

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16573

tee, which killed the first effort of a bill in 1956.

Also, the position of the Republican leadership on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which opposes even the administration's inadequate bill, compounds the difficulty of getting a law on the books this year.

In reality, there have been four vetoes of area redevelopment legislation:

First. The first bill, which I introduced in July 1955, was passed by the Senate in 1956, and died in the House Rules Committee. At that time, the administration vetoed our efforts to pass even the administration's own bill. There was not a formal Presidential veto, but for all practical purposes it had the same effect.

Second. The second bill, which I introduced during the 1st session of the 85th Congress in January 1957, was formally vetoed—by pocket veto—by the President in September 1958.

Third. The third bill, which I introduced in the 86th Congress in January 1959, was vetoed by a formal Presidential message in May of this year.

Fourth. The fourth veto—by the Secretary of Commerce, speaking for the administration—occurred at the hearing I called on August 18, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization.

But perhaps the most revealing symptom of the administration's diehards resistance to good legislation is the propaganda campaign being conducted through its Cabinet officials and its political candidates in the field. Let me cite just two examples:

First. The administration baldly contends that more funds would be available under the administration bill than under the vetoed bill.

The hard fact is that the administration's most recent bill calls for \$80 million, in contrast to the vetoed bill's \$251 million.

How, then, can the administration make the claim of more assistance?

It is done with this kind of statistical sleight-of-hand. It so happened that the administration finally came around and agreed to a \$75 million figure for one aspect of our program, namely, industrial loans for private projects. By pretending that this aspect is the only one involved in area redevelopment legislation—which it is not, for there are many others—the administration distorts the figures to show more assistance, for the simple reason that the vetoed bill is more comprehensive and provides more coverage throughout the country, especially rural areas.

A valid and honest statistical method would show that the administration figures are not even half truths. The vetoed bill, by any accepted statistical method, is shown to provide more than double the administration's proposal, even allowing for the fact of more coverage under the vetoed bill.

Furthermore, my original bill, S. 722, as passed by the Senate called for an appropriation of \$390 million and was only scaled down by the House in the hope that the President would not veto it. This hope was dashed when Presi-

dent Eisenhower vetoed even the cut-down bill.

If I am reelected, I will reintroduce the bill with a \$390 million authorization, and, if we elect JOHN KENNEDY, we can be sure he will sign it and will do everything he can to help.

Second. Another example of distortion of the facts is the charges made in my town State that the vetoed bill is "so broad as to include New York and Detroit as distressed areas."

The fact is that New York City was not included in the vetoed bill. The fact is that Detroit is included in the administration proposal as well as in the vetoed bill.

The use of the Detroit example by the administration in my State is further proof of the administration's cynical technique of playing one part of the country against the other.

I regret deeply that the administration has failed to come forward in a co-operative attitude.

We tried our best, but the administration brought us to a dead end of its own making.

I don't think they are going to fool anyone.

THE FREEDOM COMMISSION BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a pending measure on which the Senate can act and should act, without acrimonious debate or partisan division, before this 86th Congress adjourns. I refer to the Freedom Commission bill, S. 1689, more commonly called the Freedom Academy bill.

I would like to observe at the outset that this is a bill of extraordinary importance to the United States and the free world. In fact, the Judiciary Committee, in reporting the bill favorably, has described it as "one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress." I fully agree with this estimate. If anything, I consider it an understatement. I believe that the preservation of our freedom, the preservation of the free world as we know it, may ultimately depend on the enactment of this measure.

This is not a Democratic bill or Republican bill. On the contrary it is a measure which, as Life magazine observed, persons of all shades of opinion, save one, should be able to unite behind. The bill was originally submitted by Senators DOUGLAS and MUNDT. With some minor amendments, it received the unanimous approval of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I wish I had the talent to have authored the bill, but I am proud to be privileged to present this statement today to the Senate.

The Subcommittee on Internal Security held hearings on the bill in April and June of last year. A distinguished panel of expert witnesses, representing many shades of political opinion, testified overwhelmingly in favor of this measure. It has been strongly endorsed by the AFL-CIO, which has possibly had more experience combating the Communist conspiracy on the interna-

tional scene than any other private organization, and by the Reserve Officers' Association, which is one of the very few private groups that has made a detailed study of political warfare.

I believe it is a fine and wonderful thing that a bill of such importance to the cause of freedom should command, at the outset, such broad and distinguished bipartisan support.

Mr. President, the measure before the Senate is quite unique. It is a truly pioneering bill which seeks to fill a major gap in our national defenses. I believe, without exaggeration, that it may make the difference between victory and defeat in the cold war. Because this bill is so different, because it proposes to create an entirely new instrumentality for winning the cold war, I believe the Senate should be informed in some detail of the purposes and reasons for this measure.

What is the gap in our cold war defenses this bill seeks to fill? Why is it necessary to create a new agency? How will the new agency fit into the Federal structure? These are the questions I shall attempt to answer in my remarks this afternoon. We are in the closing days of the session. We must still attend to many matters. Other Senators are waiting to speak, and I do not wish to impose on them. However, I hope that the Senators who are not present—and I know they are busy with committee work and other important matters—will read what I am saying, because I believe that if they have a real knowledge of the content and purpose of the bill, it can be passed with practically a unanimous vote.

We have been losing the cold war partly because we have failed to understand its total character, partly because we have been amateurs fighting against professionals. The Soviets have been winning the cold war because they have from the beginning accepted it as a total war, to be waged with all their resources and on every plane and, second, because they have, through their specialized training institutions, developed scores of thousands of practitioners in the art of total political warfare.

So long as we are amateurs pitted against professionals, Mr. President, we shall continue to lose the cold war. The task of the Freedom Academy will be to fill this gap in our defenses. Its function will be, first, to develop systematic knowledge about all aspects of the Communist conspiracy; second, to develop a science of counteraction against Communist subversion that will see us through the perilous period ahead and ultimately pave the way for the victory of freedom; and third, to train Americans and nationals of other free countries in this science of total political warfare, as it must be waged by freemen.

To illustrate the problem, I would like to review recent events in four countries, each of which occupies a position of importance to the security of the free world. One country is in the Middle East, one is in the Far East, one is in Africa and one is in Latin America. Each has been a major target for Soviet political-economic warfare. Each has already

been captured or seriously weakened. What has happened there points up the urgent need for the present bill. In these countries the Soviets have demonstrated a highly successful form of attack against which we have grossly inadequate countercapabilities.

The first country is Iraq. Three years ago Iraq was considered a Middle Eastern bastion of stability and anti-Communist strength. The Iraqi Government was strongly pro-Western, it was the only Arab government to join the Baghdad Pact, and, because of its apparent solidity, its capital had been chosen as the seat of the Baghdad Pact organization. The Iraqi Army was well trained and well equipped. Nuri el Said's government was engaged in a program of social and economic reform which was enlightened by Middle Eastern standards. The country was receiving large amounts of economic and military assistance from the West. The Iraqi Communist Party, sternly repressed by Nuri, had been reduced to a few hundred hard core members and driven underground.

Then, in a few hours, this citadel of free world strength was overwhelmed. In a sudden coup, the King was assassinated and Nuri was dragged through the streets. In its precision and utter ruthlessness, this coup was completely alien to the Arab tradition; the staffwork could only have been done by carefully trained professionals. A virulently anti-American, pro-Communist military dictatorship was established. With appalling speed, the remaining Communists emerged from underground. They organized and led the street mobs which intimidated or tore to pieces all who opposed them. They took over the educational system, including the all-important indoctrination of the army. They captured the press and radio. They whipped the people into an anti-Western frenzy with expert agitation and propaganda. With great skill they manipulated their opponents from positions of power.

Why did this country of Islam, with every reason to be anti-Communist, prove so susceptible to Communist subversion? During the many years Iraq was in the Western camp, why was the West so unsuccessful in getting across its own message and getting across the truth about communism? Why did Kassem and so many of the younger officers display an almost pathological hatred and suspicion of the West? Who forgot to educate the Iraqi Army about communism? Who forgot to educate the students about communism? Why were so many non-Communists so indifferent to the Communist takeover? Why were they unable to organize effective opposition? Why did the principal opposition have to come from the Nasserites? Why was there an ideological vacuum?

Mr. President, the second country I propose to discuss is Japan. The full extent to which this cornerstone of our Far Eastern defenses has been weakened by Soviet political warfare and subversion is still imperfectly understood. I will only take the Senate's time for one critical example which I hope will help

to illustrate the overall problem we face and the need for the present legislation.

Let us take the case of the Japanese Teachers' Union, whose 500,000 members staff Japan's public schools. For some years now the Teachers' Union has been a captive of the Japanese Communist Party. While the overwhelming majority of its members are non-Communists, the union's machinery is completely in the hands of the Communist Party. The party has, in fact assigned some 1,500 party members to work as full-time union functionaries and organizers.

The Japanese Teachers' Union makes no bones about the fact that its principal purpose is political rather than professional. In its pamphlet called "The Teacher's Code of Ethics," the Japanese Teachers' Union states that "the realization of socialism is the historic task imposed on the teacher. It is the duty of the teacher to foster young people who would help realize such a society." Since the Teachers' Union is Communist controlled, it should be understood that the word "socialism," as used in this directive, means "communism."

A substantial number of Japanese teachers are carrying out these instructions. Young children are being taught that the U.S.S.R. is their real homeland. One common tactic is for the teacher to draw a map of Japan on the blackboard with a red flag in the middle and tell their pupils, "this is the Peoples Republic of Japan." Constant reference is made to the United States as an aggressive, imperialistic power, while constant praise is heaped on Russia and Red China, who are identified as Japan's real friends. The effect on young minds of this corrosive propaganda, repeated grade after grade, year after year, through their entire secondary education, can well be imagined.

The Teachers' Union has conducted violent demonstrations against proposals to hoist the Japanese flag and to sing the national anthem at school programs. The union throws itself into all sorts of political activities and demonstrations which have nothing to do with educational affairs and constantly agitates the teachers to bring the message of Socialist salvation into the classroom.

Westerners wonder why so many Japanese students join the radical Zengakuren which led the recent rioting. Correspondents who interviewed these students were surprised by their warped picture of the United States and their fantastic ideas about democracy. If our pundits had paid more attention to the almost unbelievable situation that exists in so many Japanese secondary schools, they might have anticipated the results.

To me the most alarming aspect of the Communist takeover of the Teachers' Union is not the systematic brainwashing in the classroom and the resulting ideological prostitution of a generation of Japanese youth. To me the most disheartening thing is the way the great mass of the Japanese people have sat on their hands and permitted this to happen.

The Teachers' Union represents the best educated, major organized group

in Japan. Yet, when the Communists were taking over, only a handful of educators were willing to fight back. And these very few who were willing to stand up, did so as scattered individuals, without organization. Not very surprisingly, they were quickly crushed by the Communist apparatus.

Why, in heaven's name, have Japanese parents remained passive when their sons and daughters come home from school and inform them that Soviet Russia is their real homeland? Why is it that no democratic force has developed in Japanese universities to compete with the Zengakuren? Why has no third force developed among the students even in the Christian universities of Japan? Why is all the dedication and organizational know-how on the side of the Communists? What is wrong with the forces of freedom? Where are they?

I believe the Communist victory in the Teachers' Union in terms of its long-range implications may well be the greatest single defeat the United States has suffered in the Far East other than the Communist victory in China.

For nearly a decade we occupied Japan and directed its reorganization along democratic lines. We spent hundreds of millions of dollars and devoted the energies of many of our best minds, yet we may have failed, because in our political innocence we thought that the only enemy was Japanese militarism, which was crushed and discredited, and we totally failed to prepare the Japanese to defend themselves against the real enemy.

History may show that a few thousand superbly trained professional Communist conspirators had a far greater influence on the future of Japan than all the treasure and talent we poured in.

I should have liked, if there were time, to discuss the critical situation in the Japanese Socialist Party, Japan's principal opposition party, whose dominant leftwing has been successfully infiltrated by the Communists, and the situation in the 3½ million member General Council of Trade Unions of Japan which also has been successfully penetrated and captured by the Communist Party. But since I must limit my speech at some point, let me only say that the story in each of these situations is the same—well-trained Communist cadres versus untrained amateurs.

Mr. President, the third country I should like to examine is Cuba. A little more than a year and a half ago a brutal dictatorship was overthrown in what appeared to be a popular revolution. I am told that Fidel Castro had the enthusiastic support of 90 percent of the Cuban people when his victorious column entered Havana. Seldom in recorded history has a man been in a position to do so much for his people. Castro was welcomed in this country as a conquering hero and we stood ready to extend every assistance to his regime.

Today the lights are going out in Cuba. The Communists have captured the government machinery. The non-Communists and anti-Communists, who repre-

sented the great majority of Castro's supporters, have been decisively defeated. Today, Communists are streaming into Havana from all over the world to consolidate their victory. We have now a Soviet satellite within 90 miles of our own border. The Monroe Doctrine has been successfully flouted. Our vaunted military preparations have proven useless.

How were the Communists able to capture a popular revolution so quickly and so completely? Why were the Cuban people so naive about Communist operational methods? Why were the anti-Communists so disorganized and so inept when the showdown came? Why were they outthought, outplanned, outorganized and outmaneuvered by the Communists from the very beginning? Why was the large middle class in Havana, which was solidly behind Castro, unable to cope with the Communist cadres? Where were their leaders? Why were they not better trained? To what extent was our own negligence responsible for this catastrophe?

Once again I ask the question: Why must the dedication and know-how so often predominate on the Communist side? Why does it always seem to be well-trained professionals versus disorganized amateurs?

Mr. President, Cuba today is being converted into a major staging area for the subversion and capture of Latin America. While Castro may be increasingly unpopular with many of the present governments of Latin America, he seems to be increasingly popular with the intellectuals, students, labor, and the peasants, and these groups may provide the leaders who lead the next revolution and form the next governments.

So powerful has the Castro image become that certain governments appear afraid of taking any action against Cuba for fear of bringing down the wrath of powerful groups of their own countrymen. Many Latin American politicians, who privately denounce Castro's actions, feel it necessary to support him publicly. Our Government was dismayed by recent remarks of leading political figures in Mexico, who stated that Mexico would side with Cuba in its dispute with the United States. And in the current meeting of the Organization of American States, we have been unable to obtain backing for action against Castro one-tenth as vigorous as the action that has been taken against Trujillo.

There is not time for me to analyze the major Soviet, and, to an increasing extent, the Red Chinese penetration of Latin America. The Senate has been kept well informed by such experts as the junior Senator from Florida. I do, however, want to mention one aspect of this penetration which I find especially discouraging.

This is the deep and highly effective penetration of the universities and student organizations. Many, possibly a majority, of the larger student organizations in Latin America have been captured. One of the techniques is to use professional students, sometimes in their thirties, who have already obtained their degree from one university and enter

another university, often under an assumed name, to work full time as student organizers. This is the same technique which worked so effectively in China prior to 1948. To me the disheartening thing in Latin America, as in Japan, has been the near absence of organized opposition in so many universities to the Communist takeover of the student organizations.

U.S. News & World Report for August 1, 1960, prints part of a letter from a Costa Rican student who had just completed a year of study in the United States. He writes:

Castro propaganda has increased enormously since I was home a year ago. All kinds of committees are set up that present Fidel as a messiah. Communists now are louder than ever, especially in the university, who keep shouting "Yankee imperialism." Indifference of the people to what is happening alarms me.

Why are so many non-Communist educators and students in Latin America passive and indifferent to this fearful challenge? Is the concept of freedom so blurred it is no longer worth fighting for? Why are the students of Latin America so naive about the methods of communism? Why do the Communists find them so easy to manipulate? A substantial part of the youth in Latin America, as in Japan, are being led into the enemy camp while we stand by helpless. Where are the forces of freedom? Where are the articulate believers in freedom and democracy? Why are not some professional students on our side?

Mr. President, the fourth country I propose to discuss is the newly independent state of Guinea, which was formerly a part of French West Africa, but chose independence in the 1958 election. The President of Guinea, Mr. Sekou Toure, was for many years a loyal member of the French Communist Party. He held positions of importance within the Communist-controlled General Confederation of Labor. He was carefully trained in party schools in France, Prague, and Warsaw. In 1956, he said he broke with the Communist Party. He claims that, while he remains a Marxist, he is not a Communist. A serious question remains. Was this break made from conviction, or under party orders?

During its 2 years of independence, the government and social structure of Guinea have been ruthlessly organized along Communist police-state lines. There is only one political party, which follows the Red pattern from cell to politburo. The agricultural population is being forced into communes which bear a marked similarity to the Red Chinese variety. In fact, Chinese instructors are directing the work. The police are being trained by imported members of the Czechoslovakian secret police, and the populace is being spied on with Czech-made wire recorders. In recent months hundreds have been arrested as enemies of the state, and many have been brutally and fatally tortured. The only news distributed comes from Russian, East German, and Red Chinese news agencies. Guinea is the first non-Communist nation to recognize the East German government. Guinea's econ-

omy has been mortgaged to the Soviet bloc for years to come in a series of one-side trade agreements. Guinea's army is equipped almost exclusively with Czech arms and is being trained by Czech instructors. Hundreds of Guinea's youth have been sent behind the Iron Curtain for political training, while large number of Iron Curtain technicians swarm all over the country.

On June 6 of this year, Time magazine observed:

Last week there were alarming signs that * * * Guinea was rapidly becoming a police state under the cold direction of imported Communist instructors.

And Time further observed:

If Toure is indeed no Communist, he seemed fast becoming the captive of those who were.

I believe it is correct to state that Guinea has become the first African Cuba. Already the Reds are transforming Guinea into a major staging area for the subversion of the rest of Black Africa, just as they have turned Cuba into an advanced post for the subversion of Latin America.

Sekou Toure was recruited into the French Communist Party during his Paris student days shortly after World War II. For many years the French Communist Party made a special effort to befriend, indoctrinate, and recruit African students studying in France, because the Communists, with their vaunted long view of history, were aware that these students were the future leaders of Africa.

Mr. President, why must it always be the Communists who have this foresight? Where were the forces of freedom?

It is being said that France invited Soviet penetration by pulling out in a huff and taking everything with them when Guinea voted for complete independence. I suspect the battle was really lost 15 years ago when a lonely African student, ignored by other Frenchmen, was systematically cultivated by the alert Community Party. He found a home in the party. And today the Soviets have acquired a major base in Africa.

