

January 24, 1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

897

Orthodox Church in Newark, who offered the moving prayer in commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. His eloquent words reflect the sentiments of the membership of the House of Representatives who annually pay tribute to the heroic Ukrainian people and pray for their deliverance from the cruel yoke of their oppressors.

Ukrainians have been most unfortunate in their modern history, and to a great extent their misfortune has stemmed from the geography of their beloved homeland. Placed almost squarely between Europe and Asia the Ukraine has found itself the gateway to Europe for the invaders from the East. As one of the richest granaries of Europe, its fertile soil has aroused the envy and avarice of neighboring peoples. For these reasons the country has been an arena of discord between the East and West.

In the continental struggles between contending civilizations, between the Asiatic East and European West, the fate of Ukraine has been conditioned by forces and factors over which its people could exercise little control. For centuries their country was overrun by conquering armies, and remained divided under alien rulers until 1918. Then, as the forces which had suppressed their nationalist spirit were overthrown, the Ukrainians seized the opportunity and proclaimed their political independence. That historic event took place on January 22, 45 years ago.

But the new state, from the time of its very birth in 1918, was surrounded by powerful forces of destruction, and was marked by its foes, especially by the Russian Communist regime, as ready prey. In 1920 the country was overrun by the Red Army and all Ukrainian opposition was subdued. That was the end of the short-lived Ukrainian National Republic.

Since then the people of Ukraine have been enduring their long national ordeal under the Soviet regime. The country has become part of the Soviet Union, and today more than 42 million Ukrainians are prisoners in their homeland. Of course, they cannot celebrate their great national holiday, their Independence Day. But those Ukrainians living in the free world, and especially Americans of Ukrainian descent in this great Republic, do so in the hope that some day and soon this Independence Day will be celebrated in a free and liberated Ukraine. I gladly join all freedom-loving Ukrainians in their wish that their cherished dream will be realized.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF HARTWELL POWER

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed allotment of power from the Government dam at Hartwell on the Savannah River is unfair and discriminates against the REA co-ops and other preference customers in the State of South Carolina. The Department of the Interior is

proposing to allot 50 percent of the Hartwell power to Georgia, 37½ percent to North Carolina, and only 12½ percent to South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, this means that Hartwell power would be wheeled right straight through western South Carolina into North Carolina, even to the borders of Virginia and Tennessee. This arbitrary plan or deal would establish a precedent and would create an unlimited service area. Under this plan, Hartwell power would be wheeled 125 miles, 150 miles, and even 200 miles away from the Hartwell damsite on the Savannah between South Carolina and Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress authorized the construction of Hartwell Dam. The Congress appropriated nearly \$100 million to build this gigantic project. We did so in order that this power might be made available to preference customers and thus be a yardstick for power rates in that area. I expected and intended, when I supported this project, that this power would go first to the preference customers in the immediate area, certainly no further than 100 and 125 miles from the dam.

The REA co-ops and municipalities in my district and throughout western South Carolina could use this power and are entitled to their fair share. Not one acre in North Carolina is flooded by Hartwell Reservoir. More acres are flooded in South Carolina than in Georgia. Under the Department of Interior plan, my people will not only lose tax revenue but will lose the advantages of cheap power. This is definitely wrong. If South Carolina would be allotted its fair share of Hartwell power, South Carolina consumers would save \$300,000 annually.

The REA has done an excellent job for the rural people of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see the great REA program in western South Carolina undermined by this capricious, arbitrary, and autocratic proposal. I hope the Department of Interior will revise this plan and give the REA municipalities of South Carolina a fair deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the Record a resolution of protest unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the Saluda River Electric Co-op.

#### MODERN COLONIALISM—HUNGARY FORGOTTEN?

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, since there have been so many arresting international problems of recent days, few people have noted the action of the U.N. in relation to the question of Hungary.

Instead of continuing to authorize the special mission of Sir Leslie Munro to investigate the Hungarian situation, as was done in the past, the matter of implementing the action of the U.N. in relation to investigating conditions in Hungary was referred to U Thant, the Secretary General, to take such action as should seem appropriate to him.

Among other reasons, it was suggested that some of our associates in the U.N. were becoming tired of having this question repeatedly brought before the bar of this international organization.

