

to use profits above a set return to the Government so as to provide incentives and increase investments.

In brief, the Government is adjusting its theories to realities and the people are being given private initiative and personal motivations. The Soviet economy may be a more formidable competitor in the future than it has been in the past.

Looking ahead, the U.S. State Department projects a continuing growth of the American economy at a yearly rate of 4 percent. This is a compromise figure between reputable estimates that range between 3.3 and 4.9 percent.

The 4-percent target for the American economy is realistic but its achievement will by no means be automatic. American economic expansion during the coming decade will depend on the growth rate in the factors of production (labor, land, capital, education and technology); the efficiency of their utilization; the efficient use of manpower. These all have two properties in common. First, they can grow only at the expense of sacrificing present consumption or leisure for future potentiality. Second, they will require responsibility and cooperation by government, business and labor.

Premier K. Svygin told the Soviet people that the new system will mean more defense, a higher standard of living, a shorter work-day, higher pay, lower taxes, pensions, bonuses and better working and living conditions. This sounds very much like President Johnson's formula for the Great Society.

The hard facts of economic life, which know no nationality or ideology say that there can't be more of everything for everybody unless it is earned. Victory in the race of economic growth will go to those who work in the light of this truth.

Constitution Day Address at Louisville, Ohio, by Prof. H. H. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the highlight of the annual Constitution Day celebration at Louisville, Ohio, officially known as Ohio's Constitution Town, was an excellent address by Prof. H. H. Walker, of Malone College, in nearby Canton. I am certain it will be of interest to Members:

CONSTITUTION DAY ADDRESS AT LOUISVILLE, OHIO

(By Harold H. Walker)

I did not come here tonight to recite for you constitutional biography as thrilling as it is to recount. One might well address oneself to such constitutional characteristics as its birth from necessity, talented cast, confrontation of issues or unfoldment by compromise. But instead, I want to talk to you about a concept I choose to call emergent freedom. Each century of the American venture has had a major movement toward enlarging or emerging freedom. In the 17th century we had the heroic struggle of the founding movement as a new cradle for freedom was sought by those who cherished it far above the security afforded by the monarchs of their homeland. In the 18th century the cause of freedom was emerging still more strongly in the hearts of colonists and further realization demanded a break from European imperialism. Great ac-

complishment though this was, it was not the highest summit for freedom as the 19th century witnessed a most critical movement involving the young nation in a civil war to bring about the abolition of slavery. I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the 20th century, like the three preceding it, also has its opportunity to contribute to the emergence of freedom through realization of human rights.

Every century has had its handwringers, blue breathers and gravediggers; and friends, they are better organized and more visible now than ever before—but not any different. I ask you to reject the thesis that America has had it; that it is about all over, that we are in the dusk of America's day. The thesis I would like for you to accept tonight is that America can and will bring forward the emerging freedom of this country in a movement comparable to those great advances of the founding, the Revolution, the Civil War, portrayed in the immediate three centuries past. I see this possibility as a product of three factors: our Christian heritage, our classic Constitution, our dynamic struggle for individuality, which is guarded so zealously by our Constitution. Time does not permit me to dwell in depth or number on the emerging freedoms I see possible in our time, but allow me to mention a few. Freedom from ignorance. Our educational machinery is greater, more available and more efficient than at any time in our history. It is also greater than any nation on earth. We are now learning enough about learning if you please, to know that no normal man need be ignorant and we are moving significantly in this direction of freeing Americans from the shackles of ignorance.

Second, I suggest that we can and will move toward freedom from what I choose to call petty particularism. The time is brightly dawning, when religiously we shall not criticize each other or divide ourselves over such petty particulars as whether or not it is acceptable to sing praise to God with or without accompaniment. Ethnically we are divesting ourselves of such concepts and labels as "wop," "kike," "spick," and so forth. Racially we shall come to know that human dignity is not caused by color.

Third, I ask you to think what is happening in the area of endeavor to free us from physical pain. I am sure these great advances need no amplification here. Last I want to point out the emergence of freedom from binding labor. Think of the burden which is being lifted from man's back. I have faith that this freedom when realized will launch this Nation into a new era wherein man shall be released from toil and be free to create, appreciate in its fullest sense, and recreate.