In Iraq, Japan, Cuba, and Guinea the Communists have demonstrated an impressive political warfare capability. In four widely separated parts of the globe, confronted with completely different political and social conditions, and operating in environments which by all rights should have been hostile, they have scored major triumphs. In the first country they successfully penetrated and manipulated a Middle Eastern Nationalist movement, in the very heart of Islam. In the second country, they have successfully penetrated and manipulated the secondary schools, the universities, the student groups, the labor unions, and one of the two principal political parties of an advanced industrial nation. In Cuba, they have captured a popular revolution in a Catholic country which has traditional ties of friendship with the United States and lies on our very doorstep. In Guinea, they have moved in on a primitive society and have taken

over at the very moment that its people were supposed to gain their freedom.

Mr. President, why do we still try to console ourselves with the thought that if we just spend enough money on guns and missiles and foreign aid, we can make the Free World secure against communism?

Our recent disasters in Iraq, Japan, Cuba, and Guinea should help us to realize that we can outgun communism and outspend communism—and still lose the cold war.

We are up against an enemy who has mastered all forms of social conflict—political, ideological, psychological, economic, and organizational, as well as military and paramilitary. With the political warfare weapon he has moved over and around our military defenses to secure beachheads deep in our rear areas. He has a coordinated long-range strategy for victory in which he will use all methods and all means against us.

With every day's news, it becomes clearer that the old methods of defense are not enough. Either this country masters the new dimensions of warfare the Soviets are employing against us and goes over to the offensive, using all of our strength and wisdom, or we face the certain prospect of increasing isolation in a world which is swinging evermore toward the Soviet sphere.

There must be a new start, a new approach in our planning and thinking.

I believe the most important question before the country is this: How do we prepare ourselves in the shortest possible time—because I am afraid there is only a very short time left to us—to meet and defeat the Soviets in this many-sided conflict? How can we develop a coordinated counterstrategy for victory? What is the quickest and best way to train our people in this new art or science?

I emphasize the quickest as well as the best, because we are many years into the cold war. Regardless of how fast we now move to repair our situation, important battles to come may already have been lost for lack of preparation. But if we move without delay, we can, I am certain, still prevent a decisive shift towards the Soviets, still recover the initiative, still make our way to victory.

As a starting point, I suggest that we examine what the Communists have done. How were they able to achieve their very great capabilities in political warfare? In suggesting this as a starting point, I do not mean that we should copy Soviet procedures. We can, however, learn a great deal from the Soviet experience, even though we ourselves must develop quite different methods—methods which meet our special needs and are in accord with our own ethic.

The key to Soviet successes is their massive development and training program in political warfare.

This development and training program, whose modern origins extend back some 60 years, has given them a huge fund of political warfare knowledge, an effective operational science and large numbers of highly trained, dedicated professionals who have mastered all phases of the total war.

There is no time for a detailed resumé of the Soviet program. I will therefore cover only its basic outline. But I believe this will assist the Senate in visualizing the dimensions of our own problem.

The father of modern political warfare and the architect of the Communist Party was V. I. Lenin.

In 1895 Lenin, then an obscure lawyer in St. Petersburg, and deep in the Russian underground, was arrested by the czar's secret police. After serving 14 months in a St. Petersburg prison, he was exiled for 4 years to a remote village in western Siberia. He received a stipend covering his board, clothing, and lodging, leaving him free to do pretty much as he pleased. He used his time to analyze what had gone wrong with the Russian underground, which was making little headway against a very alert police force.

For 4 years he pondered the problems of revolution. He concluded, in substance, that he and his associates were amateurs using "primitive methods" of conflict. What the revolution needed was not eager amateurs, but highly trained professional revolutionaries, who, in Lenin's words, would give to the revolution "not their spare evenings but the whole of their lives." Lenin recognized that political warfare is a complex art or science and that it must be intensively and systematically developed.

After completing his sentence, Lenin made his way to Germany and then to Switzerland. There he and other emigrants established a revolutionary newspaper called *Iskra*, the Spark. In a series of articles, beginning in 1900, he spelled out the strategy and tactics which would later be adopted by Communists throughout the world. Again and again he hammered at these central themes—political warfare is a difficult science—we must master all forms of conflict—the revolution must be led by trained professional revolutionaries.

In 1902 he elaborated on these articles and published them in a book called, very appropriately, "What Is To Be Done?" The last half of this book outlines a deadly political science for waging all-out political warfare against the established order. On almost every page he reemphasizes the need for trained professional revolutionaries. "What Is To Be Done" because the bible of Lenin's Bolshevik faction. It is probably the most important book of this century, in terms of the forces it set in motion. Yet I wonder if a handful of people in this Chamber have read it.

Unfortunately for us, Lenin was a brilliant organizer and teacher as well as theorist. It is a little-known fact, but prior to 1917 he established three political warfare schools in Western Europe. One on the Isle of Capri outside Naples, one at Bologna, Italy, and one in a Paris suburb. Lenin and other revolutionary figures taught in these schools, and the graduates became the world's first professionally trained revolutionaries.

The Senate will recall that in 1917 the czar was overthrown and a democratic regime was set up under Kerensky. The Bolshevik leaders played a minor role in the first revolution. Lenin was in West-

ern Europe. Trotsky was in New York; and Stalin was in exile in Siberia.

Lenin then returned to Russia in the famous sealed train and immediately set to work undermining the new government. Those who have studied the Russian Revolution of March and the Communist counterrevolution of November 1917, have marveled at the efficient, ruthless manner in which Lenin and his small, but well-trained group of Bolsheviks, were able to penetrate and control key army regiments, labor unions, and intellectual groups, to isolate the government from the people by expert agitation and propaganda, and to manipulate their opponents from positions of power.

The graduates of Lenin's three political warfare schools played a key role in these operations. It took them just 7 months to lay the groundwork for the November seizure of power.

When the Communist counterrevolution failed to ignite revolutions in other countries, the Bolsheviks realized they were in a long range struggle with the Western Powers. But they were supremely confident of the superiority of their new operational science. They were convinced they could wage a war of attrition against the West in which we would, over the years, be isolated from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and our will and ability to resist gradually eroded.

This total, global political warfare had to be codified and systematized, as Clausewitz had systematized military warfare. Thanks to Lenin's writings, the early training schools and their extensive experience in Russia, the Bolsheviks were well on their way to achieving this scientific know-how.

However, world revolution required more sophisticated operational thinking. The techniques which had prevailed in Russia would need modification and specialization for the quite different conditions in other countries. Those at the control centers in Russia—the conflict managers of world communism—would need the most detailed information about their victims. In each country they would have to know the degree of political maturity and class consciousness, the areas of friction, the symbols invoking the greatest response, the decision-making machinery, the vacillators and opportunists who might be won over, the identity of those who could never be won over. Above all, they would need native Communists, trained to execute the complex strategy of subversion and motivated to win.

All this required a vast development and training program, without precedent in world history.

THE COMMUNIST TRAINING ESTABLISHMENT

Shortly after their takeover, the Bolsheviks established a system of top-level political warfare development and training centers. These were in full operation by the mid-1920's. There was the famed Lenin Institute of Political Warfare, where students from all parts of the world were given 3 years of the most intensive training in every aspect of political warfare. There was the Academy of Red Professors, which had

the function of teaching the teachers, with courses 4 to 7 years in length. There was the Sun Yat-sen University, sometimes called the Far Eastern University, which trained most of the present top leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and gave them the political and military know-how to conquer China. These were the best known institutions. But there were many more training centers, large and small, to take care of every nook and cranny in the spectrum of conflict.

It was estimated at the hearings that these top schools have graduated more than 100,000 Communists from all parts of the world. These ace professionals are the first group in history whose training has prepared them to coordinate the full range of political weapons and cold-war weapons systems—the political, the economic, the social, the psychological—with basic military strategy. This synthesis has brought into being a sophisticated, unified, operational science that adds new dimensions to the global power struggle.

At these top universities for political warfare and at the auxiliary centers, Russian political scientists and other specialists undertook a tremendous research program in tactics and strategy of political warfare. They studied the experiences of conquerors and power seekers throughout history to determine what techniques will or will not work under various circumstances.

This vast body of knowledge was augmented by affiliated research projects.

They studied the adaptation of Pavlovian studies of induced behavior to the service of political warfare.

They developed advanced techniques for penetrating and manipulating nationalist parties in the colonial areas. Special attention was given to the revolutionary forces at work in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The West has set these forces in motion, but the Soviets expect to harness and manipulate them for their own purposes.

Communist leaders were brought in from all parts of the world to give the students the advantage of their practical experience; and intensive area studies were undertaken of the conditions in their assigned countries.

One former American Communist, Joseph Kornfeder, who attended the Lenin Institute from 1928 to 1931, testified at the subcommittee hearings that by that time the Soviets had already accumulated a central library serving these centers, comparable in size to the Library of Congress.

In the Soviet Union, historians, sociologists, anthropologists, linguists, psychologists, and economists have been enlisted in the service of political warfare. Their newly formed Academy of Social Sciences has impressed the social sciences into the service of political warfare. Their Institute of World Economics has the function of analyzing economic situations in other countries to determine how economic difficulties may be exploited for the benefit of the Communist movement. Their Institute of International Relations has a similar function. Their Institute of Marxism-Leninism, not to be confused with the

Lenin Institute, develops the ideological part of the program. Even their Academy of Sciences is engaged in political warfare to an important degree.

The extent to which these associated centers support Soviet political warfare is indicated in the following paragraph from the speech of Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, to the National Guard Association on November 8, 1959:

The Soviet Union is clearly preparing for action in Africa. Since 1950, considerable study and research has been underway in various academies and institutes of the Soviet Union and bloc countries. An increasing number of publicized studies on Africa, some of real scientific value, have been forthcoming from Soviet Government study programs. Introduction of a wide range of university courses and the stepped-up preparation of instructors in African subjects have been underway at Moscow, Leningrad, and Prague universities. Language training in such languages as Youraba, Congo, and Luba, has become a fixed part of the curriculum. The aim is clearly to create a nucleus of Soviet experts on Africa and to equip Communist engineers and scientists with the necessary knowledge for work in Africa. Standard among such training is included the techniques and methods of propaganda and subversion.

Below the top political warfare centers in Moscow, the Soviets have set up a system of intermediate level training centers on both sides of the Iron Curtain. A school at Tashkent, Russia, trains Communists from the Islamic areas. Prague, Czechoslovakia, has become a principal center for training foreign Communists. One Prague school, which has the innocuous name of the Institute for the Study of Latin American Relations, specializes in training Communists from Latin America. As far back as 1954, Daniel James, a leading authority on communism in Latin America, describes this school as follows:

The institute has an enrollment of 750 students * * * The great majority of them are Latin Americans, the rest Europeans. The purpose in having Communists from Latin America and Europe study together is to train them as teams. Upon graduation, the Latin Americans return to their native countries and are later joined by European graduates, who may be former classmates. The latter are usually assigned to Iron Curtain diplomatic or trade missions in Latin America—hence the stress being laid by Communists everywhere in Latin America upon establishing diplomatic and trade relations with the Soviet sphere. (It is quite possible that the Iron Curtain envoys in Mexico who visited Guatemala were trained at Prague.)

Subjects taught at the Institute for the Study of Latin American Relations include the history, culture, politics, law, and languages of the Latin American countries, all rendered from a Marxist viewpoint. Special attention is devoted to the theory and tactics of revolution, espionage, and sabotage.

The institute's primary aim, however, is not to turn out spies and saboteurs but experts at infiltrating non-Communist organizations and institutions and at leading or influencing mass movements, in accordance with the general strategy of exploiting and channelizing the dominant trend in Latin America: nationalism. The trainees are handpicked from Latin America's Communist Parties and their labor, intellectual, peace, and youth fronts. These facts underscore the significance of the increasing flow of Latin Americans to Communist centers in

Europe; there is scarcely any doubt that a great many of them find their way to Prague.

Another Prague school trains Africans. Antony Head, the former British defense chief, who has made a detailed study of Soviet penetration of Africa, estimates this school has facilities for 3,000 students. Incidentally, a recent issue of Newsweek magazine noted that 100 Congolese students undergoing training at Prague and Warsaw are being graduated ahead of schedule so they can return to the Congo and fill the administrative vacuum.

I wonder how the Belgian Government could have been so naive about the nature of the global struggle as to permit these students to journey to Prague for an advanced education in subversion, while denying to all but a handful of other Congolese students university training in Belgium or elsewhere in the free world.

Antony Head, in a speech to Parliament on February 19, 1959, chided the British Government for permitting a number of Africans to travel freely to Prague. He speculated that it might only be a matter of time until some of the key government positions in the former colonies were held by Prague alumni.

Thus do the democracies cooperate in their own destruction.

Mr. President, I have been speaking of schools operating in the Soviet Union and its satellites. It is interesting, and I believe most significant, that Red China is now getting into the act on a big scale. In 1956, the Soviet Union stepped up its training of Latin Americans. In the same year, the Chinese Communists established a parallel system of political warfare training centers for Latin Americans. I believe these stepped up training activities are a better indication of future Soviet intentions and activities than almost any other indicia.

On November 5, 1959, General Cabell gave this important testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee:

The training of Latin American Communist Party leaders at the higher party school of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been going on continuously since 1953, with an increase noted since 1956.

The usual curriculum is based on a 2- or 3-year course of training, and the students are active party leaders and functionaries who have been selected by their parties and approved by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

It is probable that most of the Latin American Communist Parties now have a number of leaders who have received this special training. Beginning in 1956, the Communist Party of China also undertook to give training to Latin American Communist Party leaders.

They emphasize, among other subjects, the special contributions of the Chinese party in the field of clandestine work, agrarian reform and peasant affairs, guerrilla warfare, and the manipulation of the bourgeoisie and other elements in the "anti-imperialist struggle."

Since 1956, there is evidence that the organization of such training has been improved, and that the Chinese Communist Party is now giving regular courses specifically for Latin American Communist students, thereby paralleling the Soviet effort.

16578

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26

Chinese Communist revolutionary instruction is well received by Latin American Communist students who find it practical and well suited to the conditions in which they operate in Latin America. They especially appreciate the fact that the Chinese Communists pay even their travel expenses.

In February and March of 1959, Latin American Communist representatives received specific advice and guidance from Mao Tze-tung and other leading Chinese Communists concerning international Communist policy and effective methods of carrying on clandestine activities.

The intermediate level schools have been extended into the Western Hemisphere. For example, in the fall of 1958 the Communists were operating a secret training school in a walled estate in a suburb of Buenos Aires. Only a few people were supposed to be living in the estate, but local townspeople noted that enough food was being taken in to feed an infantry platoon. Mysterious strangers were coming and going at all hours of the day and night. The local police, suspecting a narcotics operation, raided the estate and caught the school in session.

The students came from many parts of Latin America and included lawyers, college professors, schoolteachers, and labor leaders. The course was 6 months long, 7 days a week. The training was comparable in intensity to our wartime Officer Candidate Schools. Presumably some of these students took postgraduate work at Prague and Moscow. A wide range of political warfare subjects were covered in the curriculum.

Below these intermediate level schools, the larger Communist Parties run a whole system of training schools which teach political warfare as a matter of course.

In addition to general training, there are specialist schools for training organizers, agitation and propaganda experts, specialists in military questions and penetration of military forces, specialists in labor unions, race specialists, church specialists and guerilla-political specialists. Also, they have specialist schools for specific national, ethnic or regional groups. For example, there is a school for African labor leaders at Warsaw. From 1953 to 1955 they ran a school for Latin American labor leaders at Budapest. One satellite school specializes in training students from Guinea.

Mr. President, this system of training schools and development centers constitute the most elaborate establishment in history for creating political warfare cadres and capabilities.

It is remarkable that, with all that is being written and said about Communism, so little mention has been made of these centers. Yet they are the key to Soviet victories.

At the upper level, these institutions have provided the Soviets with a new type of strategist, a conflict manager who sees the cold war in all its dimensions. He is at home with all forms of conflict—political, ideological, psychological, economic, cultural, technological, military and paramilitary. In planning his strategy he is not limited to the conventional means of diplomacy.

Rather he has at his finger tips a vast array of nonmilitary weapons—of cold war weapons so to speak—which have been tested and perfected over many years. He knows how to combine and integrate these into a complex strategy, utilizing all methods and all means in a many directional approach to strategic problems.

Activities which Western peoples look upon as pursuits of peace, such as diplomacy, education, trade, cultural exchange and scientific research, he looks upon as tools of strategy. His entire career has been directed to the acquisition of power, both in the party where he has stepped over the bodies of less gifted comrades, and in planning and directing the Soviet's carefully patterned total aggression against the world. For nearly 60 years he and his predecessors have perfected the deadly political science which Lenin first described in "What Is To Be Done" and his articles in "Iskra."

At the middle and lower levels are several million Communist cadres who have been intensively and systematically trained in methods ranging from subtle techniques of subversion to the organizing of street mobs. They are deployed in every country. They work harder, they are more dedicated and have more know-how than do any of their opponents with rare exceptions. They give to the revolution the whole of their lives and not just their spare evenings.

I ask the Senate to consider for a moment the impact this Soviet training and development program will have in Africa. The hundreds of Africans graduating every year from the centers at Prague, Warsaw, and Moscow are instructed to conceal their party membership. They do not return to Africa as open Communists. Rather they return as nationalists, African Marxists, and anti-imperialists. They are not instructed to form mass Communist parties. Rather, they are told to join the Nationalist parties emerging in the newly independent countries and to manipulate them from within—first toward neutralism and then toward the Soviet bloc.

Look at the fabulous opportunities awaiting them in countries where only a tiny fraction of the population has received higher education, and almost no one has political experience. If Communist cadres can capture the Socialist Party in an advanced country like Japan, what are their horizons in the Congo? At present, I can see very little standing in the way of Communist capture of the bulk of the African nationalist movement. Diplomats and reporters who have little understanding of the techniques of communism, simply because they see no evidence of large Communist parties in Africa, conclude that communism is a minor force in the dark continent. They should visit Prague.

I hear suggestions that we should bring thousands of Africans to this country and train them in administration and the professions. This is all well and good. I believe it should be done and I will wholeheartedly support such a program. However, we should ask ourselves this question: If we train 1,000 Congo-

lese as technicians and administrators, and the Soviets train 100 in political warfare, which group will win control of the Congo?