If this is true, it is a strange commentary, indeed, to find that questions of oppression and tyranny can lose their immediacy with the passage of a few months.

A trenchant editorial on this subject appeared in the Waterbury, Conn., American on January 7, 1963, and in the interest of further circulation of this excellent statement, I am appending this editorial hereafter.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Jan. 7, 1963]

#### HUNGARY FORGOTTEN?

With world attention presently focused on the Congo, few people will have noted that the United Nations has apparently tossed in the towel in the matter of Hungary.

It was in 1956 that a resolution was adopted by the U.N. which condemned the enslavement of the Hungarian people by Soviet troops. Each year, until 1962, that resolution was reiterated. Last year for some unknown reason it was not.

Now the U.N. has canceled the special mission of Sir Leslie Munro, of New Zealand, to investigate the Hungarian situation. The whole business has been placed in the hands of Secretary General U Thant to handle as he sees fit. In this action the United States has acquiesced, unfortunately.

In effect, this withdrawal of any U.N. action on the matter of Hungary—and the other captive nations as well—is simply giving tacit approval to Russian colonialism.

The reasoning behind this is difficult to understand, unless it is that the West should tread softly in dealing with Moscow, for fear of creating any new crises.

But that gives little reassurance to the peoples of Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—to name only a few—that the Western Powers are thinking in terms of eventual liberation for these captive countries. They may certainly not be criticized if they have the feeling that the free world has forgotten them.

President Kennedy spoke recently in terms of liberation for the people of Cuba, although short of lip service to the ideal the administration has made it fairly clear that it will do nothing to give encouragement to the Cuban freedom fighters.

If the United States can talk of liberation (eventually) for Cuba, why not talk of liberation for the captive nations of Europe? Soviet suppression of once-free peoples is no less offensive in Europe than in Cuba.

The U.N. decision to drop the Hungarian investigation is a sad commentary on the state of world affairs.

#### AMERICA NEEDS AN UNDERGRADUATE FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I hope the House will forgive me if I return to a familiar theme, but I should like to direct your attention for just a few minutes to something I regard as essential for the future security of this country, namely, the establishment of a National Foreign Service Academy.

I think the need for this Academy has long been obvious, and I think the pro-

posal merits our most serious consideration. For 17 years we have been the object of a relentless cold war waged by the Communist powers of the world. Sometimes this war has flared into military conflict, but most of the time it has been carried on in the gray areas of propaganda, psychological, and economic warfare. The military aspects we can handle. We have a superb officer corps, highly trained at West Point, Annapolis, and at the new Air Force Academy, which is quite capable of devising the strategy to hurl back the Communist military challenge. But we have no comparable corps of Foreign Service officers, schooled in the techniques of nonmilitary conflict, capable of anticipating the Communist thrust and devising an effective parry, or indeed, possessing the attitude of mind which thinks in terms of a prior thrust by the forces of freedom, for which communism must seek the counters.

To correct this condition I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1122, for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. This Academy would instruct and train diplomatic cadets, in preparation for careers as officers in our Foreign Service. The course of instruction would be prescribed by the Secretary of State, and would be the equivalent of the curriculum in the field of foreign affairs currently prescribed for the bachelor's degree in many of the Nation's leading institutions. Emphasis would be placed on history, culture, customs, folklore, and languages of the nations in which the diplomatic cadets would elect to serve, and provision would be made for field study in such nations. Entrance to the Academy would be on the basis of competitive examinations.

I wish to state most categorically that my proposal in no way reflects on the institutions currently offering training in foreign affairs. All across the country there are a number of first-rate programs which can offer the student a broad understanding of international relations, a specialized knowledge of an area, or both. But most of these programs are at the graduate level. Parenthetically I may add that a number of other bills introduced on the subject of a Foreign Service Academy are cast in terms of graduate instruction. There is nothing wrong in this. But I wonder if it does not result in the creation of detached, critical scholars, of which the country has an ample supply.