I do not believe that it can be denied that America is converging upward. That is we are progressing in the elimination of the very poor, the very ignorant, the very unhealthy and the very mistreated. I believe the 20th century can go down as that great time when America carried forth its heritage of emergent freedom in a surge of new strength, based fundamentally on man's right to be regarded as an individual—free from the debilitating labels of groups whose existence has been forged by emphasis of differences which were never sanctioned by God's law—the brotherhood of man. Friends and neighbors, while I believe the contribution of this century can and will be one of greatness—let me assure you that it can be achieved only with the sacrifice, constance, and persistence which characterized the great men and women who have given birth to and nurtured the American dream. In closing may I quickly suggest three ways in which each of us can help. First by future orientation. Let's look ahead with openness and anticipation of contributing to this time and the future—rather than precluding that it never could

be like the good old days. Ours is the challenge and opportunity of good new days.

Second, let's talk America up. I believe that this Constitution Day celebration is a powerful idea. Think of this as an example of talking America up. Think of what this seed so carefully planted and nurtured by the pioneering spirit of Louisville, Ohio, can become. In only 18 years it has already gained State and National recognition. I can envision the time when Constitution Day will be a national holiday. Yes, let's avail ourselves of every opportunity to talk America up.

And third, let's be informed so that we know what we are talking about. We should be students of our heritage, advocates of emerging freedom, and builders of tomorrow. In conclusion let me emphasize again that we are now in a time when the torch of freedom, lighted by our forefathers, made brighter by generations of brave people, must again be fueled by a people committed to extending freedom. This is our time. It is our opportunity, our privilege, and our responsibility to lift the torch of freedom higher and higher and higher, so that its glow encompasses a widening circle of our people and shines as a beacon to mankind everywhere.

Vietnam Critics Go Out of Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as William S. White points out in the following column we have been through "2 years of almost constant biting at American purposes" and the tide of publicity is finally beginning to turn and now reflects what has been true all along. The majority of the American people has always supported the administration in its determination to resist Communist aggression in southeast Asia and they continue to do so.

Mr. White's article follows:

VIETNAM CRITICS GO OUT OF STYLE

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time it can be said with confidence that the long attack upon the American policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam by candid military force is clearly falling, both in this country and in Europe.

The new isolationism of the sixties—an isolationism expressed in recommendations that in one way or another we should abandon the South Vietnamese and cut and run from Asia under elegant rhetoric, protesting that we were not running at all—is dying at last.

Its death at home—and a slow death it has been through 2 years of almost constant biting at American purposes—is manifest, both in what is now happening and in what is now not happening. The shrill outcries formerly heard so often from a Democratic fringe in the Senate are heard no longer, except here and there and in very minor key.

The hostile student teach-ins are not altogether a thing of the past. But apart from the fact that proresistance teach-ins are now also being organized these academic fevers were never more than a nuisance. And they never reflected any substantial opinion in this country, anymore than the little band of complaining Democratic Sen-

ators ever represented a more liberal and more democratic fragment of Congress.

The mischief of the teach-ins and of the clamors of the Senate splinter was that they warmed our critics abroad, particularly in Britain, with a suggestion of togetherness.

This implication that the real brains here were against the war of resistance was, of course, always absurd. Far the greater proportion of the intellectual community was always in support of this Government. Still, it was never so strident, so skilled at self-publicity. So it was the opposition that was largely heard in Europe.

Yet, as the Johnson administration on this issue has steadily enlarged its backing at home—and spectacularly so in recent weeks, as the Harris Poll has just confirmed—so has our position improved in that focal point of important foreign criticism which is England.

Indeed, the Labor Government of Harold Wilson has now become the most useful of all our associates in beating back the mixed international group—of mere beatniks, of honest sempitactists or decent ultriberals enchanted with the delusion that it always is possible to halt Communist incursions by mere negotiations—that had so long given the U.S. Government so much trouble.

The magnitude of Mr. Wilson's achievement at the recent Labor Party convention at Blackpool in destroying their case has not been appreciated here.