I ask the Senate to consider the impact of the Prague center on Latin America. General Cabell recently told the Internal Security Subcommittee that all Communist Parties in Latin America are under orders to recruit new members on a secret basis. The days when the Communists were seeking to produce large mass parties are past, at least in Latin America. The new technique is to penetrate the existing institutions, especially the universities, the left of center parties and mass communication systems, including newspapers, TV, radio, publishing houses. Members recruited in these groups are told to stay where they are and to work from within.

Imagine the impact on the future course of Latin American history when many thousands of dedicated revolutionaries, who have received advanced training in Prague, are redeployed throughout the fabric of each Latin American country—not as Communists, but as apparently devoted, hard-working members of the professions, the press, the schools. Because of superior know-how and conspiratorial endeavor, wherever they are, they quickly rise to positions of control.

There is hardly a country in Latin America that does not have a revolutionary or potential revolutionary situation. The Prague graduates are masters at exploiting these situations by supporting ostensibly non-Communist parties—and then gaining control of the new revolutionary parties. They have an intimate knowledge of agrarian problems; but, more important, they know how to organize the peasants into a political force. They have an excellent working knowledge of labor and labor unions; but, more important, they know how to agitate and organize labor into supporting pro-Soviet causes. They understand the Latin student and his problems; but, more important, they know how to capture student organizations and use them to spearhead revolutions.

Antony Head predicted that the day would soon come when Prague alumni would emerge as cabinet ministers in the newly independent colonies. I wonder if the graduates of Prague are not within striking distance of achieving working control of the Left in much of Latin America. The progress they have made in the last 2 years is impressive—and frightening.

Mr. President, I submit that the Communist political warfare centers in Moscow, and other points, constitute the most insidious and most deadly instrument for conquest the world has known.

How well prepared is the United States to engage in the new dimensions of conflict?

We are told with tiresome repetition that we are engaged in a world struggle for the minds of men. It is axiomatic that the cold war must be fought with the same intensity as a hot war. But are we taking the measures necessary to win the war?

Lenin said that political warfare is a science and those who practice it must be intensively trained professionals. He was speaking, of course, of political warfare waged by an illegal international conspiracy.

But I say to you that the political warfare of free men, though its objectives and methods are quite different, is no less a science and that those who represent our side must be trained with equal vigor and intensity.

I believe there is no area of human activity which makes greater demands on a person's courage, intelligence, integrity, and stamina than political warfare. It is, indeed, the most difficult and demanding of all the arts or sciences.

It has taken the Soviets 40 years of the most intensive development and training to achieve their present capabilities.

The job of developing a science of counteraction for the free world and of training large numbers of our people to apply this science to all phases of the cold war will require at least as great an effort on our part.

Mr. President, I now come to a shocking and disheartening fact. We are in the 15th year of the so-called cold war, yet we have no development and training program which can hope to produce the cold war operational knowledge and the trained leadership groups who can outplan, outthink, outorganize, and outdedicate the Communists.

We are a happy, contented people. We would like nothing better than to be left alone. We have approached the grim realities of the nonmilitary aspects of the total struggle forced upon us, with the timidity of an old lady tiptoeing into a cold pool, one toe at a time. We have simply refused to acknowledge the fact that political warfare is a vast and complex art or science, that it must be intensively developed as such, and that those who practice it must be given the same lengthy, intensive, systematic training as an engineer or a nuclear physicist.

We recognize the urgency of staying ahead in military technology and we spend billions of dollars on research and development. We recognize that our military forces must be led by well trained, dedicated professional officers, and we have created a magnificent system of training schools which provide the professional officer with superior training at each stage of his career. The Army, for example, has West Point, the Command and Staff School, the Army War College, the National War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, as well as many specialist schools.

In other words, we as a free, democratic people are able to respond to the challenge of a possible hot war.

But we do not recognize that the nonmilitary arts or sciences of cold war must be developed with the same intensity and that we must train leaders for cold war with the same intensity as leaders for hot war.

The hearings on the present bill establishes these two facts, and here I read from the committee report:

1. No concentrated, systematic effort is being made to develop an integrated opera-

tional science for our side which will meet the entire Soviet attack and work toward our long-range national objectives in a coordinated manner, utilizing every area of potential strength in the public and private sectors. We have not thought through all of the short- and long-range methods and means which free men can properly use when faced with a Soviet-type challenge, and we have not integrated these methods into a broad strategic plan. This is especially true in the field of political and economic warfare. Bits and pieces of the problem are being worked on within the Government and at some universities, and part of this development work is of a high order, but the total effort falls far short of seeking an integrated, operational science and does not begin to develop our true potential.

2. Nowhere today can Government personnel or private citizens receive broad spectrum training in cold war, especially in the large and highly complex field of political and economic war. Not only do we lack top level schools, we do not even have intermediate or lower level schools. There is no place where the bits and pieces are pulled together and taught in concentrated form.

These are shocking facts. I know there is a natural tendency to resist these findings. Nevertheless, they are true, and we could make no greater mistake than to try to sweep them under the table—or to point to this limited project or that limited project and try to pretend that the job is being done.

One of the many well qualified witnesses who testified at the hearings was C. D. Jackson, who is presently publisher of Life magazine. In World War II, he was Deputy Chief of Staff for Psychological Warfare at SHAEF. Later he was a member of the Jackson committee which made a study of our cold war machinery. For 2 years he was a special assistant to President Eisenhower on cold war planning. He also served as president of the Free Europe Committee which operates Radio Free Europe. As you can see, he has had extensive experience in political warfare at the highest levels in the military, civilian, and governmental spheres and is well qualified to testify as to what is being done—and even more important, what is not being done.

I want to read a few short excerpts from his testimony, and what he says here was repeated again and again by other equally well qualified witnesses.

Mr. Jackson testified:

If there is a single common denominator running through these different experiences—military, civilian, governmental, and private—it is the difficulty of finding Americans who have not only an instinct or a flair for political warfare, but also the elementary knowledge and training on the nature of the conflict and how to go about our end of the conduct of this very real and continuing warfare.

To be a Communist is to make political warfare a full-time job and a life commitment. For Americans it is at best a part-time aspect of some other job, conducted intermittently and with grossly inadequate training. There are far too few Americans who are both dedicated enough and knowledgeable enough to combat communism effectively on a full-time basis. If the Communists are scoring steady political gains—and we know they are, in all corners of the world—it is because they take their political warfare seriously and we do not. Our greatest danger, it seems to me, is that we may

let the victory go by default, simply because too few of us realize the nature and understand the weapons of the struggle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may repeat and paraphrase, I am sure that there is a general impression that adequate instruction places exist where this art or this profession can be studied. Actually, sir, there is no existing place where the whole problem is pulled together and taught in concentrated form and not in bits and pieces. That is why I think this is a good idea.

It is only by uniting the study and teaching of these elements in one place and one time that the challenge can be fully comprehended and adequate response generated.

Mr. President, what is wrong with us? How could we possibly permit ourselves to enter the 15th year of the cold war without creating the development and training facilities which alone can lay the foundation and create the capabilities we must have if we are not to go under?

In a moment I want to examine our present training and development facilities. But if this examination is to be meaningful, we must first consider what we need in terms of an operational science for our side and what types of trained leadership we must have.

The free world does not have to ape Communist methods. This is neither desirable nor necessary. It is a question of thinking through all of the methods and means free men can properly use when faced with a Soviet type challenge, and then integrating these into a total counterstrategy of our own, which will meet the entire Soviet attack, not just parts of it, and work towards our national objectives in a systematic manner.

Further, our own strategy must not be merely defensive. Those who plan only a holding operation are inviting eventual defeat. Ours must be a strategy with the worldwide victory of freedom as its ultimate objective.

At the upper levels of Government, then, we need trained professionals who are thoroughly familiar with the full range of Communist operational methods and who are also at home with the equally broad array of methods a free people can properly employ.

But we cannot leave everything to Government. We must be able to mobilize and utilize the vast array of organizations and talents in the private sector. We must think through not only all of the methods and means our Government agencies can employ but all of the methods and means our private citizens and organizations can employ.

Finally, we must provide broad but less extensive training for large numbers of people at the intermediate and lower levels of our cold war agencies, our Armed Forces, and the general public. Otherwise, good planning at the top will be frustrated by lack of know-how in the field. Without such people at the lower levels, our planners will be in the position of a general staff without a trained army.

How do our present training and development facilities stack up in relation to these requirements?

They are grossly inadequate for the simple reason that they were not designed or staffed to do this comprehensive job.

Take for example, the Foreign Service Institute which was created in 1946 to give in-service training to our Foreign Service career people and also to the personnel of other agencies dealing with the cold war. The institute is divided into two schools—a foreign affair school and a language school. About 60 percent of its annual \$5 million budget goes to language training, which is certainly needed, and this has improved the efficiency of our Foreign Service—particularly in the hard language areas. Most of the remaining dollars go for traditional type career training, like fiscal management, economics, trade promotion, general orientation and how to avoid irritating the local nationals.

Certainly a Foreign Service officer must know these subjects, and I am sure they are well taught. But they do not prepare the student to participate in a global struggle between freedom and communism. On the contrary the orientation is toward a traditional, diplomatic career. There is practically no training designed to equip or motivate the student to think in terms of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy.

The institute does offer a 2-week seminar on communism, which I understand is quite well done. However, considering the present sophistication and complexity of the Soviet attack, this is equivalent to a 2-week course in law, medicine, or nuclear physics. This is the kind of elementary knowledge that should precede any specialized study.

Most students attend the Foreign Affairs School for only a few weeks and the bulk of the training is designed around this brief orientation course. Last year the Institute inaugurated a 9 months' senior officer's course for about a dozen high ranking Foreign Service officers at a time. Some of our top cold war people give lectures or briefings during this course and I understand it does a good job of preparing these senior officers for high-level diplomatic assignments where they will employ the conventional methods in the traditional way. But there is little evidence this course produces or is supposed to produce the type of cold war professional we must have to win.

After all, they can hardly be trained in an art or science which has yet to be developed, and which the Institute is making no effort to develop.

One of our finest training facilities is the National War College and below it the Army War College, the Naval War College, and the Air University. I have always been impressed by the caliber of instruction at these institutions; indeed, I believe that our private universities could learn a great deal by studying their methods. The curriculum at the war colleges goes beyond purely military subjects and takes note of political-economic warfare. However, the military does not consider political-economic warfare its area of responsibility and it is always mindful of the traditional separation of our Armed Forces from political matters. As a result, the whole vast field of political warfare is treated as a mere footnote to more traditional career subjects. In the usual curriculum

three or four guest lecturers may give the subject a light once-over in the course of a 1-hour lecture.

The Central Intelligence Agency runs several secret training schools. I am not permitted to go into their curriculum in any detail. However, these are agency schools concerned with the special training needs of Central Intelligence. They are not designed to produce qualified cold war practitioners. I believe it should be clear to the Senate that CIA is not the agency to have prime responsibility for training our rounded cold war leaders.

The FBI has a school to train its internal security people. But again this school is primarily concerned with the special and limited problems of internal security.

There is no point in reviewing the Government's remaining training facilities, because they have even less relation to our inquiry.

I have thus far been discussing our training facilities. How about our research and development facilities for the nonmilitary aspects of cold war? What about institutions like the Russian Research Center at Harvard or the Rand Corp., or the research programs going on at a number of our universities?

Much work has been done in collecting facts, figures, and analyses on the Soviet bloc. Research has been undertaken on some of our nonmilitary operational problems. And again let me emphasize, as the committee report emphasizes, some of this work has been of a high order.

Hundreds of books and research papers on communism and the Soviet bloc have been printed in the past 10 years. The Russian Research Center at Harvard, which is only one of many, has gone into numerous aspects of the Soviet state and related matters. As far back as 1952 the Rand Corp. produced an excellent advanced textbook on Communist strategy called the "Organizational Weapon." I could go on and on.

However, when we come to the most important part of the problem—the development of a science, or strategy of total political warfare specifically designed to serve the free world—it is here that our development program stops short or breaks down. At this point it becomes very much of a bits-and-pieces affair.

Despite the many books on communism and the Soviets written within the past decade, to my knowledge, in this 15th year of the cold war, the first book has yet to be published which even attempts to develop an integrated operational science for our side. This is amazing. We seem to be so obsessed with studying the enemy, we have no energy or talent left over for thinking through the conclusions to which these studies should point. It is almost as though we were hypnotized into a condition of partial mental paralysis.

Actually, our situation bears a certain resemblance to that of the Russian revolutionaries of 1900. We, like they, are amateurs, using primitive methods of political warfare which are easily frustrated by an alert enemy. We have produced no free world Lenins to show us

how to develop our own operational science and train our own leaders.

Mr. President, the results of this failure in the field of training and development are all around us.

Within the Government, we find a grave deficiency at the higher policy-making levels. Our policymakers and their advisers have not had systematic, intensive training in the complex strategy of the cold war. Their formal schooling on the nonmilitary aspects of the cold war, of necessity, has been fragmentary and disorganized because there was no place they could go where the whole problem was pulled together and taught in concentrated form. Actually, to the extent that they have mastered the cold war, most of our top experts are self-taught. But this field is so vast that self-education inevitably leaves large blanks in essential background and operational knowledge. The result is that our policymakers and advisers are generally not able to view the problem whole, to anticipate the future, to make plans that take advantage of all our potential resources.

Our capabilities are attuned and limited to reacting on an ad hoc basis to each Soviet thrust. Sometimes our limited holding operations, as in Lebanon, are brilliantly planned and executed. But we must ask ourselves: Is there anything we might have done in previous years that could have prevented the eruption of the Lebanese crisis and of all the other crises of recent years?

Many of the extremist mid-Eastern leaders of today were educated in institutions established and endowed by Western philanthropy. As I see it, the damage was done 10 to 20 years ago, when the Communists first planted their people in these universities with a very specific assignment: to foster a pathological hatred of the West in young Arab students like Kassem.

There were many things we could have done and still can do to prevent future catastrophes. But it takes policy planning personnel trained to phase our strategy in any area over decades; and it takes facilities that can assist those who believe in freedom, first to understand, and second, to combat the Communist conspiracy.

As things stand in the Middle East, the Communist conflict managers have been able to turn a generous and seemingly enlightened Western educational endeavor into an instrument for smashing the Baghdad Pact. I could point to hundreds of similar examples of failure of Government policy.

It is in the private sector, however, where our training and development failure is most clearly seen.

I have already pointed to the fact that the Soviets have mobilized their entire society to win the cold war, as well as to prepare for hot war. In these circumstances we must not fight with one hand tied behind our backs. We must also organize. We must also utilize our full potential in the private sector. But coordinated, intelligent action in the private sector, as in government, must be preceded by knowledge, organization, and trained, motivated leaders. But, looking about us, one is compelled to ask:

1960

Where is the knowledge? Where is the motivation? Where are the leaders?

No other society has as many organized civic groups as our own. Millions of dollars and millions of man-hours are poured into civic projects every year. Yet almost none of this activity has any direct bearing on the outcome of the cold war.

There is a vast range of activities that private citizens and organizations can undertake which would have an important effect on the outcome of the cold war. In fact, whether these things are done could mean the difference between defeat and victory. But our people are unable to visualize these things.

There is very little in our educational system or in our past experience to prepare our people for the type of struggle we are now in. Many of our people would like to do something. They realize there is a danger, and they are quite prepared to give their time and, if need be, to fight and to sacrifice to meet it. The trouble is, they just do not know what to do.

Let me take the example of one of our finest national organizations, an organization composed of the up and coming young leaders of the community. If there is any civic group which should be providing the community with leadership in meeting the challenges of the cold war, it is this group. Yet what are they doing? I note city beautification projects, bathing beauty contests, kiddies day projects, Christmas lighting contests, tuberculosis X-ray projects, and so forth.

In another time and under other circumstances I suppose these projects might suffice as a program of activities. But today, when a brutal challenge has been thrown in our face, when the enemy has occupied a beachhead within 90 miles of our shore, when everything men of good will have sacrificed for and died for through a thousand years of history is at stake, then I say that a program confined to such unimaginative, irrelevant activities amounts to a form of adult delinquency.

With rare exceptions, the leaders of our many great national and civic organizations seem to lack the will or the know-how to break with the "business as usual" methods and to orient themselves toward the basic question of the survival of freedom.

Mr. President, we are in a long-range war of attrition with the Soviets. Barring a military disaster, our people must sustain a determination to win and a will to sacrifice over an indeterminate period. For this reason it has become essential that our people understand the nature and dimensions of the Soviet challenge. They must also know how they can participate in this continuing struggle in an effective and systematic manner.

But where are the leadership and ideas to come from? The answer is that they can only come from an institution like the Freedom Academy.

THE FREEDOM COMMISSION BILL

The purpose of the Freedom Commission bill is to fill this training and development gap. It creates logical or-

ganizational means to do the job in a concentrated, systematic manner.

The bill creates an independent agency within the executive branch of the Government, the Freedom Commission, composed of six members and a chairman. The sections setting up the Commission are patterned after similar provisions setting up the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commissioners are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. They serve for staggered terms of 6 years. No more than four Commissioners may be members of one political party.

The Commission is directed to establish an advanced training and development center, the Freedom Academy.

The Commission and the Academy are given two principal jobs.

First, they are directed to think through all of the methods and means that freemen may properly use to defeat the entire Soviet attack in the political, social, ideological, cultural, psychological, economic, and organizational spheres—not only what can be done in the public sector, but also what can be done in the private sector. Then they are directed to develop proposals for a coordinated short and long range strategy for victory.

Second, the Commission and the Academy are directed to educate government personnel, private citizens and foreign students concerning the nature and dimensions of the global struggle between freedom and communism, and to train them in the science of counteraction.

In order to do these things the most competent available experts in the relevant fields of knowledge are to be brought together at the Academy so they can devote their full-time to these duties. They will be relieved of all other responsibilities.

The importance of bringing these diversified experts under one roof can hardly be overemphasized. Today no one man or group of men possesses all of the necessary knowledge. Much of the background knowledge and operational know-how must be researched and developed before it can be integrated into a meaningful strategy. But sufficient knowledge does exist in fragmented form and scattered around the country in government agencies, in universities, and elsewhere to form a solid foundation for a broader inquiry.

Through this intimate association of minds in all the relevant areas of knowledge, through the long-range research and daily seminars covering the many problems of the cold war, through the concentration of the best available talent—through this combination of circumstances there is every reason to believe that a total strategy for freedom will ultimately be synthesized.

The training program will be geared to the research and development program, so that there will be an ever-increasing pool of trained experts who possess a common fund of operational knowledge and are capable of planning and executing a sophisticated cold war strategy.