In contrast, I believe in the old-fashioned maxim, "catch 'em young." Of course we want the members of our Foreign Service to be thoroughly schooled, to be fully acquainted with the basis of international politics, and to know their areas thoroughly. But we want them to be engaged, or perhaps I should say committed, to believe completely in the cause of the United States, and to advance that cause by all legitimate means. In my judgment this can be accomplished successfully only if the recruits to our Foreign Service have gone through a course of study which instills this outlook. A U.S. Foreign Service Academy, which will feed in the bulk of the recruits to our Foreign Service, is

the answer to the problem. It will give us not only scholars of international relations, not only men possessed of a deep knowledge of an area, but men capable of being the junior officers of the cold war—men who see the picture as a whole, who see it true, and who understand that the United States cannot sit idly by, but must advance the cause of freedom, else it will wither away.

My bill does not propose that the Foreign Service Academy will be the exclusive mode of entry into the Foreign Service. Graduates of our private colleges and universities would be admitted as before. But preference in making appointments to the Foreign Service would go to the graduates of the Academy. In this way there would be the stiffening of professionals, just as the officer corps of the military services is stiffened by the graduates of West Point and Annapolis in its midst. These would be the men professionally dedicated, the men with the concept of service. Such men have been needed at all times in our history, but never more than now, and nowhere is their dedication more appropriate than in the Foreign Service.

I might even add that educationally there is a unique feature to my bill. Field study of an area is not widely conducted at the undergraduate level. The usual pattern is for such study to be carried on at the graduate level, and it is not unknown for graduate students to so immerse themselves in the viewpoint of the area in which they specialize as to lose all perspective as Americans. But younger students, under the discipline of the Academy, could observe foreign cultures at close hand, could integrate that observation with classroom study, yet should be able to secure an appropriate grasp of how these studies fitted into the context of their own country's policy.

If I may summarize: I advocate the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy because it is educationally sound and politically necessary. I believe a unique opportunity is now at hand for the establishment of such an Academy. I say we should seize that opportunity, and establish such an Academy forthwith. I am confident that in just a few years the return would be well worth the cost.

#### WORLD WAR II CLAIMS

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress passed Public Law 87-846 which amended the War Claims Act of 1948 to authorize settlement of several classes of meritorious World War II claims which were not covered by the original law or its subsequent amendments. On August 8, 1962, at the time the measure was on the floor of the House, I supported the bill but pointed out that there was a grave inequity in it: It provided payment of a war claim only if the claimant, and all predecessors in interest, were on the date of the loss nationals of the United States. The claims of persons who were nationals of

another country at the time of the loss but later came to the United States and became citizens of this country cannot be recognized. On August 8 I sought to amend the measure to include those citizens who suffered losses and later became American citizens.

Today I have introduced a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to allow the filing of claims by those citizens of the United States who would be eligible to file for compensation under the present law except for the fact that they were not citizens at the time of their loss.

My bill would in effect allow all citizens to file for compensation regardless of the date of their citizenship with the exception of members of the enemy armed forces during World War II.

I believe that the present law with its unjustifiable discrimination against American citizens creates, in effect, two classes of citizenship. The concept now embodied in the present War Claims Act that the United States owes a greater obligation to those who became citizens earlier than their fellow citizens is wholly antithetical to the spirit of the Constitution. Under our Constitution all American citizens are treated alike with the single exception of eligibility for the presidency. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly stated that naturalized citizens are not second-class citizens.

It has been argued that this subject of war claims compensation involves international law and that the rules of international law require continuous citizenship from the date of loss to the time of filing with respect to claims one government asserts against another on behalf of its nationals. However, it must be remembered that we are not concerned with international law. This is not a situation in which the U.S. Government negotiates with a foreign government to obtain redress for wrongs against our citizens. The war claims are to be paid out of assets owned by the U.S. Government to U.S. citizens by the U.S. Government. This is a wholly domestic matter and should be governed by our fundamental constitutional principle that all citizens no matter when they became citizens should be treated alike.

In a sense the present policy discriminates against those who deliberately chose to owe their allegiance to the United States. Having renounced their former allegiances, they cannot now look to any other government for redress. Although they pay taxes and chose to be Americans, we refuse to treat them on the same basis as any other citizens.

I urge all the Members of the House to support this bill so that a serious inequity can be corrected in keeping with our constitutional principle of equal treatment for all citizens.

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)