for defense purposes. And yet we live in fear that the Russians may be developing weapons more powerful than our own. We cannot be content to do our best and leave the rest to Providence. We believe every rumor that comes along concerning Russia's potency and our impotency. Self-confidence is a thing of the past.

America is supposedly a God-fearing nation; we have churches of all denominations where our citizens may worship as they please. But just how deeply do we believe? How often do we admit that it is "God that has made us and not we ourselves"?

The religious fervor of a nation, as well as its other qualities, should be reflected by its leaders. We certainly gave Khrushchev a fine insight into the shallowness of our faith

during his tour; not once, at any meal that he attended, was the food blessed. We were ashamed to be seen giving thanks.

At one time Khrushchev said that our grandchildren would be under Communist rule. Now he says it will be our great-grandchildren. Progress is being made—one generation has been saved. What is going to be done to save the next generation?

This is a question I cannot begin to answer. I doubt that anyone else can either, for in the end the answer will not come from a politician, a statesman, or a citizen; it must come from beyond.

director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, with other associates in their book, "The Protracted Conflict."

Yours truly,

EDWARD FREEMAN.

Castro's Justifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, several constituents have communicated with me urging that the United States not intervene in the internal affairs of Cuba. From the tenor of their notes, one would infer that the United States has instigated action against Castro and that Castro is blameless. Many of these notes have been inspired by an advertisement carried in the New York Times of May 10 and signed by a number of American citizens.

Arthur Krock, well-informed writer of the New York Times, analyzes the pro-Castro advertisement and demolishes the arguments of those who claim that the United States has been aggressive against Cuba. I believe that the factual report and analysis by Arthur Krock clarifies some of the confusion in the minds of some of my constituents and others who have been misled by advertisements which do not set forth events in their chronological order and consequently distort the meaning of historical events.

Mr. Krock's article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1961]
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 letter-writers 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

How About Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following letter which I received from one of my constituents, Mr. Edward Freeman, Porter Corners, Saratoga County, N.Y.:

MAY 16, 1961.

Hon. CARLETON J. KING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KING: Daily reports give the impression Laos is more deserving of solution than Cuba, 90 miles away. As a recent Member of Congress I trust you will be more susceptible to a reexamination of some puzzling aspects of a neglected policy toward communism.

Doesn't it occur to anyone in Washington that our policy and leadership toward the Communist internal anarchy around the globe is, either by intent or weakness, a failure? That the recent failure of the Cuban patriots follows a chain of events indicated in the enclosed article, and is a second Hungary?

How can anyone justify sending our soldiers to Laos, and not Cuba? The encouragement given the return of the Cuban patriots, and then deliberately letting them down, is the same consistent lack of integrity that has characterized our policy since 1933.

Dean Rusk, Chester Bowles, and Adlai Stevenson are cited by a writer in the May 1 New York Herald-Tribune as having argued the President out of adequate military air support of the Cuban patriots. This is the same advice that defeated Chiang Kai-shek, and prevented our success in North Korea. And the only way to rectify such misguidance is to fire these men who should not have been selected in the first place.

One conclusion is obvious—we just haven't got the men in office with sufficient integrity and policy to measure up to the Communist international subversion. Add up the inhuman practices, deceit, civilized demoralization practiced by the Communists since the Soviets seized power—only a morally deficient and patriotically negligent man can support collaboration with them. The continued diplomatic relations with this organized debauchery, and their degenerate leaders, is beyond normal comprehension. Our continued relations is a first principle indictment, and one might say is designed to support Quislings.

A complete assessment of the Cuban situation, and failure to deal with the facts is made in a recent book by Nathaniel Weyl, "Red Star Over Cuba." And our policy failure is analyzed by Dr. Strausz-Hupe,

Germany Teaches the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News recently carried an excellent editorial, which I think worthy of the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, it follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, May 17, 1961]

GERMANY TEACHES THE UNITED STATES

U.S. economic advisers increasingly are embarrassed by contrasts between America and West Germany—persistent unemployment here as against a labor shortage there. Scripps-Howard writer Roger Stuart has dug up a long-secret report which helps explain the embarrassment.

The report was made by a team of U.S. economists and submitted to the West German Government September 24, 1951. On the U.S. team was Prof. Walter Heller, now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

Some of the recommendations:

West Germany was told it couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept on worrying about inflation. The Government was chided for an "excessive concern for price stability."

However, Dr. Ludwig Erhard, West German Finance Minister, knew something about inflation. He had seen his parents' life savings lost when the mark went to pot. He rejected this advice.

Dr. Erhard also was told by the U.S. advisers that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." But German interest rates were left to find their own high level and so were savings and investment. Today West Germany is investing up to a quarter of its national output annually in the most modern industrial plant in the world.

Dr. Erhard was cautioned against liberal depreciation policies and advised instead to adopt a "compulsory investment program." But liberal depreciation policies helped the German economy grow last year at the rate of 10.8 percent. The U.S. rate was less than 3 percent.

Just 15 years ago West Germany was a defeated and demoralized nation, its resources squandered by Hitler, its factories and homes flattened by bombs. Since then it has taken in more than 12 million refugees. It has imported nearly half a million more and still has a labor shortage.