I do not envision the Freedom Academy as a leisurely academic undertaking.

The congressional findings in section 2 emphasize the clear and present danger. The Commission and Academy are charged with developing the operational knowledge upon which the fate of the free world will depend and to do this in the shortest practicable time. The need for Academy graduates is as urgent as the need for trained officers in the early days of World War II. Therefore, the training must be conducted with the same intensity as a wartime OCS.

In assembling a teaching staff we must find those who can inspire others by personal example and quality of instruction, for motivation is the most important goal in our training program. Graduates must have the desire, the will and the courage, as well as the know-how, to outwork, out-think, and outdedicate Communist cadres under all conditions.

The Academy will not duplicate or weaken the existing training centers like the Foreign Service Institute or the CIA schools. These are essentially trade schools concerned with specialized skills. The training function of the Academy is much broader and it would not want to be tied down with responsibility for these special programs.

The committee found that not only do we lack top-level training schools in political-economic warfare, we do not even have intermediate or lower level schools. Therefore, if the Academy is to fill the training vacuum, it must provide instruction at several levels.

At the upper levels, the Academy would seek to fashion a rounded cold war expert who understands the full range of methods and means, many still to be developed, which can be brought to bear in solving cold war problems and in working toward our national objectives in a systematic manner.

At lower levels, the Academy would offer basic and intermediate courses, from a few weeks long up to a year in length. While this is hardly time enough to educate a cold war expert, it is time enough to acquaint students with the broad outlines of our cold war problems, to motivate them to take an active part, and to show them specific things they can do.

Where would the students come from? It is expected that all Government agencies connected with our cold war operations would utilize the Academy's facilities, just as some 25 agencies use the facilities—principally language training—of the Foreign Service Institute. These agencies would employ Academy graduates, as well as assign their personnel for basic, intermediate and advanced training.

I note the State Department sends small annual quotas of students to the War College and to several of the schools of international relations. This is a fine practice. But think how much more broadening and pertinent their Academy experience would be. For the first time, all of the bits and pieces would be pulled together. For the first time, they would understand that new methods of conflict are not a Communist monopoly, that free men can meet and defeat the entire

16582

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26

Soviet attack, and do this without aping Soviet methods.

I would like to see our colleges and universities send one or more members of their faculty to the Freedom Academy for at least a year, so that on their return they could organize similar courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. This kind of extension is especially important, since one Freedom Academy can hardly close the entire training gap.

I have commented on the failure of our great civic organizations to orient themselves toward the survival questions. I would, therefore, like to see all of our civic organizations, at the national and local levels, send selected members for basic and intermediate courses, so that on their return they could provide the leadership and ideas to enable their organizations to play a meaningful role in winning the cold war.

Today, our high school students are curious about communism and full of questions that their teachers are unprepared to answer. It is important that they understand the enemy, that they understand the brutal challenge that confronts us, that they understand the meaning of freedom and the ideals of their own country. If they truly understand these things, and not learn them by rote, they will be prepared for the increased responsibilities of citizenship during the years of peril that lie ahead. I would, therefore, like to see history teachers and social science teachers attend 2-month summer courses sponsored by the Freedom Academy.

Corporation and labor unions can sponsor members, and businessmen, labor leaders, newspapermen and students, communicating with, visiting, or residing in foreign areas, would be especially desirable students.

Tens of thousands of foreign students attend our universities each year. A significant number would probably volunteer to attend the Academy, at least for one of the short courses. If they did so, they would be infinitely more effective in preserving and strengthening the free world. Today many students return home without a sense of mission, without a clear understanding of the Soviet challenge, without the feeling the free world depends on them as it depends on every individual, and with no organized thoughts on how they can participate in freedom's battle. I therefore feel strongly that a good deal of room should be reserved in the Freedom Academy for specialists and students assigned by the governments of friendly countries.

The bill leaves the details of student selection to the Commission, adding the general policy proviso, for private citizens and foreign students, that the students come from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed.

The Commission should train those students who can make the greatest contribution on graduation and can step into the areas where leadership is most needed.

Thus, many factors other than prior academic attainment will have to be

considered in student selection and it would probably be a mistake to attempt to spell these out in the bill. Selected Government personnel will be trained upon the request of the interested agency.

The bill authorizes financial assistance to students and their dependents. The committee believes that many desirable students will be unable to attend without help. The amount of assistance needed will vary, so the bill does not establish fixed grants or per diem, but leaves this to the sound discretion of the Commission. I expect that many private citizens will be able to pay their own way.

The bill also authorizes the admission of foreign students as nonimmigrants for such time and under such circumstances as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. Foreign students may be summarily deported for stated reasons. This subsection is patterned after a similar section of the U.S. Information Service Act setting up the student exchange program, and it provides the same safeguards.

Section 8 of the bill authorizes the Commission to establish an information center within the United States and fills an important need. If the research and development work of the Academy is to be made known and fully utilized, the Commission should have authority to publish and the organizational means to disseminate. Also, there should be a recognized center where private citizens and organizations can turn for information and assistance in making the private sector more effective in our struggle for survival. Section 8 gives the Commission authority to publish and also to prepare and disseminate other material, including training films suitable for community, high school, and college level instruction. Our film industry in cooperation with the Commission could make an important contribution here. It is also desirable for the Academy to keep in touch with its graduates through a newsletter or magazine, and this can be handled through the information center. The committee feels there would be no significant overlapping between the proposed information center in this country and the function of USIA.

Section 10 of the bill provides a double security check of Commission personnel. Subsection (a) provides for the standard Civil Service Commission investigation. Subsection (b) also authorizes the Commission to request a security check by the FBI of any individual employed by the Commission or under consideration for employment. The latter subsection is considered desirable, because of the importance the Soviets will attach to penetrating the Commission.

Section 12 authorizes the Commission to employ a General Manager to discharge such of the administrative and executive functions as the Commission may direct. The purpose is to ease the administrative load on the Chairman and Commissioners, so they can concentrate on the development and training functions. The section follows a similar section in the Atomic Energy Act.

At this point I would like to comment on the position taken by the Justice Department and the State Department that the development and training functions of the Freedom Academy could be handled by existing agencies with less overlapping and confusion.

Note their position is that this could be done, not that it is being done.

But how and when?

None of the Government's existing training centers is either staffed or designed to do the job assigned to the Academy. It would take a major overhaul, a drastic reorientation, a greatly expanded staff and facilities before any one of them, or all of them together, could approach the work of the Freedom Academy. To my knowledge, there are no existing plans to accomplish this purpose. Actually, the agencies are quite busy with the day-to-day problems and have shown no desire to take on the heavy added burden of an Academy-type training and development program. In the year and a half since this bill was introduced, the administration has come forward with no alternative program.

Let us face it. As a practical matter, nothing will be done until one agency is divorced from other responsibilities and given clear direction and authority to do the job.

The letters from State and Justice are disturbing, because they demonstrate an inability to comprehend the nature of our development and training gap. They infer, in fact recommend, that the training and development function of the Academy be broken up and parceled out to the existing agencies. This would perpetuate the present piecemeal approach.

It would effectively prevent the rapid development of the integrated, many directional, operational science. The best researchers and teachers would be scattered between various Government agencies and private institutions, whereas commonsense indicates the advantage of concentrating them in one center where they could work together with greatest efficiency and with the widest range of thinking.

It would lead to endless duplications. Equally important it would prevent the systematic, concentrated training of top professionals. It would compel them to obtain their training at different times and different places, in a piecemeal fashion because there is no center concerned with or staffed to teach the overall approach.

Let me repeat, it is only by bringing together all of the elements at one place and at one time that the full scope of challenge can be comprehended and an adequate response generated.

If the recommendations of State and Justice are followed, then nothing will be done, because they have asked for no authority or funds to handle the proposed Academy function even on this expanded piecemeal basis. We will continue to drift.

The question remains whether it would be better to set up the Academy as a bureau or subagency within an existing department or agency. I believe not.

First of all, the academy's work will go well beyond the assigned area of re-

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16583

sponsibility of any present department or agency. There is real danger that the narrow operational approach, the traditional methods of doing things, and the preconceptions of the past will carry over and inhibit both development and training. A fresh approach is needed. This does not mean the vast experience accumulated over the years by our various agencies will not be utilized in full.

Second, there is a natural tendency on the part of an operating agency to use its best brains and all of its available facilities to meet the urgent day-to-day problems. There is a real danger the Academy would become a stepchild rather than the high-priority project it must be.

It seems to me far better to set up the Freedom Commission completely independent of the operating agencies, so that it can draw on their experience, yet not be stifled in any way by their established attitudes or methods of doing things.

It has been suggested that the functions of the Freedom Academy could be handled better by our private universities. If by this is meant dividing up the functions of the Academy and parceling them out to various private institutions, then again this would perpetuate the piecemeal approach, and would work against the concentrated, systematic research and training which are essential. And again, there are no plans to do this, so it is just talk.

More important, our universities, including their centers for international studies, have shown little interest in developing political warfare. To hand them this vital job about which they have shown so little interest or capacity would not seem wise.

Mr. Leo Cherne, executive director of the Research Institute of America, told the committee:

It would not be desirable at the early stages to contract to a university, any university, the job either of assembly of the Academy or the job of preparation of the curriculum. If the universities had demonstrated any capacity to do the job, they would in fact have been doing it on their own campus, and I see no evidence of this.

Dr. Stefan Possony, an experienced educator, and a top authority on Soviet affairs, told the committee:

Nor could an individual university, however large, handle the job on a sufficiently broad and sustained basis. There also is the objective problem: If you go to one university, you have two or three professors who may be suitable. Actually, this is an optimistic assumption. These men have their own opinions, specialties and hobby horses and cannot be expected to provide the wide, broad, all-directional approach that would be necessary in order to cover all pertinent problems. Subjects like communism, democracy and political warfare are universal encyclopedic subjects.

The piecemeal approach that presently takes place, in which each international relations course, or each course on foreign governments, handles some part of this problem, requires a great deal of duplication in basic information. The basic introductory information is repeated time and time again but the payoff phase of the instruction, the specifics, the details, the ramifications and implications, the final arguments and the final deductions never are reached. Hence I think a central instrumentality would be

the only effective solution, provided, of course, it were based on sound principles, and provided it will be adequately funded.

Again, let me emphasize that the creation of the Academy will not end the need for the existing centers—either those operated by the Government or by private institutions. Nor will it compete with them.

On the contrary, as I see it, the Freedom Academy will revitalize the existing centers by opening up new dimensions of operational knowledge and by providing the free world with its first professionally trained cold war experts who are familiar with the full spectrum of nonmilitary countermeasures. No longer will the existing centers be staffed primarily by narrow specialists.

There has been some confusion between the present bill and that hardy, perennial proposal for an undergraduate foreign service academy. The present bill is a completely different proposal. It has even less relation to an undergraduate foreign service academy than West Point has to the National War College. And the principal argument against the undergraduate school—that it would take future Foreign Service officers out of the main stream of American life at too early a period in their development—has no relevancy to the present bill.

I understand that some persons have expressed the fear that we would be creating a possible Communist-type apparatus to fight a Communist apparatus. This is a remarkable and revealing observation. It is not very flattering to the President, who will make the appointments to the Commission, or to the Congress, which will control appropriations and keep the Commission and Academy under constant study. It is revealing, however, in that it shows a complete lack of faith in the ability of freemen to meet the entire Communist attack without violating their own ethics. Those who make this argument would default in vital areas of the struggle without even making a real effort to find new ways of defending freedom that do not offend the tenets of freedom.

There also is some confusion as to how the Commission and Academy will fit into the Federal structure. I believe this should be clear by now, but I do want to emphasize this point. The Commission and Academy will be a research, development, and training organization, not a policymaking organization. The Commission and Academy will produce ideas, organizational-operational suggestions, short- and long-range program proposals. These would be made available to the President, the National Security Council, and the various agencies of Government, to enable them to improve present methods, to make use of entirely new methods, and to assist them in developing an integrated, long-range approach to the cold war, utilizing our full potential in the public and private sectors.

The Judiciary Committee has called this bill one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress.

This bill is the free world's answer to the Lenin Academy. It is a congressional statement that we have been pushed

around, insulted, outmaneuvered, out-fought and outthought long enough. It is a declaration to both our friends and our enemies that we have at last understood the nature of the struggle and that we are getting down to the practical work of devising the tools and training the manpower for victory.

No nation in all history has had as much to tell the world as America. It is we, not the Soviets, who should provide the ideals, the inspiration, and the know-how which can guide and shape the revolutionary forces at work in every part of the world.

Yet good ideals and democratic institutions do not automatically prevail through the working of some natural law—especially in a world that has been infiltrated by the alumni of the Prague and Moscow centers. The forces of freedom possibly even more than the forces of tyranny, need organization and trained, dedicated people.

We are in the midst of a world revolution in the true sense. The Communists did not create it, but they study ceaselessly to utilize it for the spread of their power and for the destruction of ours. We did create it. But we do not try to understand or to utilize it, nor to aid it in finding new forms of abundance and of freedom.

In closing let me quote the final sentences from the magnificent speech of Bertrum Wolfe, given last summer at the National War College:

We, not they, are the champions of the right and freedom of workingmen, the freedom of movement, the freedom to change jobs, the freedom to build organizations of their own choosing under their own control, the right to elect their own officials, to formulate and negotiate their own demands, the right to strike, the right to vote for a party, and a program and candidate of their own choice.

We, and not they, are able to call the armies to "fraternize across the trenches," for it is they who must cut off their armies from the news of what is happening in the West, and we who must make our armies and theirs understand what is happening in their land.

We, not they, are the champions of freedom of the human spirit, of the freedom of the arts and sciences, freedom of conscience, freedom of belief and worship, freedom from scarcity and want, and from the tyranny of irresponsible and omnipotent officials.

So in all these things the free world presents its own imperfections and lapses, these are the things that the free world stands for and in good measure realizes, and these are the things which totalitarianism completely destroys and makes high treason even to think upon.

In the battle for the future shape of the world, all the creative and explosive weapons are in our hands if we had the wit and the understanding to take them up. If no, then there are no psychological or ideological vulnerabilities of communism. If yes, they are vulnerable on every front and every moment and in every layer of their society.

Whether the answer to this question is "Yes" or "No," this will determine, in my judgment, the outcome of the protracted war that is likely to occupy the rest of our lives and the rest of the century.

Mr. President, time is running out for the free world.

Despite the brief time left to us in this session, I pray that we will somehow

16584

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26

manage to pass on the Freedom Commission bill before Congress adjourns. I pray that the vote on this measure will not follow party or ideological lines.

Let all of us unite behind this measure, as a declaration to men of good will everywhere that we have only begun to fight.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following documents relating to the need for a Freedom Academy:

First. The text of Senate bill 1689.

Second. An article entitled "New Center of Modern Education and International Brotherhood," which appeared in the World Marxist Review for August 16. It describes the operations of the Lenin University in Moscow.

Third. An article entitled "Education in Japan," by Prof. Sydney Hook, which appeared in the New Leader for November 24, 1958.

Fourth. Excerpts from a speech by the Honorable Antony Head, in the British Parliament, on February 25, 1959, relating to Communist penetration of Africa and Asia.

Fifth. The text of a lecture, by Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe, on "The Enemies of the Open Society: The Ideological-Philosophical Vulnerabilities of Communism," delivered at the National Strategy Seminary of the National War College, Washington, D.C., on July 21, 1959.

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

S. 1689

A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Freedom Commission Act".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress of the United States makes the following findings:

(1) The Soviet Union and Communist China are waging a total political war against the United States and against the peoples and governments of all other nations of the Free World.

(2) Unlike the Free World, the Soviet Union has systematically prepared for this total political war over several decades. Drawing on the experience of previous conquerors and upon their own elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, Soviet leaders have developed their conspiratorial version of political warfare into a highly effective operational science. Recognizing that political warfare is a difficult science making unusual demands on its practitioners, the Soviet Union and Communist China have established an elaborate network of training schools, within and without the Free World, in which have been trained large numbers of highly skilled activists. These activists continue to receive intensive training throughout their party careers.

(3) In this total political war the Soviets permit no neutrals. Every citizen, every economic, cultural, religious, or ethnic group is a target and is under some form of direct or indirect Communist attack. The battleground is everywhere, and every citizen, knowingly or unknowingly, through action or

inaction, is involved in this continuous struggle.

(4) Since the end of World War II, the Soviets, taking full advantage of their better preparation and often superior organizational and operational know-how, have inflicted a series of political warfare defeats on the Free World. The total sum of these defeats is nothing less than a disaster for the United States and the Free World and the continuation of this political war by the Soviets confronts the United States with a grave, present, and continuing danger to its national survival.

(5) In order to defeat the Soviet political warfare offensive and to preserve the integrity and independence of the nations of the Free World, it is imperative—

(A) that the knowledge and understanding of all the peoples of the Free World concerning the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism be increased as rapidly as is practicable;

(B) that private citizens not only understand the dimensions and nature of the threat, but that they also know how they can participate, and do participate, in this continuous struggle in an effective, sustained, and systematic manner;

(C) that Government personnel engaged in the cold war increase their knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, develop a high esprit de corps and sense of mission and a high degree of operational know-how in counteracting the international Communist conspiracy.

(b) It is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority and powers granted in this Act be fully utilized by the hereinafter created Commission to achieve the objectives set forth in the preceding subsection (a) (5) of this section. It is the further intent and purpose of the Congress that the authority, powers, and functions of the Commission and the Academy as hereinafter set forth are to be broadly construed.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this chapter—

(1) The term "Commission" means the Freedom Commission;

(2) The term "Academy" means the Freedom Academy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM COMMISSION; COMPOSITION; CHAIRMAN AND ACTING CHAIRMAN; QUORUM; OFFICIAL SPOKESMAN; SEAL

SEC. 4. There is established in the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the Freedom Commission which shall be composed of six members and a Chairman, each of whom shall be a citizen of the United States, one of whom shall be selected from the higher echelon of the State Department. The Chairman may from time to time designate any other member of the Commission as Acting Chairman to act in the place and stead of the Chairman during his absence. The Chairman (or the Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and a quorum for the transaction of business shall consist of at least four members present. Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission, shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote. Action of the Commission shall be determined by a majority vote of the members present. The Chairman (or Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman) shall be the official spokesman of the Commission in its relations with the Congress, Government agencies, persons, or the public, and, on behalf

of the Commission, shall see to the faithful execution of the policies and decisions of the Commission, and shall report thereon to the Commission from time to time or as the Commission may direct. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

MEMBERS; APPOINTMENTS; TERMS; COMPENSATION; EXTRANEOUS BUSINESS

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission and the Chairman shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members, including the Chairman, may be members of any one political party. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and qualifications of the nominee. The term of each member of the Commission, other than the Chairman, shall be six years, except that

(1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, two at the end of two years, two at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The Chairman shall serve during the pleasure of the President. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum; and the Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,500 per annum.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH THE FREEDOM ACADEMY; FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION AND ACADEMY

SEC. 6. The Commission shall establish under its supervision and control an advanced training and development center to be known as the Freedom Academy. The Academy shall be located at such place or places within the United States as the Commission shall determine. The principal functions of the Commission and Academy shall be—

(1) to carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated operational science that befits and bespeaks the methods and values of freemen and through which the free world will be able to meet and defeat the carefully patterned total aggression—political, ideological, psychological, economic, paramilitary, and organizational—of the Soviet bloc, and through which we, as a nation, may work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner. To achieve this purpose the full range of methods and means is to be thoroughly explored and studied including the methods and means that may best be employed by private citizens and nongovernmental organizations and the methods and means available to the Government other than the methods and means already being used. This research program shall include the study of our national objectives and purpose and the development of proposals for intermeshing and integrating the full spectrum of methods and means into a coordinated, short and long range strategy for victory, seeking the utilization of our full potential in the public and private sectors.

(2) to educate and train governmental personnel, private citizens, and foreign students concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy, the nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, and the science of counteraction to the Communist conspiracy.

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16585

ACADEMY STUDENTS; SELECTION; GRANTS AND EXPENSES; ADMISSION AS NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS; DEPORTATION

SEC. 7. (a) Academy students, other than Government personnel, shall be selected, insofar as is practicable and in the public interest, from the diverse groups within and without the United States where trained leadership and informed public opinion are most needed. Persons in Government service coming within the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act may be trained at the Academy pursuant to the provisions of said Act. All agencies and departments of Government are authorized to assign officers and employees to the Academy for designated training.

(b) The Commission is authorized to make grants to students and to pay expenses incident to training and study under this chapter. This authorization shall include authority to pay travel expenses to and from the Academy or other authorized place of training under the chapter, and authority to give financial assistance to the dependents of students during the time they are undergoing training authorized under this Act.

(c) Foreign students selected for training under this Act shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 1101(a)(15) of title 8, United States Code, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted, or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interest of the United States, or in activities in conflict with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 1251-1253 of title 8, United States Code. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 1254 of such title 8.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH AN INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 8. The Commission is authorized to establish an information center at such place or places within the United States as the Commission may determine. The principal function of the information center shall be to disseminate, with or without charge, information and materials which will assist people and organizations to increase their understanding of the true nature of the international Communist conspiracy and of the dimensions and nature of the global struggle between freedom and Communism, and of ways they can participate effectively toward winning that struggle. In carrying out this function, the Commission is authorized to prepare, make, and publish textbooks and other materials, including training films, suitable for high school, college, and community level instruction, and also to publish such research materials as may be in the public interest. The Commission is authorized to disseminate such information and materials to such persons and organizations as may be in the public interest on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine.

RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 9. Nothing in this chapter shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

SECURITY CHECK OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 10. (a) Except as authorized by the Commission upon a determination by the Commission that such action is clearly consistent with the national interest, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until such individual has been investigated by the Civil Service Commission to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk and a report thereof has been made to the Freedom Commission.

(b) In addition to the foregoing provisions, the Commission may request that any individual employed by the Commission, or under consideration for employment by the Commission, be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to determine whether the said individual is a good security risk.

GENERAL AUTHORITY OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. In addition to the authority already granted, the Commission is authorized and empowered—

(1) to establish such temporary or permanent boards and committees as the Commission may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this Act;

(2) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission. Such personnel shall be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, except that, to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws: *Provided, however*, That no personnel (except such personnel whose compensation is fixed by law, and specially qualified professional personnel up to a limit of \$19,000) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee;

(3) to conduct such research, studies and surveys as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(5) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for administering and carrying out the provisions of this Act;

(6) to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. Whenever the Commission shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under the authority of this Act, the Commission shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Commission under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or by direct transfer;

(7) to utilize or employ on a full- or part-time basis, with the consent of the organization or governmental body concerned, the services of personnel of any State or local government or private organization to perform such functions on its behalf as may appear desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, without said personnel severing their connection with the furnishing organization or governmental body; and further to utilize personnel of a foreign government in the same manner and under the same circumstances with the approval of the Secretary of State;

(8) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all

kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(9) to receive and use funds donated by others, if such funds are donated without restrictions other than that they be used in furtherance of one or more of the purposes of this Act;

(10) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 73b-2 of title 5, United States Code, for persons serving without compensation;

(11) to utilize the services of persons on a temporary basis and to pay their actual and necessary travel expenses and subsistence and in addition compensation at a rate not to exceed \$50 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

GENERAL MANAGER; APPOINTMENT; COMPENSATION

SEC. 12. The Commission is authorized to establish within the Commission a General Manager, who shall discharge such of the administrative and executive functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct. The General Manager shall be appointed by the Commission, shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission, shall be removable by the Commission, and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$18,000 per annum.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

[From the World Marxist Review, August 1960]

NEW CENTER OF MODERN EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD

(By S. Rumyantsev, professor, rector of the Friendship of the Peoples University)

The Soviet Union consistently pursues a policy of promoting cooperation between the Socialist camp and the countries which have taken the road of national regeneration. As far back as 1916, V. I. Lenin, in his "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism" wrote with foresight: "We shall endeavor to give * * * peoples who are more backward and more oppressed than we are, 'disinterested cultural aid * * *', i.e., help them to go over to the use of machines, to lighten their labor, and to go forward to democracy and socialism."

Lenin was an ardent advocate of friendship between the peoples of the world. He considered it be the Soviet state's historical mission to render fraternal aid to the hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa, and other continents who had awakened and were yearning for freedom and a bright future, and by this very fact had already, in the first quarter of our century, greatly accelerated world development. Their all-round social progress is an indispensable condition if the independence of the new states is to be consolidated and their development insured. It stands to reason that countries which have known colonialism—capitalism at its worst—are looking for new roads. And their eyes turn to the Socialist countries, first and foremost, to the Soviet Union and People's China.

The Socialist camp is helping other peoples who have achieved independence to abolish the aftermath of colonial rule and backwardness and to attain economic prosperity and cultural regeneration. The Communists, as N. S. Khrushchev has said, are not only working for increasingly better living standards for the people of their own countries, but for good conditions for the people of all countries. In a matter of a little over four decades, during the lifetime of one generation in fact, the Soviet Union has made a

truly gigantic leap from poverty to abundance, from weakness to strength.

The experience of the socialist countries has shown that the productive forces of society cannot develop, neither can popular gains be defended from the aggressors without a national intelligentsia, an intelligentsia possessing a good knowledge of modern science and technology, an intelligentsia full of the spirit of genuine patriotism. All branches of the national economy are continuously being supplied with machinery which is constantly being improved. With a view to insuring the proper use of technology, to improving production, and to obtaining a high rate of technological progress, we train skilled workers, technicians, engineers and scientists, and see to it that the conditions are created for the flowering of science. One of the most remarkable results of the cultural revolution in the U.S.S.R. is the development of higher education in the national republics, particularly in those of the Soviet east.

Our growing numbers of highly qualified specialists contribute greatly to the promptness with which pressing scientific, technological, and economic problems are solved. That is why the Soviet Union, on the basis of its own experience, does not confine itself to giving economic and technical aid, but helps its friends also in the educational field. Quite a lot has already been done in this direction. We are helping, for example, to set up technological institutes in India, Burma, and Indonesia, while a polytechnical institute is being established in Guinea; it will be that country's first higher educational establishment. Many Soviet scientists give lectures at higher educational institutions abroad.

Thousands of young people from many countries are studying in Soviet institutions of higher education. Graduates from these institutions have made a good showing in both the professional and social fields at home. Increasing numbers of young people are eager for the opportunity to study in Soviet institutes.

A request to have more national specialists trained in Soviet higher schools was expressed by progressive public and government circles and individuals in many Asian, African, and Latin American countries, and was backed by Soviet public organizations—the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and the Soviet Youth Organizations Committee. It was they who sponsored the setting up of a Soviet institution of higher learning for the purpose of training specialists for the respective countries, and the proposal to establish a Friendship of the Peoples University in Moscow was approved by the Soviet Government.

Eligible for admission to the university are men and women under 35, irrespective of race, nationality or religion. Study at the Friendship of the Peoples University will be free of charge. The university will provide all students with bursaries, free hostel accommodation, and medical care, and pay their traveling expenses to Moscow and back.

The university represents a new form of training national specialists for the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It goes without saying that the existing forms of cooperation in education will be maintained and extended.

The new form of cooperation has a number of specific features and is highly promising.

The university will be attended by persons from many countries and of various nationalities. They will have had different educations and will speak different languages, some of which are only little known. How are we to overcome the difficulties that will thus arise? The university's preparatory

faculty will deal with these problems. This faculty will accept future students who do not know Russian, or who have not reached the necessary standard of secondary school education and prepare them, in a period of 1 to 3 years, for study in one of the university's six main faculties.

The fact that students will combine their training with scientific work guarantees a high level of education. With the establishment of the Friendship of the Peoples University, facilities have been created for large-scale research which will pay due regard to the national economy and culture of the Asian, African, and Latin American peoples, thus making for a higher level of training of specialists.

In its capacity of a scientific institute the university will cooperate with other Soviet scientific centers studying similar problems. It is also prepared, on a reciprocal basis, to establish permanent contacts with institutions of higher education, scientific institutions, and public organizations in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America with the object of exchanging visits, scientific information, and publications. The university intends to participate in international scientific and cultural activities.

In the conditions obtaining at the university, it will be possible to reduce the terms of study somewhat in comparison with those customary for the Soviet institutes. In the Soviet higher educational establishments the length of these terms depends on several factors. In the first place the specialized training of the students is tied up with the concrete conditions generally obtaining in our country, sometimes even in a particular area of the country. In the second place the practical work our students usually do over a prolonged period is explained by the need to prepare them for the actual conditions in their future spheres of activity. The kind of student enrolled also has a bearing on the term of study. Thus students who already have some practical experience will not need to study as long as those who have no such experience.

The students at the Friendship of the Peoples University will get to know the actual conditions of the future work on their return home.

The experience of Soviet higher education has been taken into account in drawing up the university's curriculums.

The university will train specialists in all the major branches of knowledge, in accordance with the needs of the Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

The concept of economic planning on the basis of the Socialist countries' experience has won worldwide recognition. And countries whose development has been retarded by imperialist colonialist domination are particularly interested in this. They realize that their salvation lies in a concentrated effort to combat the effects of the economic havoc the imperialists have left in their wake. Prime Minister Fidel Castro of Cuba has called the Republic's economic development plan a plan of struggle for economic progress and for rooting out the evils of the past, while Sekou Touré, President of the Republic of Guinea, described the adoption of his country's 3-year development plan as an event equal in importance to the winning of political independence. The university will help to meet the demand for economists, specialists in planning the national economy, in the Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

The faculty of engineering will train mining, mechanical, and construction engineers. Unless a country has a modern industry it cannot hope to achieve a high level of national production. Young people in foreign countries know full well that the Soviet Union has something to teach future engineers. A youth from Guinea, for example,

wants to go to the university to become an engineer. His country, he writes, has plenty of iron ore, coal, oil, and diamonds. And he wants to become a specialist so that he can help build a national industry and use Guinea's mineral wealth for the good of his country.

The Asian, African, and Latin American countries are faced with the urgent task of transforming their backward, extensive agriculture into an advanced intensive farming. The experience in transforming the scattered and backward agriculture of Russia into large-scale highly productive agriculture is attracting the attention of these countries and the use to which they put this experience will depend on the conditions obtaining in the different countries, and on the attitude of their leaders. President Bourguiba of Tunisia, for instance, said recently that in organizing cooperative farming in Tunisia it would be useful to study the Soviet experience. Sylvianus Olympio, Prime Minister of Togo, emphasizes the importance of cooperation in the agriculture of this young republic. Guinea's first 3-year development plan, adopted in April 1960, envisages the setting up of more than 500 cooperative farms. The government of India is also showing interest in cooperative methods of farming.

The faculty of agriculture will train specialists who, armed with modern scientific knowledge, will help the peasants in their countries "to raise two ears instead of one," to use the words of K. A. Timiryazev, the great Russian naturalist.

Many of the Asian, African, and Latin American countries are planning extensive public health programs, and the faculty of medicine will train doctors and pharmacists for these countries.

A task of paramount importance in most of the economically underdeveloped countries has been and still is the struggle for general elementary education. And this has given rise to an acute shortage of teachers. Nearly all the faculties of the university and particularly the faculty of agriculture and the faculty of history and philosophy will train their students for the noble career of teaching.

Thorough research is required in both the natural and social sciences before the Asian, African, and Latin American countries are able to solve a number of their pressing problems. The faculties will, therefore, acquaint the students to engage in research.

The development of international relations, the defense of national sovereignty, and cooperation with peace-loving states call for experts in international law. To meet this need the university will train specialists in international law for these countries.

We shall do our best to turn out qualified specialists who, on returning home, will enthusiastically set about building a better future for their peoples.

In addition to their specialized training the students will have every opportunity to see the Soviet Union, familiarize themselves with the cultural treasures created by its people, and to extend their knowledge through classical and contemporary literature and art.

The Friendship of the Peoples University is not a state establishment. It is directed by a council composed of representatives of the founding nongovernment organizations, and includes a representative of the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education of the U.S.S.R. and representatives of the teaching staff and students. Thus the students will find that the university is at the same time a school of democratic self-government.

In view of the recent further cut in the Soviet armed forces by one-third, the premises formerly occupied by a staff college and by one of the military schools have become vacant and, under a decree of the Soviet

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16587

Government, made available to nonmilitary organizations. They will, it has been decided, be placed at the disposal of the university.

Great help is being given by the Soviet public to the university which is still in its infancy. Splendid initiative, for example, has been shown by the staff of Leningrad University which, appreciating as it does the difficulties connected with an undertaking of this kind, has offered comradely assistance.

Progressive public and government circles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are displaying a friendly interest in the new university. We value their appreciation of Soviet aid to the underdeveloped countries, and the efforts they are making to recommend students who, we are certain, will, after graduation, bring great benefit to their countries. The future student should understand that he shoulders a great responsibility when he enters the Friendship of the Peoples University.

The friendly cooperation of all organizations concerned is enabling us to establish a well equipped institute of higher learning with an experienced staff, an establishment that will enjoy prestige in both scientific and educational respects. The applications pouring in bear witness to the fact that young Asian, African, and Latin American men and women are most eager to study at this University.

"The people who have risen like a mighty giant

Are now reaping the harvest of freedom."

sang the Indonesian Poet Hadji in a poem dedicated to the Bandung Conference, a Conference which demonstrated the powerful growth of the national consciousness of the Asian and African peoples. The Friendship of the Peoples University will work for the triumph of the principles of Bandung.

EDUCATION IN JAPAN—COMMUNIST TEACHERS' UNION AND STUDENTS' ORGANIZATION STRETCH PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

(By Sidney Hook)

TOKYO.—It is not often that an educational struggle is a herald or portent of a civil war. Today in Japan, however, the educational situation is such that an analysis of the complex factors involved provides the best introduction to its troubled political life. What seems like a simple educational issue, for example, a method of rating teachers' efficiency, has deep political taproots. What in Western countries would be solved by legislative hearings and consultations between professional educators and officials of boards of education is in Japan the occasion of fierce struggle and violence more extensive and severe than most episodes of industrial strife. The excesses of one side provoke the other into attempts at wholesale remedy which widen the scope of the political conflict.

Some knowledge of the historical background is indispensable in order to understand the nature and ramifications of the controversy over education in Japan today. Two things of importance should be remembered. Before the military defeat of the last war, education was geared to the interests of Japanese militarism, especially in the primary and secondary schools. Whatever opposition existed to the Emperor system and military rule manifested itself on the university level and was largely passive. The teachers in the universities were not so much overtly hostile as less enthusiastic than those in the lower schools. When the old system was destroyed and the only world they knew crumbled into dust, Japanese teachers looked to the Americans with their slogans of democracy as the source of a newer and more viable authority.

Just as important is a second factor. The so-called democratic revolution in Japan

was really an American revolution. The Japanese were commanded to be democratic even before they understood what it meant. There was no real upsurge or movement from below. The resultant follies were compounded by the political naivete of the American occupation which at first included Communists in the democratic spectrum and opened the doors to them in the labor movement which included almost 500,000 members of the Japan Teachers Union, the Nikkyoso, or J.T.U.

This explains why, whatever proposal is put forth to undo some of the laxities, oversights and mistakes of the occupation, the cry is immediately raised that this means the restoration of the old system of authoritarian control. This fear is quite sincere in some quarters, but it is exploited mercilessly and dishonestly by the leadership of the Japan Teachers Union. Refusal to come to grips with specific crisis in their own times also explains why the meaning of democracy is badly misunderstood by those who invoke its slogans most vehemently. The Government Party deems it sufficient to have a simple majority in order to ram through legislative measures without adequate preliminary discussion, advance notice or even an attempt to take its case to the court of public opinion. The opposition is irresponsible and reacts with a conditioned reflex of political negativism. It consists of the Socialist Party, completely dominated by its infantile leftwing and committed to a pro-Communist foreign policy, the Communist Party (politically immature but influential in intellectual circles and in the lower trade-union cadres) and a host of captive cultural organizations. In the eyes of the opposition nothing can be democratic which is against its collective or individual interests; anything which furthers those interests is ipso facto democratic. There is no real concern for the parliamentary process or respect for the principle of democratic majority rule. Symptomatic of how far semantic corruption of the term "democracy" has been carried is the amusing story of a Japanese citizen, slightly intoxicated, who accosted a policeman—a rather awesome figure in pre-war days—thrust out his foot and said: "Hey, you, tie my shoes. After all, you are now a democratic public servant."