Average wages have doubled in 10 years and still are climbing. And increases mostly are in true values because of effective measures against inflation.

West Germany last year lost fewer than 40,000 man-days through strikes. We lost twice that many on missile bases alone. German wage raises have come out of increased productivity—eight percent last year. German prices have been kept competitive in world markets, thus rapidly expanding foreign commerce.

The Germans, in short, have followed the historic principles of free enterprise—despite the advice they got from the United States. Even the West German Socialist Party has repudiated socialism.

The general theories of the 1951 report, rejected by the Germans, are the general theories now being urged on America by Professor Heller and other administration

economists: big spending and even budget-busting tax cuts, which breed inflation; artificial restraints on interest rates, which discourage saving and encourage Americans to export jobs by investing abroad; gimmicks in the form of tax "incentives," instead of adequate depreciation allowances

Somewhere in all this may be found a clue to our "creeping rate of growth," so roundly deplored in the campaign. Now Professor Heller wants us to follow some more of our own bad advice.

Address by Mrs. Wallace I. Kargman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to my colleagues a speech in honor of Marian Anderson, recently given by Mrs. Wallace I. Kargman, one of my constituents, and a close personal friend. This address by Mrs. Kargman was a Chicago tribute to Marian Anderson sponsored by the Chicago Women's Division, American Friends of the Hebrew University.

Miss Anderson was selected as Woman of the Year by the National Women's Division of the American Friends of the Hebrew University in recognition of her cultural and humanistic achievements:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY MRS. WALLACE I. KARGMAN AT CHICAGO TRIBUTE TO MARIAN ANDERSON SPONSORED BY THE CHICAGO WOMEN'S DIVISION, AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY—FEBRUARY 20, 1961, SHERATON BLACKSTONE HOTEL

Miss Anderson, reverend clergy, Mayor Daley, Madam President, distinguished dais guests, friends of Marian Anderson, and the Hebrew University, I am very happy to welcome you here this morning. We are assembled here to pay tribute to a great and gracious lady, whose life has been dedicated to the highest principles of mankind. Miss Anderson was selected by the National Women's Division of the American Friends of the Hebrew University as Woman of the Year because her deeds are symbolic of the cultural ideals espoused by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Our honored guest is no stranger to Chicago. For many years she has enriched our cultural life. We honor her today for the great beauty of soul and spirit which has, through the years, made her a tireless ambassador of America, creating new bonds of friendship and understanding for our country among the peoples and rulers of the world. She is a woman whose extraordinary accomplishments, nobility of spirit and dignity of person, symbolize the rising attainment of human aspirations in a fast changing world society. Our guest of honor is a great American, a citizen of the world, whose magnificent voice has become a medium of communication, her achievements a symbol of peaceful progress among all the people of the world. We meet also in the presence of the distinguished representatives of other nations which have honored Miss Anderson.

We, the Chicago Division of the American Friends of the Hebrew University, reflect in the honors that are yours, Miss Anderson, for it is written in "bringing honor to oneself, one brings honor to all mankind." We, the

Women's Division, and its acquired arm, the Mary Zimmerman Scholarship Club, though young in years, is fast emerging as a vital force in a community replete with many areas of endeavor. It is very stirring to be part of so vital a group, that is dedicated to the building of a great house of learning on the sacred soil of Israel—a bridge that knows no barriers—that can surmount the greatest obstacles, for individuals who are trained to think—act independently and understand the words of Torah can only contribute the achievements of the good life and serve on the highest level. Education knows no past—no present—no future—it bridges all times and forever. What greater joy can one have than to advance human dignity and learning. The Women's Division recognizing that the nerve center of a university is its library, has undertaken to build the central library of the Hebrew University. We know that the library will play a vital and unique role in the university's continuing educational program. It serves as the central library of the university, the library of the Jewish people all over the world, and the National Library of the State of Israel. It has become a center for students and faculty unparalleled in the Middle East. As the university takes on an increasingly important role in providing the technical experts and instructors needed by the newly emerging states in Africa and Asia, the library must assume new responsibilities. Students from many lands receive training at the university.

In a message addressed to Senator Herbert H. Lehman, chairman of the National Council of the American Friends, President Kennedy praised the American Friends of the Hebrew University—and I quote: "All members of American Friends of the Hebrew University have cause for satisfaction, for these are true monuments toward peace and understanding—I commend your efforts in support of the growth of this institution as a constructive force in the Middle East and for the educational assistance to the new nations of Africa and Asia."

One of the new study halls now in process of completion will be the United Nations documents reading room—an undertaking which we take particular pride in providing. It is most appropriate that the Women's Division has elected to honor Miss Anderson—now—and for future generations by dedicating the United Nations reading room in her name.

I know that Miss Anderson will take away with her today a deeper awareness of what she has given to us, and that she shares with us the pleasure in seeing so many people who have joined together to express their regard and affection for her and in the name of a great center of learning.

America's Inferiority Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in a "Greater Interest in Government" essay contest for initiates of Tau Beta Pi Association, national engineering honor society, the paper written by Clemson College senior Thomas C. Welch III, member of Alpha Chapter at Clemson, was judged the best among entries submitted from 81 chapters throughout the United States.