Whatever deficiencies can be traced to the educational policy of the American occupation authorities (SCAP), like imposing excessive decentralization and raising inferior institutions, which were little more than training institutes, to the status of universities, the main educational aim of the occupation was quite exemplary. Education was to become politically neutral. Measures were taken to guard against the possibility that the Federal Government, with a highly centralized educational system, might abuse its monopoly of power and inject propaganda into the educational curriculum. But SCAP could not foresee that teachers would systematically propagandize in their classes on behalf of the narrowest factional political interests.

This is precisely what happened, on a scale and with a boldness unparalleled in any democratic country. The chief source of educational indoctrination is the J.T.U., whose leadership is in the hands of members of the Communist Party or of sympathizers who make no secret of their political allegiance. Recently, the Nikkyoso disaffiliated itself from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. An organization of its size employs a large number of full-time professional workers who are not teachers or educators but trade-union activists. Among them are approximately 1,500 members of the Communist Party, assigned to work in the Teachers Union. And while most of the teachers in the J.T.U. are not Communists or even fellow-travelers, they are helpless before the skillful and unscrupulous fac-

tional politics deployed against them. Some of the teachers maintain that dissent from the pro-Communist leadership, particularly if accompanied by attempts to combat it organizationally, is physically dangerous in certain regions.

The J.T.U. does not conceal the fact that its trade-union or professional activities are subordinate to its political goals. It is wedded to a Marxist-Leninist view according to which any government which is not Socialist, in the special sense of that term, is "an enemy of democracy and peace." It openly declares in the pamphlet with which it indoctrinates its new members:

"Our teachers union is an organization which stands at the forefront of the struggle. Its national membership is 500,000. Imagine each of these teachers closely tied, through his 50 pupils, to the working class which constitutes 90 percent of the entire population! Is it not a picture which is enormously encouraging and gloriously resplendent? * * * We are to fight on the side of these workers against the tyrannical propertied class of Japan."

No attempt is made to conceal the fact that the teacher is expected to indoctrinate his students. In its pamphlet, "The Teacher's Code of Ethics," the J.T.U. states that "the realization of socialism is the historic task imposed on the teacher. It is the duty of the teacher to foster young people who would help realize such a society."

That these directives are carried out is evidenced in many ways. Not only does the J.T.U. throw itself into all sorts of political activities and demonstrations which have nothing to do with educational affairs, it agitates its teachers to bring the message of "socialist" salvation right into the classroom. In this task it is abetted by the Japan Teachers Political League (the Nisseiren) of the left-wing Socialists, who make the Pietro Nenni Socialists of Italy appear moderate. Typical of the specific practices of indoctrination is the report that teachers draw a map of Japan with a red flag in the middle on the blackboard and tell their pupils that "this is the People's Republic of Japan." At the same time it is noteworthy that the J.T.U. has conducted violent demonstrations against the proposal to hoist the Japanese flag and to sing the national anthem, Kimigayo, at school ceremonies. This has been branded as a major step toward the revival of militarism. The chairman of the Arita City Education Board, in the Wakayama Prefecture, reports that some pupils have been surprising their parents with the information that they have been taught that the U.S.S.R. is their real homeland.

Although many professors and educators are quite eager to denounce any educational measure sponsored by the Government to correct this situation, very few have come out publicly to protest against the flagrant abuse of educational trust and the massive indoctrination carried on in the schools by the pro-Communist elements in the J.T.U. (Privately, almost all whom I have questioned admit that this indoctrination is widespread.) Occasionally, a brave man like Kotaro Tanaka, professor emeritus of Tokyo University, risks his reputation among the packs of conformist "progressives," and speaks out. More than a year ago (the situation since then has become much worse), he wrote in the Bulletin of the Research Institute of Comparative Education and Culture:

"A segment of educators, particularly a part of the primary and the secondary school-teachers, in the name of democratic education, have advocated the communistic or some similar viewpoint. They have not only played a considerable part in political campaigns, but have influenced pupils in the classrooms. Literally faithful to the doctrine of Marxism, they have not failed to profit

16588

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26

by every opportunity to condemn traditional morality and virtue as feudalistic and reactionary, to exaggerate existing social evils, to stimulate class antagonism, to insist on the overthrow of conservative government, to discredit the judiciary and to excite anti-American sentiment. And this under the slogan of democracy and democratic education."

There is no space to detail the various administrative measures the Government proposed to correct a situation which even leading members of the Japanese Socialist Party admit (privately, of course) to be educationally undesirable. Some of these measures were of dubious wisdom. The chief instrument the Government attempted to employ was the efficiency rating system. Rating systems exist for civil servants, for educational personnel of Government colleges and universities and for noneducational employees of the school system. But until recently a rating system was not applied to schoolteachers. The Government also attempted to introduce, at about the same time, an ethics course into the curriculum along lines familiar to Western schools.

And now one of the strangest things in the history of education occurred. Instead of contesting the educational validity of the efficiency rating system or of courses in ethics on professional grounds, the JTU took to the streets. It called a series of strikes throughout the country which culminated in a general strike. Teachers were enjoined to desert the classrooms during school hours, tell the children to stay away from school on the days of the strike, and involve their parents as well. In many parts of the country these demonstrations led to sit-down, lay-down and locked-arm tactics that became prefaces to violence. With the help of specially recruited squads of Communist university students, the leadership of the JTU conducted pitched battles in several prefectures to prevent principals of schools from receiving instruction in the application of the ratings. Particularly furious was the JTU's reaction to attempts to introduce courses in ethics.

Yet the first general strike of the JTU showed that its Communist leadership had gone too far. Most of the teachers did not abandon their classes and their educational charges. Parents were annoyed. The Japanese children, who strangely enough enjoy going to school, seemed to feel deprived and bewildered at the spectacle of their honored elders falling out—and sometimes upon each other. Public opinion polls conducted by the Asahi Shimbun and other agencies indicated that less than 10 percent of the population approved the strike tactics of the JTU. Even the Japanese newspapers which are traditionally critical of almost all Government measures—this is supposed to be a sign of their independence were indignant at the spectacle of teacher extremism and violence. When I saw newsreels of students and teachers using a tree-trunk to batter down the gates of a building in which other teachers were receiving instruction in how to conduct ethics courses, the audience seemed stunned and hostile.

Despite this reaction and the emergence of a more moderate faction in the JTU which sought to conduct the struggle against the teachers' efficiency rating in a more orderly manner and on an educational plane, the extremist leadership of the JTU pressed for further general strikes during the teachers' working time. When I left Japan, another strike was in the offing. The only concession made by the dominant group in the JTU was to permit the local unions to set their own time for the walkout.

The educational validity of the teachers' efficiency rating and the ethics course are more complicated matters. I have made a

careful study of both. The first is an extension of the American questionnaire procedure, but enormously extended. In principle, it is unexceptionable, but some of its detailed provisions are superfluous and its use for salary allocations or raises is of doubtful wisdom. The only relevant question about the ethics instruction is whether it should be given in conjunction with the study of other subjects like history or literature or presented at a specially assigned hour. The alternatives are obviously not exclusive. The last thing in the world, however, that the JTU wants is a discussion of these proposals on their educational merits. For it would then have to reveal itself once more in favor of the antidemocratic, pro-Communist indoctrination being carried on systematically in the schools under the skillful direction of left-wing trade-union activists.

No government in a democratic community can permit this type of educational subversion to go unchecked and stand by idly when groping efforts to cope with it are challenged by organized violence. In the wake of the teacher and student violence, the Government introduced a bill to revise the present police duties law. During the American occupation the power of the police was emasculated for obvious reasons. Except when crimes have been committed, the police function mostly like traffic cops, and with greater mildness than the New York City variety. They cannot even arrest uncontrollable drunks or put them into protective custody or confiscate arms from juvenile delinquents. The proposed revisions try to remedy this by an extension, so to speak, of the American "clear and present danger" principle, phrased in such a way that teachers' violence and similar disorderly activities on the part of extremists can be curtailed. But these provisions may be abused to curb legitimate activities on the part of trade unionists and Socialists. It would therefore have been wiser to amend the education law instead of the police law, making violent interference with the processes of education legally actionable.

The potential dangers, vastly exaggerated, of the police duties law have aroused large segments of the population, and it is not likely to be adopted in its present form. The leftwing Socialists, Communists, and the JTU are having a field day screaming "fascism is around the corner" and lining up hosts of genuinely liberal organizations as well as different front organizations in a national campaign of opposition, much of it violent. It is significant, and highly characteristic of the present situation in Japan, that not a single organization which has gone vigorously on record in protest against the proposed revision of the police duties law has so much as by a whisper protested against the violence, the betrayal of educational trust on the part of the JTU whose behavior was the most powerful consideration determining the introduction of the law. The Government made a mistake in not announcing these considerations more openly, in not proceeding more carefully with proposals to remedy specific deficiencies gradually. Its hypocrisy, however, has been surpassed by the hypocrisy of the opposition. Regardless of the fate of the police law, nothing can prevent an ultimate showdown between the Government and the fanatical leadership of the JTU, except the moderating influence of the Socialist Party—an influence it is unlikely to wield. The ideal solution would be for the members of the JTU themselves to revolt against their pro-Communist leadership under the inspiration of prominent educators in the universities. But at the moment this appears to be a forlorn hope.

Something should be said of the student movement in Japan. The only organized force of importance is the Zengakuren,

which is more Communist than the Communist Party today because its leadership insists upon following the ultra-violent tactics which the Communist Party advocated only yesterday. At present, the CP is attempting to purge the Zengakuren leadership. The bulk of the students are largely passive and even in the Christian universities no third force has developed. The Communist students regard themselves as the shock troops of the revolutionary movement. They meet opposition within the student movement and within their own ranks with ready violence. Last year they assaulted the past president of Kyoto University. This year at Fukushima University they boycotted examinations in protest against the teachers' efficiency rating system, an issue which has no relevance to university educational life. When some professors came to the aid of students who were being obstructed from entering the university to take their examination, they were severely beaten. The ring-leaders among the Communist student union are "professional" students, in effect functionaries of the Communist Party planted in the universities to recruit students and to further the party line. There is hardly a trick employed by the young Communist Leagues decades ago in the West which has not been adapted to Japan, from paying students so much per day for participating in sit-downs and lay-downs, to compromising the professional future of students by unnecessary exposure in order to close all avenues of work for them except some kind of party activity. Everyone seems to deplore the activities of the Zengakuren, but no alternative has been developed. The field is pretty much left to its activities. The general attitude is that all students are radical when young but become conservative when they grow older: Therefore, there is nothing to worry about. There is some truth to this, of course, but it overlooks some crucial differences which exist between student radical movements of the past and present, and certain distinctive features of Japanese society and economy which make the character of Japanese education a weighty factor in determining whether Japan is to remain free.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY HON. ANTONY HEAD

The Communist today is a fervent and passionate believer that the future world can only be made safe and can only be well run if it is a Communist world. There is nothing wicked in believing that; it is part of communism, and we shall not eliminate that by summit talks or the kind of discussions which the Prime Minister is having. Nobody would think that.

It would be just as well for the Hansard reporters to ask the honorable and learned Member for Northampton (Mr. Paget) to speak faster. I am not being insulting; it is a part of him. It is the same way with communism. It is an integral part of communism. That conviction and missionary zeal in the 13 years between 1946 and now have led to a territorial expansion of the influence of communism which is almost unparalleled in world history, and it has been achieved without a single Russian soldier firing a shot.

In the 1920's and 1930's, the French created the maginot line, a vast complex of antitank obstacles, antitank guns, machine guns, artillery concentrations, searchlights, and so forth. Military critics and pundits of the day, as some honorable members will remember, said that the strength of defense had outrun the attack. No names, but that is what they said. Many people said it, and many people drew great comfort from it.

What happened? The maginot line was completely outflanked by a new technique—the deep penetration of armor supported by aircraft. The line hardly fired a shot or

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16589

played any part. What I am suggesting to the House of Commons today is this: May not our undue concentration purely on weapons, and atomic weapons, if it is pressed too far, become our kind of maginot line? I am not saying that it is not necessary, because, until some form of disarmament takes place, a deterrent is vital. But, do we not concentrate too much on it? May it not be that our discussions in these defense debates, ignore and disregard some other but vital form of defense? What might that be?

Mr. F. J. BELLENGER (Bassetlaw). The right honorable gentleman is making a very interesting speech. He has told us that the maginot line was turned or outflanked, whereas these other weapons he talks about will go over the line. The maginot line was turned and then consolidated by ground forces.

Mr. HEAD. I am trying to suggest that NATO and the atomic weapon may be outflanked by some technique against which we have little or no defense. That is all I am trying to suggest.

I was going on to ask, What does all this lead up to? At this stage I should like to make a flat statement to the House that will explain quite clearly what I am driving at. It is my belief, rightly or wrongly, that if things continue as they are now, if the trend of events continues and we do nothing to stem it, within 10 years, or maybe less, the vast majority of southeast Asia, the Middle East, and central and northern Africa will either be under Communist governments, or will, politically and economically, have their affiliations to the East rather than the West.

I am saying that as a rather blunt affirmation, and honorable Members may say, "Well, maybe, but what of it?" Again I maintain that if southeast Asia, the Middle East, and that part of Africa go Communist, it is my belief that the Commonwealth and Western Europe will be so weakened, strategically, economically, and morally, that it will start a decline which may prove irreparable for the West.

Honorable Members may think that that is an exaggeration, but may I quote on my own behalf the Communists themselves? They are extremely frank, just like Hitler was, about policy, doctrine, and methods. The central tenet for communism today is that the way for communism to overthrow the West is by an alliance with the revolutionary trends in the dependent and colonial territories. That is the central theme. That is what they have been doing, and, what is more, are doing today.

Honorable Members may well say, "Why do you suddenly come out with that view in a defense debate?" I have had the advantage, through circumstances, that during the last 2 years I have not had very much to do, and I have had time to think, which I know is extremely difficult for the front bench. [Honorable Members: "Hear, hear."] I am saying that quite seriously, because it is a problem with which every Minister is confronted. I have had time to read something of the theory and practice of communism, and in the last 2 years I have visited southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa.

As a result of that, there has grown within me an increasing conviction that we are losing the ideological war—the battle for men's minds. Look at southeast Asia, Indonesia, Indo-China, Ceylon, where the Communists are working, or Singapore, with an 80 percent Chinese population. SEATO does not really cater for the ideological question. Consider the Middle East, Syria, Iraq, and the Yemen, where the Russians are building a port which will be very handy for causing trouble.

Turn to Africa, where I was told that there was very little progress in the field of communism. But in Czechoslovakia there is a very large school for young Africans to

learn about Marxism and subversion, and in Russia itself scores of Russians are learning African dialects and about the geographical and economic problems of Africa. Again, at the Accra conference, the advice of the Russians to the African delegates was, "Get rid of the Europeans. Demand universal suffrage. If, industrially or economically, you suffer any deprivation because they have gone we will make it good, and you can run the show yourselves." In all these areas, there is from Russia central direction, efficient weapons for the ideological war—propaganda, books, intelligence, all perfected by experience, and proved by success.

If one contrasts this aspect of defense, or whatever you may call it—and I believe it is a highly important part of defense—with the efforts of the West, what do we find? Whereas in NATO we have achieved unity, both of purpose and policy, in southeast Asia, the Middle East and Africa, we find the West in very ragged disarray. We find no unity of policy, and we find that the weapons for conducting the ideological war are inefficient, out of date, inadequate and too few.

What I have been saying may sound alarmist, or it may perhaps sound exaggerated, but what I want to ask the House is: When does the House of Commons ever discuss this subject? Does it come into defense, is it a question of foreign affairs, of colonial policy, of Commonwealth relations? The answer is that it forms part of all of these, but, as a whole, it passes us by. We never discuss it. This is a quiet and insidious war, and as its victories occur, we are apt to look upon them as sudden events, rather than the consequence of a long and deliberate policy.

It is no good our expecting the Russians to stop this. Unfortunately, it is part of their belief and, unless we are willing to accept that these new and young independent countries now growing up are all going into the Communist ideology we have got to convince them that our way of freedom, and our attitude to man and his liberties and rights are the best. It will be a tragedy if, one after another, these countries go over to a political and ideological doctrine which everyone in the West, including I think, almost every honorable Member, believed to be fundamentally disastrous and wrong.

Yet, can one sit back and answer that we are doing enough in this field. Is our machine good enough? Have we got a policy? It is all very well for me to talk like this, but I feel that the questions I have put oblige me to make some proposals about what should be done. I do not despair in this respect, because we have many assets on our side. The combined economic and industrial strength of the West is infinitely greater than that of Russia. The amount now being poured out in terms of aid and economic and technical assistance is very great.

However, it is scrappy, bitty, uncoordinated, and lacks unity or planning. We also have on our side the indestructible faith of many of these young nations in a God and that is one of the greatest counters to the spread of communism. Furthermore, there is our own faith in free institutions, a faith which we should be able to spread. What, then, can now be done to stop the trend of events which I believe to be slowly leading us toward a major defeat which could end disastrously for the West?

First, and perhaps most important, is unity of policy and aim by the West as a whole. Perhaps the key to that is the attitude of our strongest partner, the United States. There is still a strong feeling of anticolonialism in the United States. I have talked to Americans and found that some still think that it is a good thing that the British should be getting out of these

areas, for the Americans do not approve of colonialism.

Let us leave colonialism out of the argument for a moment. I am not advocating a reactionary policy of sitting it out in these areas with hundreds of soldiers. I agree that these countries must be led to independence, but they must not be suddenly given independence when they are administratively incapable of running themselves and are, educationally, all but illiterate. That is not only a very feeble way out of our responsibilities, but is a way to hand these people, for whom we have done so much in the past, into a state which is bound to lead to tyranny and probably to communism. Premature democracy can lead to disaster.

We, must, therefore, convince America, which we are surely capable of doing, that the United States is just as much concerned with these territories as we are. Let the West adopt a policy of gradually leading these nations to independence when administratively and educationally they are ready to "make a go" of it. If we can convince America that domination of all these areas by communism would be disastrous to the eventual defense of Western civilization, we would have gone a long way.

Having done that, we must have a policy for both southeast Asia and Africa which is a common policy of the West. Again, do not all honorable members agree that our own policy in southeast Asia and Africa—and within these areas what happens in one small country interacts on the other—is very bitty? We have the Commonwealth Relations Office here, the Colonial Office there, the Foreign Office there, three busy Ministers, three separate departments and coordination for the areas as a whole.

The same argument applies internationally. Having evolved a policy for those areas, we should take action to convince all the countries agitating for immediate independence that we mean business and that we are bringing in our educational schemes and improvements of native states, but that we will not be bounced into giving them premature independence. From the point of view of the West, I would rather see a £5 million education scheme for Kenya than a couple of Blue Streaks.

Having got a policy—and I know that I am asking a lot—we have to start to implement it. This must be done by a regional organization smaller, but in its effect, equivalent to NATO. It would deal with southeast Asia and Africa—although not as large and not a military organization like NATO. Such an organization would have to be above party, as is NATO. We must not allow the organization to feel that a change of government will result in a change of policy. I do not believe that any honorable Member opposite believes in giving premature and sudden independence to backward and illiterate countries and thereby cause that state of anarchy and chaos which is the most likely field for communism. What might so well happen after premature independence is that a Czechoslovakian-trained African would become Home Secretary and obtain control of the police and before we knew where we were the "People's Free Party" would be dominated by the Communists. That can well be a result of going too fast.

Mr. ELLIS SMITH (Stoke-on-Trent, South). It has not happened with India.

Mr. HEAD. I am sorry not to be able to take up that interjection, but I am trying to sustain a complicated argument.

I do not believe that this is a party matter. It is something for Western civilization as a whole. I know that it is difficult, but if we achieve some international cooperation among the countries of the West there are, in addition, several domestic matters to be considered. There is a striking similarity in the criticisms and complaints which one

16590

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 26

hears in southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. I know that people always complain about Whitehall but these are too similar to be disregarded. First, I feel strongly that a person or a committee of great capacity and strength should overhaul the whole of our intelligence organization.

This subject has been raised in endless debates and we can all recall debates when we were assured that Kenya was sound—just before Mau Mau; that Cyprus was sound, when we were getting out of Egypt; that all was well in Iraq. The latest example has been that of Cuba. It is clear that our intelligence organization must be overhauled. If we want a policy to make sense in oversea countries, if we want even our propaganda to succeed we must know what is going on in those countries; and I am far from satisfied that we do.

Do our security arrangements make sense? I mention that because when the young Africans in the Czechoslovakian schools have finished learning about Marxism and subversion, and so on, they are allowed to go back to their homes in Africa. I am all for liberal institutions, but that is going a bit far. Are we right in allowing Marxist-trained agitators to return to areas where we have trouble enough?

Viscount HINCINGBROOKE (Dorset, South). What about the London School of Economics?

Mr. HEAD. It may be that the noble Lord will have something more to say about that if he has an opportunity to speak. The London School of Economics is not to be compared with the considerable numbers going to Africa from Czechoslovakia. To give agitators passports does not make sense. Our security arrangements are not good enough.

It was curious that the three soldiers who went to areas where there was trouble, Templer, Erskine, and Harding, all reported unanimously, though separately, that intelligence, security, and police were weak and not good enough.

What about our propaganda? Everywhere I have gone I have been told that our case is going by default. There is nothing easier than criticizing propaganda, and I know that the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster has been all over the world trying to improve our propaganda. But is he not propping up a rickety building? Do we not want a radical overhaul of our propaganda arrangements if we are to put our case across? This is a matter which should be treated as urgent, something which requires men of brains.

I believe that it is now inclined to be the mark of a "dud" that he should go into propaganda. That was not the case during the war. In the ideological battle propaganda is of vital importance.

Finally, somebody ought to be thinking about this whole question. Who is the minister of defense for the ideological war? Who is thinking about the battle for men's minds? Ministers are desperately busy; they have their departments and their day-to-day business. The Prime Minister is very busy. Who is watching this matter and thinking about it?

I am not suggesting a new Minister, or anything like that. What I am suggesting is that a committee or individual should be charged with thinking about, meeting and coordinating this vital question, and that should happen not only here but with our other partners in the Western World. I appreciate very much the difficulties, especially when everybody is busy, in starting up something of this kind and putting the proposals into effect, but if we do nothing, if things go on drifting like this, who in this House can deny that we are losing the battle for men's minds, who can say that we are giving ourselves a chance in this field? I do not think that anybody can. Who can feel

that the West as a whole has any unity of policy in this respect? I believe it to be thoroughly inadequate.

All I can ask of those who have been good enough to listen to me is that those who are unconvinced might pause to think whether or not there may not be something in what I say. If any American should read my speech—it is not very likely—I hope he may pause and wonder whether there is something in what I say. In my maiden speech—I do not wish to be conceited; many things in my past speeches do not bear repetition, as the hon. Member for Dudley has demonstrated—I said that it was of vital importance for the world—this was in 1945—that America should realize that what happened in the Middle East was just as intimate a concern of hers as what happened in the Middle West. Today, what happens in Africa and southeast Asia is of intimate concern in the long run to the United States and to the West as a whole.

We on both sides of the House, on this subject which we hardly ever discuss, are really the trustees for the future. In my opinion, the next 10 years will be decisive. If we do something about it, I think that we have no cause for despair, but if we delay, and things drift on and go from bad to worse, no amount of belated exertion and effort afterward will ever be able to put things to right.

DOCUMENTS OF COUNCIL AGAINST COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(By Bertram D. Wolfe)

(Text of lecture by Mr. Bertram D. Wolfe on "The Enemies of the Open Society: The Ideological-Philosophical Vulnerabilities of Communism" at National Strategy Seminar, The National War College, Washington, D.C., on July 21, 1959.)

I am to talk on the psychological and philosophical vulnerabilities of communism.

Vulnerability implies an alert and determined opponent, ready to take advantage of every weakness and every opening. Only then do weaknesses and inconsistencies become vulnerabilities.

But because this determination and this readiness are today lacking, I think that my very subject is a misnomer.

The Communists know that they are engaged in what Strausz-Hupe and his associates have called a "protracted war." They know that they are engaged in a war to the finish, a war for the world. Every separate issue, every negotiation, every conference, every utterance, they regard as a move in that war, whereas for us in the West each is treated as a separate concrete issue to be settled once and for all in order that we may relax.

We aim to persuade our opponents that our intentions are friendly. We aim to reassure—and I am quoting—"We aim to reassure the Soviets as to their security."

We aim to trade concessions which in practice means only to give away positions which we possess, so that the other side which offers nothing in exchange, can renew the battle from a more advantageous position.

As historian Gibbon wrote on the fall of Byzantium, "Persuasion is the resource of the feeble; and the feeble can seldom persuade."

We are not feeble. Actually, America is at this moment stronger economically, stronger in its military position, and the free world is stronger than the opponent that is determined to destroy us.

But we are acting as if we were acting from feebleness, thus endangering peace by making the other side underestimate our strength and luring them, without intending to lure them, into some folly of attack. Thus, the very moves we make to preserve the peace of the world are moves which in my judgment profoundly endanger the peace of the world.

Insofar as we act as if we were weak, and as if our task were to persuade the unpersuadable, to settle that which cannot be settled, instead of to win the war that the Kremlin is waging upon us, a war that is stepped up even when they are our allies, as they were in 1943—insofar as this is so, insofar as we have permitted them to divide the world into their "peace" zone, where we may not and do not intervene, and our "war" zone, where the entire world and the United Nations and they also may intervene, to that extent it is not they who are vulnerable, but it is we who are proving vulnerable.

In short, I would be less than honest, gentlemen, if I delivered to you today a cheerful, reassuring talk on the vulnerabilities of communism when every Soviet expert worthy of the name is filled with gloom at our incapacity and unwillingness to use the openings which their system has provided, does provide, and will continue to provide.

What we need, first of all, is an understanding of this universal, unitary, unending war to the finish.

Second, we need a revolutionary strategy, to put the revolutionary forces of our time at our disposal and deny to them their use and exploitation. Only then will their system prove more vulnerable than ours, as potentially it is.

With this caveat in mind, let us examine, first, their theoretical foundations and, second, their strategic and tactical vulnerabilities, insofar as the time permits the examination of these two subjects.

I. THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION—MARXISM

The theoretical foundation lies in something called Marxism. So I will examine, first, the self-refuting inconsistencies in Marxism and its prophecies refuted by history.

1. The prophecies

A hundred years ago, Marx undertook to lay bare "the law of motion" of industrial society in a work called "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy"—exactly a hundred years old at this moment. And 110 years ago, a decade earlier, Marx and Engels issued their call to arms in the "Communist Manifesto" with its dogmatic pronouncements and apocalyptic expectations. Those 110 years have not dealt kindly with Marxist predictions and have mocked and refuted the very "law of motion" which he claimed to have discovered.

The heart of those works was an expectation of an early apocalypse. The world was headed toward immediate and total catastrophe.

In 1848 this catastrophe was only days or, at most, weeks away. It would come with the next street skirmish. Before the year was up it was to come with the next war, which would come within the year.

When it came neither with the street skirmishes nor with the wars which Marx advocated, then he decided it would come with the next downswing in the business cycle.

The apocalypse failed to appear.

The second startling thing about the Communist Manifesto which aimed to be the program for the Revolution of 1848 is that it prophesied the end of nationalism, yet 1848 was the greatest explosion of nationalism in the history of Europe.

And now, in the 20th Century, two world wars and their revolutionary aftermaths have proved that nationalism is the one great cause for which millions are ready to fight and die.

It has spread from Europe, which was its home, to Asia, and Africa, which knew not the nation in Marx's time. National feeling provides great vulnerabilities in the Soviet empire if we have the wit to exploit them, and provides great vulnerabilities for the free world in Asia and Africa because the men in the Kremlin do have the wit to ex-

1960

16591

plot the nationalism which they themselves in the "Communist Manifesto" said was on the way out or was already out.

The third prophesy of Marx dealt with the increasing polarization of society. It treated industrial society in mythical Hegelian terms as a system, all the parts of which were so connected that no change could be made in it; the system could not be improved, reformed; evolved; it could only be scrapped. The defects were treated as integral to the system and incapable of being removed defect by defect, and replaced by other structures or circumstances, but only shattered, replaced by another system.

The special mission was assigned by Marx to the working class to do the shattering. When this did not come immediately as the "Communist Manifesto" anticipated, Marx began his long work to give a "scientific"—the words are his—a scientific foundation to this expectation of the apocalypse.

"Das Kapital" has this as its function. The book is strangely constructed so that most of it consists of empirical evidence, striking descriptions of the workings of industrial society, drawn from the England of Marx's day, or rather the England of the day before Marx's day.

He took most of the evidence from the parliamentary blue books, of a parliament that had already investigated the evils of early industrialism and was busy regulating, moderating, reforming, and removing the evil excrescences of industrialization. His book thus gives overwhelming evidence of this moderating and reforming, as he himself is compelled finally to conclude somewhere in the latter part of it. When he is discussing the achievement of the 10 hours law, regulation of child labor, and other such achievements of the England of his day, he writes: "Capital is under compulsion from society." (What then happens to classes and the class struggle?)

"Capital is under compulsion from society. The factory magnates have resigned themselves to the inevitable. The power of resistance of capital has gradually weakened. The power of attack of the working class has grown with the number of its allies. Hence, the comparatively rapid advance since 1860."

If you read Marx's "Capital" as an empirical student should read it, the overwhelming evidence of the blue books drives you, as it drove him, to this conclusion. Yet when you come to the last chapter, "the last for which the first was made," a chapter called "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation," you find that capital came into the world, conceived in original sin, "a congenital bloodstain on its cheek, dripping with blood and dirt from head to foot, from every pore."

And it is destined to leave it now in a fearful cataclysm, a day of wrath and doom, by the workings of "the imminent laws of capitalist production itself."

"One capitalist kills many;" all other classes are destined to be proletarianized; and, as if by mitosis, society is to be polarized. "Along with the constantly diminishing number of magnates of capital * * * grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this grows too the revolt of the working class. * * * The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production. Centralization of the means of production, and socialization of labor, at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

Thus the conclusion of 1848 is tacked on again after the mass of empirical material to the contrary which makes up the bulk of the volume. For this it was not necessary to study the parliamentary blue books, for this is a conclusion of 1844 to 1848.

Such has been the perversity of history that she has in the countries of advanced industry not vouchsafed the revolution Marx expected, but has vouchsafed revolutions which invoke Marx's name only in underdeveloped countries on the eve of industrialization or just having begun it, in countries shaken by the impact of the West's economy and equality upon autocratic institutions which Marx regarded not as pre-socialist but as prebourgeoisie or non-bourgeoisie.

2. Industrial society not at the end but the beginning of its development

Another thing which would startle Marx were he to be resurrected today is the succession of industrial revolutions which followed his "industrial revolution." He knew the development from cottage artisanship to manufacture, from the use of wind and water and animal and manpower to the use of steam power. This was the industrial revolution that Marx studied.

But the industrial revolution is unending. He thought that industrial society had reached "the end of its development" in 1848 when he delivered its doom so stirring. Actually it was but at the beginning of the development of its productive forces.

Since then have come the age of electricity, of conveyor belt, combustion engine, synthetic chemistry, electronics, automation, fission, fusion; and the end is nowhere in sight, unless atomic war should bring a cataclysm indeed, but not Marx's cataclysm.

3. Not polarization but depolarization

The society which he thought was to polarize until it had reached the breaking point of total polarization has actually been depolarizing. Intermediate classes have not disappeared; they have multiplied. The industrial proletariat has not become the whole of society, except for the little handful of magnates at the opposite pole, but it has lost in numerical weight in society while it has gained in status and in economic and political power.

Classes have become more fluid and more equalized. Not merely in comparatively classless America but in once caste-ridden England and France and Germany as well.

In America, absurdly Marx would think, one man, woman, and child in every eight is today a stockholder in the great corporations which he thought were going to provide the little "handful" of capitalists to be destroyed.

Main Street frequently exercises more power than Wall Street, and labor and farmers have more influence on legislation than corporation executives or bankers. The latter could only fume impotently and curse "that man in the White House" while we went through the tremendous revolution in our society known as the New Deal. And even the "owning class" was divided in its attitude.

The state thus has proved refractory to Marxist prophesies. In place of becoming an executive committee of a shrinking bourgeoisie, as he described it, it has been increasingly democratized, subjected to pressure of the labor vote, the farm vote, and the intermediate class votes, even to the pressure of strategically located minorities such as the Negroes in the big cities of the North.

Out of labor's influence on government, and out of the classless pressure of the whole of society, has come a state regulation of economic life, a legal limitation of the hours of work, a minimum wage, collective bargaining, the legislated right to organize, and a whole sweep of social security legislation.

"The state," as the French Socialist Deat wrote, "has undergone a process of socialization, while socialism has undergone a process of nationalization."

4. The growing supremacy of politics over economics

In Marx's day there was a general superstition of which Marx was the most prominent advocate but which was general for most of the leading thinkers of his age: the superstition that "economics determines politics." In the 20th century even a halfwit—Hitler was a halfwit, in a sense—has discovered that politics tends to determine economics. In fact, totalitarianism is, from this angle, an attempt totally to determine the economic and social structure of society by putting one's hand on the powerful political lever, the lever of unified, centralized, and exclusive power.

Thus what has happened to the economy is that it has been increasingly politicalized. Moreover, the whole notion of an autonomous economy, with its own autonomic laws, on which Marx based himself, and on which Marx's opponents in the middle 19th century based themselves no less, all this has become obsolete and revealed itself as no longer a workable hypothesis. In its place has come the increasing social and political regulation of the economy. Politics determines economics through tariffs, protectionism, quotas of export and import, currency regulation and manipulation, regulation of the interest rate, deficit spending, price floors, price ceilings, parities, subsidies, state fostering of cartelization as in Germany, state persecution or prosecution of cartelization as in our antitrust acts in the United States, supranational economies like Benelux, the "inner six Common Market," the "outer seven free trade area," and all the other supra-national economies that are beginning to grow up. And in vast areas of the world there is total politicalization and autarky. Not a word of what Marx has written as helpful in approaching the problems of this, our era.

Whether these features which I have just enumerated so swiftly are to be welcomed or to be feared, they have surely produced a world which makes the projections of Marx and the projections of his 19th century opponents alike irrelevant.

5. The worker rejects his mission

Unkindest cut of all, the worker himself has not consented to being increasingly proletarianized, increasingly impoverished, and having thrust upon him the mission with which Marx endowed him.

If the worker has engaged in a class struggle, the struggle of his class has been to put off from himself this increasing proletarianization and impoverishment and this mission which Marx has conferred upon him.

In this struggle the workers have displayed stubbornness, tirelessness, courage, selfishness, solidarity, skill, incapacity to recognize when they are defeated, and the power to enlist the sympathy of the rest of society in fighting off this prophetic destiny and this prophetic assignment.

Unlike the intellectuals who offered them socialist leadership, they have no stomach for being reduced to naught, the better to prepare themselves for becoming all.

To win the suffrage on the continent of Europe, to influence and exert control over government, to legalize and contractualize improvements in the hours of their lives that are spent in labor, to win some security and dignity within the system in which they lived, to becoming "something" in the world in which they have their being, not "everything" in the world which exists only in the fantasy of the utopians, of whom Marx was perhaps the greatest—it is to these aims that they have rallied. For this they have fought their struggle, and to these aims they have succeeded in rallying most of modern society as a whole.

Those who "being naught were to become all," having become something, the whole scheme loses its tidy outlines.

Thus, the flaw in the foundation itself, the theory on which communism claims to build, lies in the fact that a hundred years of subsequent history have reduced every theoretical tenet of Marxism to a shambles.

6. Marxism as an ism

Insofar as it has claimed to be a science, it is dead. Marx and Engels in their last years were uncomfortably aware of this, and were beginning an uneasy and reluctant patching or revising of their dogmas. But after their death the revisionists who followed were outlawed and condemned, and ceased to be Marxists, and those who claimed to be Marxists survived only with the aid of the frozen orthodoxy of a dogmatic creed no longer subject to scientific examination or revision.

Indeed, however, in this lies the strength and the staying powers of Marxism after Marxism as a "science" has proved itself bankrupt. As a science, it has produced only invalid results, but it is also an "ism"—Marxism. You note that there is no "Lockeism," no "Smithism," "Millism," "Durckheimism," "Micheletism," "Rankeism" or "Gibbonism," but there is a Marxism. And this is a fundamental difference which we must strive to understand.

Besides having claimed to be a science, it has been a creed which can be clung to by faith when the intellect questions and rebels.

Unfortunately, therefore, Marxism can be refuted by intellect talking to intellect, but the strength of the movement itself, of Marxism as such, lies not in the realm of ideas but in the realm of emotions. It is an ersatz religion, and this is harder to reach with rational argument.

7. The world revolution of our time

Though the Marxist revolution never occurred, nor is it ever likely to, we do indeed live in an age of revolution, an age of revolution which began before Marx' time and which will outlast the time of every man who is facing me today.

It is not the revolution which Marx predicated, nor did it grow from the seeds which he sowed. His theory was but one of the misunderstandings of this revolution. The West's rapid expansion to all the continents of the world upset all the world's surviving civilizations. Western society planted everywhere the seeds of its own creativeness, its own problems, and its own dissensions.

We are in the midst of a world revolution in the true sense. The Communists did not create it, but they study ceaselessly to utilize it for the spread of their power and for the destruction of ours. We did create it. But we do not try to understand or to utilize it, nor to aid it in finding new forms of abundance and of freedom. The Communists seek to give neither abundance to the mass nor freedom. What they propose to do is to extend their power and their zone; to set up regimes of specialized productivity for power and for war, and not regimes of plenty or of freedom; to link the revolutionary forces afoot in the world to their war for the winning of the world.

Whoever harnesses the forces of this revolution which the West has set in motion yet has not striven to understand; whoever manages to put these forces in politics and economics, in science and technology, in all fields of life to its use, and to deny them to its opponent, that side will win the struggle for the world.

Insofar as the Communists are doing just that and we are not, they are slowly winning the war and will continue to win the war which will occupy the rest of our century, and therefore as I said in opening, in spite of the inconsistencies, cruelties, and absurdities of their system, the balance of vulnerability has been swinging from their side to ours.

II. THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS—LENINISM

In the remaining time I want to say a word about Leninism. I will define Leninism, I think accurately and truly for the purposes of this discussion, as the strategy and tactics for waging this war which I have been describing, and utilizing the revolutionary forces afloat in the world for the purposes of building totalitarian single-party power throughout the world.

Leninism claims to be Marxism. But the "Marxism"—as Lenin put it, or as Stalin put it—"of the period of imperialism, world war, and world revolution" Leninism claims to be Marxism yet in all essential respects it has stood Marxism on its head as Marx claims to have stood Hegelianism on its head.

Marx: Economics determines politics. Lenin (and Hitler, too): Politics determines economics.

Marx: Revolution comes after capitalism has reached its pinnacle and comes first in the most advanced countries.

Lenin: Revolution comes first where capitalism is weakest, a theory of "the break in the system at the point of its weakest link."

Marx: The revolution will come first in England; or perhaps Germany or France.

Lenin: The revolution comes first in Russia, where capitalism is weakest, and then we carry the revolution to advanced Europe, or failing in that, to Asia and Africa from backward Russia in order to deny to the advanced countries their outlets and markets, cut them off from the backward part of the world, and cut the undeveloped countries off from them.

Marx: The working class is destined to develop its own consciousness, its own theory, its own organization, its own party, and its own revolution. Lenin: The working class left to itself is capable only of bourgeois thought. Not the "bourgeois-minded and vacillating" working class but a revolutionary elite, a classless vanguard party, is the guardian of the working class. It dictates to the working class. It rules over the working class—and all other classes. It uses the working class as a battering ram because the urban working class is the most unified and concentrated, but it uses the peasantry as a battering ram too, and it tries to use discontent in all classes. And piling up the discontents, it aims to put in power not the working class but its own elite vanguard nonclass party.

If this is so, of course you can make a revolution in a backward country where the working class is not ripe, and this vanguard party can profess to be establishing a dictatorship in the name of the proletariat where the proletariat is only beginning to come into existence. Or you can go to China and use the peasantry as the battering ram. And when you have seized the scepter of power you can claim that you have the dictatorship of a proletariat which does not yet exist.

Or in Vietnam—where is the proletariat of Vietnam? Ho Chi Minh, dictator in the name of a dictatorship of a nonexistent proletariat through a nonexistent party of the proletariat, dictates over a society which is not only not socialist but is still pre-capitalist in its character.

Leninism can be understood first, as a strategy and tactics for the conquest of power;

Second, for the holding and expansion of power;

Third, for the making of that power absolute and total;

Fourth, as a prescription for the building of a party designed for the seizure and holding of power;

Fifth, as a strategy and tactics—and that is the way I have defined it today—for the utilization of the discontents, the unrests, the disturbances and the revolutionary

forces which the West has set afloat in the world, their utilization to the end of subverting and destroying all that the West stands for, and all that the West dreams of.

It is a revolutionary strategy for the winning of the world and for the remaking of man according to Lenin's blueprint. As such it is, of course, highly vulnerable if there is standing over against it an alert, determined and watchful opponent, ready to utilize the revolutionary situations and strategies and really contest for the leadership of the forces set free by Western civilization itself.

III. THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

The Russian revolution is now over 40 years old. In the four decades that this new power has existed and become total, all of its original promises have turned into their opposites. Here is where an alert opponent would find more vulnerabilities than he would know what to do with if it were really on the job.

1. It promised "land to the peasants" but in the end it took away even the land which the peasants had under the czars, and it herded him into a new state-owned serfdom.

2. It promises "perpetual peace." But instead it has produced a totalitarian state which wages forever a twofold war, a war on its own people to remake them according to its blueprint, and a war upon the world.

And I don't mean the word "war" figuratively but literally. When it wages war on its own people, it is a real war, a war of nerves, a war of quarantine (the Iron Curtain), a war of propaganda, of agitation, of conditioning, of psychological warfare, of physical warfare, of prisons, of concentration camps, of bombardment by loudspeakers and press and movies and all the means of cultural conditioning and when necessary a bullet in the base of the brain.

At the same time it has used this war upon own people to keep them on a mobilization footing for unending war for the winning of the world.

3. It promised "production for use," that is, for the sake of the consumer and consumers' goods, but instead it has set up production for production's sake, for the sake of expanding the oppressive power of the producer-owner state.

4. It promised plenty, and it has produced perpetual scarcity of all the goods that make life gracious, pleasant, easy, cultured, rewarding, full of promise and possibility.

5. The state that was to wither away has expanded to totality. "Every cook was to become master of the affairs of the state," now the state is the master of the affairs of every cook.

6. It promised freedom, and it has abolished all freedoms.

7. It promised the workers paradise, and has immured its people behind an impenetrable wall and turned their country into a prison for their thoughts and for their very lives, which cannot be penetrated by learning what happens on the outside, nor by the freedom to discuss what is happening to themselves on the inside.

8. It has raised the banner of national self-determination and anti-imperialism, but it has become the most aggressive, the most oppressive, the most rapidly expanding imperialist power in the whole history of man.

Thus—and I have named only a few of these potential vulnerabilities—all the revolutionary slogans which Lenin sought to use and which the Kremlin uses today against all existing peoples, governments and institutions, could easily be turned by a determined opponent, in tune with our age and ready to use revolutionary strategy, into weapons in our hands. Their hands would prove nerveless and lifeless if we would but grasp the weapons which they are using

against us and which are not theirs by right but by right can be made to belong to us, for they are indeed our weapons.

We, not they, are today the advocates of genuine agrarian reform and the right of each man to till his own land. There is no country in the world more badly in need of agrarian reform than the U.S.S.R. itself.

We, not they, are the advocates of a just and enduring peace, based on the respect for the rights and the existence of all nations in being or aborning or yet to be.

We, not they, are the champions of the rights and freedoms of workingmen, the freedom of movement, the freedom to change jobs, and freedom to build organizations of their own choosing under their own control, the right to elect their own officials, to formulate and negotiate their own demands, the right to strike, the right to vote for a party and a program and candidates of their own choice.

We, and not they, are able to call the armies to "fraternize across the trenches" for it is they who must cut off their armies from the news of what is happening in the West. And we who must make our armies and theirs understand what is happening in their land.

We, not they, are the champions of the freedom of the human spirit, of the freedom of the arts and sciences, freedom of conscience, freedom of belief and worship, freedom from scarcity and want, and from the tyranny of irresponsible and omnipotent officials.

Though in all these things the free world presents its own imperfections and lapses, these are the things that the free world stands for and in good measure realized, and these are the things which totalitarianism completely destroys and makes high treason even to think upon.

In the battle for the future shape of the world, all the creative and explosive weapons are in our hands if we have the wit and the understanding to take them up. If no, then there are not psychological or ideological vulnerabilities of communism. If yes, they are vulnerable on every front and at every moment and in every layer of their society.

Whether the answer to this question is "Yes" or "No," this will determine, in my judgment, the outcome of the protracted war that is likely to occupy the rest of our lives and the rest of our century.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his splendid presentation of the need for the creation of a Freedom Commission and the establishment of a Freedom Academy. The eloquence and the dedication to this cause of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut are in keeping with his longstanding, tireless leadership in the fight against international communism.

Probably no Member of the U.S. Senate in all its history has more ably or penetratingly disclosed the dangers of the Communist conspiracy. Time and time again, over a period of many years, he was called attention with vigor and eloquence to the dangers which exist to us in this field.

Certainly, the Senator from Connecticut is not fooled by the attempts of the Communists, and certainly he is aware of the dangers we face. He recognizes the menace for what it is—an atheistic attempt to take over the entire world.

I only regret that the eloquence of the distinguished Senator today appears to be so futile, because there seems to be so little chance that action will be taken and completed at this session on his Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy proposal.

Certainly it should be clear to all of us that there is a great need to train and educate all of our people on the aims, objectives, and tactics of international communism. As Vice President NIXON said only recently, it is imperative for us to understand the enemy and his goals, in order to be able to counter his efforts.

Establishment of a Freedom Academy, to develop the science of combating the world Communist conspiracy and to train and develop leaders for all-out political war, would certainly be in keeping with the Vice President's views in this field. Its objective of increasing awareness throughout the free world of the machinations of international communism and methods of responding to them should commend it to every Member of this body.

That is why I am so pleased the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has spotlighted the Freedom Commission idea so ably today. Eventual establishment of the Commission would be a lasting monument to him and to others who have so vigorously supported the Freedom Commission idea, and particularly to our distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and to our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who are the coauthors of this bill.

The bill is now on the calendar. It is Calendar No. 1832. The text of it has been placed in the RECORD by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut. It seems to me it merits early consideration. It was reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary on June 30, 1960. We have before us a resolution to tell the President he ought not to make recess appointments. That resolution was reported to the Senate on August 22, 1960. I feel we should take action at this session on this very important bill, which can be an effective instrument in the struggle against Communist aggression.

I congratulate the Senator from Connecticut for sounding the clarion call for action on this important piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am grateful for the tribute and the credit which my distinguished colleague has paid to me. I do not deserve it. I wish I were more humble, but I am afraid I like to be paid such compliments. However, as I have pointed out previously, it was the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in this body who hammered out this proposal, joined in the House

by Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, and Representative HERLONG, of Florida.

The Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Illinois have over the years been among the most consistent advocates of an intelligent anti-Communist policy. This bill is a tribute to their dedication and vision. I regret, particularly, that the Senator from Illinois—who ranks, in my opinion, as one of the greatest Senators of our time—is absent at this moment. I know how much the measure means to him and how much of himself he has given to it.

I do not want to mention more names, because if I do, I will leave someone out. But these are the men who brought the bill forward, these are the men who deserve the real credit. I want to make that clear. I am glad I had the opportunity to support the pioneering measure which they have initiated.

However, I wish to pay a special tribute to the group of dedicated young Americans in Orlando, Fla., under the leadership of Mr. Alan T. Grant, Jr., who first conceived of the idea of a Freedom Academy, and who have worked tirelessly and without any remuneration for almost 10 years to convert this concept into a reality. The country owes them a very great debt of gratitude.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the words of commendation from the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but, actually, he is altogether too modest in what he has had to say, because while it is true the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I are the coauthors of this bill in the Senate, it is likewise true that the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut has been a tower of strength in committee, where action was important and imperative, and where it was promptly forthcoming.

I know it was largely the persistence and the perspicacity of the Senator from Connecticut which brought the bill through the subcommittee and through the full committee, aided by my distinguished friend from New York, who has just had some very pleasant things to say about the proposed legislation, which means we now have it available for Senate action.

I join in the expression of the distinguished Senator from New York in the hope that before this extra session of the Senate concludes, we shall have enacted this legislation.

I would be hopeful that we could pass it with a very minimum of debate, and probably not over 1 hour's time overall, because I am convinced that merely to understand what this Freedom Commission, and Freedom Academy propose to do is to present a case so persuasive that it should pass the Senate without a single dissenting vote.

I am equally confident that the House, once we have acted, will act promptly, because, regardless of political party, we are all concerned about the great and growing threat of communism. We listen to long speeches and to debate about whether we have a missile gap, or a production gap, or some other kind of gap, but I do not think anyone will deny that the United States has a great

propaganda gap, from the standpoint of being in competition with the great espionage and propaganda network of the Communists. From the standpoint of sending agents effectively to represent the cause of communism overseas, the Soviets have done a greater and more comprehensive job in training skilled visitors to go abroad than we have in the free part of the world. It is to supply this great and glaring gap that this bill was devised and brought out of committee.

I cannot think of anything else that the Senate could do more worthwhile than to enact this legislation which the country needs, which is crying to be enacted, and which the free world needs. Certainly, there is no legislation before us now, and none on the agenda, which is more important.

I say this without a single implication of criticism of the Rules Committee or the Policy Committee, or whoever it is on the Democratic side that sets up the legislative agenda, and certainly with no implication of criticism of the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], because I have spoken with him within the last 48 hours, and he has told me he was going to try hard to get the Senate to act on the bill today, and if not today, tomorrow. I know when he says he is going to try hard, he gets things done, and when he tells anyone that he will try hard, he will try hard. Therefore I am as confident as I am hopeful that we are not going to let the mantle of this Congress come down on this session by reason of having failed to act when action is so important and when there is no controversy among the Members of our two parties, or within the parties, about the fact that we need to close the gap and to provide the means and the talent so we can do battle for freedom all over the world with greater effectiveness than the Communists do battle for their form of godless tyranny. To do that we must act favorably on this legislation before this session of Congress adjourns sine die. Otherwise this Congress will have failed in an important area of its public responsibility.

This legislation has been endorsed and supported by distinguished individuals:

Mr. C. D. Jackson, former cold war adviser to President Eisenhower.

Mr. Herbert Philbrick, well-known counteragent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who knows whereof he speaks out of bitter experience.

Mr. Arthur G. McDowell, prominent labor union official and executive secretary of the Council Against Communist Aggression, under whose aegis a meeting was held in Washington, where a great deal of enthusiasm and support was aroused for this legislation.

Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, highly recognized expert on Soviet affairs and a member of the faculty at Notre Dame University.

Dr. Stefan Possony, formerly associated with the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J., and a former faculty member at the National War College, and presently a professor at Georgetown University.

Dr. Possony speaks out of an abundance of experience when he tells us that in the field of psychological warfare we are already late in trying to close the gap with Russia, and that we are in great need of improved training and techniques in the field of psychological warfare. What we are doing in the War College to train our military leaders we must start doing through such means as this bill proposes in an effort to increase our efficiency in the field of training people in foreign policy in the techniques of the cold war, and in our colleges and schools. Here little has been done because we lack the means.

Then there are many publications which favor the legislation.

Several newspapers have editorialized favorably on this proposal, including the Hollywood (Calif.) Citizens News; the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune; the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner; the Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun; the New York City Daily News; the Tampa (Fla.) Tampa Tribune; the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel Star; and Life magazine, as well as a host of others. I mention these only to show the geographic spread.

Mr. President, we should also pay some tribute, it seems to me, in large measure to Mr. Alan Grant, Jr. Mr. Alan Grant, Jr., is a distinguished attorney from Orlando, Fla., who on his own since 1950 has been working in this field trying to establish in that delightful Florida city at least some small facsimile of what we hope to do in the National Capital in a big and important way. He has been an early and ardent advocate of this proposal to establish a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy.

I salute the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for carrying the flag, for being an engine of strength, for having moved the proposed legislation to the point where it is now ready for Senate action. All we need to do is to pass it, to send it to the House, and to have it passed there. I join the Senator, and I join the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] in expressing the hope that yet today, certainly yet this week, and most assuredly yet in this special session of Congress, we shall act in this area of our responsibility where action is so vitally imperative to our entire crusade for enduring peace with freedom and justice.

Every newspaper article brings that point clearer home. Every report from Cuba brings that clearer home. There is no reason for delay. Delay is dangerous. We must not continue to do nothing in an area where we should do a whole lot and where we should have done a whole lot more a long time ago.

I thank the Senator very much and I do hope we can get action on our Freedom Academy proposal. In sincerely believe it is a matter of vital importance to our way of life.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I have talked with the majority leader. He is very sympathetic toward getting the measure before the Senate, and is earnestly attempting to do so. I am very much encouraged.

I think we shall have it before us. At all times the majority leader has shown sympathetic interest in the problem and he has given us a great deal of help. It is important for that to be said for the Record.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I compliment the Senator for a fine speech and for his support of the measure.

I really rose, Mr. President, to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his kind reference to my colleague, the Representative from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], and to my warm friend, Mr. Alan Grant, of Orlando, who has literally devoted hundreds, if not thousands of hours to the development of this program.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STRAINS IN THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN RED CHINA AND THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week I drew attention to one of the most notable developments on the international landscape. I said before this body that the strains in the alliance between Red China and the Soviet Union have been increasing in recent years, and that in the last several weeks the differences have been quite dramatic.

When a dog bites a man, that is not news. But when a man bites a dog, that is news. Well, Mr. President, when the Soviets ban a Western publication, that is not news. But when they ban a Red Chinese publication, that is news. Further, when hundreds of Soviet technicians quite abruptly leave Red China, that, also, is news.

In the last week, a number of informed and balanced commentaries have been written about the Sino-Soviet tension, and I want to append them to my remarks.

I wish to reiterate my contention, Mr. President, that Red China and the Soviet Union are not about to split tomorrow. There are still strong bonds which attach the two Communist giants. But the tension is greatly increasing, and it is incumbent upon our Department of State to watch the relationship with great insight and sophistication so that our foreign policy may realistically take into account this dramatic new dimension to the cold war.

Since reference has been made today to the situation in Cuba and in Latin America, with reference to the tremendous growth of the Red Communist Chinese propaganda in the Latin American countries and in Africa, I wish to state that the main thrust of Communist infiltration in Africa today is not from Soviet Russia, but is from Communist China. The largest propaganda program today of the Communist ideology comes from Communist China in Latin America. We are seeing a dramatic de-