For at Blackpool Mr. Wilson proved point by point that those who refuse an honorable peace in Vietnam are not bad old Yankees but rather Communists—and mainly Chinese Communists at that. When he had done, the howlers had no case left.

A Conservative Government in London could not have been so helpful. For British conservatives, like American conservatives, are suspects from the word go on any rationally hardline enterprise whatever. When authentic very-liberals stand with us, nobody can possibly accuse them of professional Communist baiting. Anglo-American politics works in illogical ways, sometimes, its wonders to perform.

Conflict of Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post in a splendid editorial this morning supported the position of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, in his opposition to newsmen being employed by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I commend the Post for this fine editorial and for its strong position against "working newspapermen" being employed at the same time by Government agencies. I recommend to all Federal Government officials and to the Congress a careful reading of this fine editorial which follows:

CLEAR CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Employment of working newspapermen by the Office of Economic Opportunity has been criticized and rightly criticized by Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The press undertakes to give readers an outside, objective, and independent report on the operations of Government. It cannot do that with reporters and editors

in conflict of interest is self-evident, unavoidable, and inescapable.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, when it hired newspaper reporters, may have been motivated only by the desire to get competent people. Whatever its motives, it is simply unarguable that such an employment policy by government generally would soon deprive citizens of any view of the Government except one obtained by those on the Government's payroll. And, it would be a sinister thing indeed if the policy of a Government agency so inclined to the employment of journalists as to suggest that the hiring policies were intended to corrupt the press. The main point is, however, that whether or not the intent is bad, Government should not employ journalists and risk the imputation of improper efforts to influence the press; and newspapermen should not work for the Government and risk the charge that their views are prejudiced.

The reputation of the newspapers for fairness, impartiality, and objectively is a thing of value in our society and neither Government officials nor newspapermen ought to put that reputation in jeopardy. The Government should dismiss any working newspaperman on its payroll, the reporters and editors who have accepted that employment, thoughtlessly, ought to resign. The best thing a newspaperman can do for his country is to write honestly about Government operations. And the best thing a Government agency can do for a newspaperman is to leave him free to persevere in that high purpose.

Declining Respect for Law in the United States Is Decried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the October 14 edition of Stars and Stripes, published weekly by the National Tribune Corp., in which declining respect for law in the United States is decried. I also include remarks by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on the same subject, reported in the Wall Street Journal of October 14.

If I may be permitted to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the above-mentioned in condemning the abhorrent practices mentioned.

The editorial and news item follow:

[From the Stars and Stripes, Oct. 14, 1965]

RESPECT FOR LAW DECLINING

Why television producers furnish a forum for draft dodgers and those who are belittling the military action of the United States in Vietnam is beyond the comprehension of most loyal and patriotic Americans.

Just this week a television program devoted considerable time to a talk singer who derided the military draft and another young man who advised those in his audience of draft age of ways and means to avoid being taken into the service. Astonishing still was the enthusiastic reception received by these misguided and unpatriotic youths.

No longer do those who sponsor certain changes in America give due respect to law and order. If they deem a law to be a bad one, then they proceed to take direct action in not obeying it. This has been one of the

the civil rights movement. It is now apparently spreading to those who oppose the participation of the United States in Vietnam and Santo Domingo.

One may surmise why spokesmen for patriotic and veterans organizations which usually present a solid front against those who would demean the sanctity of existing laws are not given an opportunity to appear in rebuttal on television programs throughout the country.

In this manner they could furnish assurance to the American people that there remains a huge majority of law-abiding citizens who look with disfavor and disgust upon the contemptible antics of those who are furnishing ammunition and propaganda to those nations which seek to destroy us.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 14, 1965]

Eisenhower is worried that "some kind of moral deterioration" has set in among Americans. The former President, talking with newsmen on the eve of his 75th birthday, cited efforts to evade the draft and signs of diminishing respect for law and order as indication of this deterioration.

World Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the following article on food and population from the Economist is interesting in view of our recent farm and foreign aid legislation.

It is necessary, I believe, that Europe, the United States and other nations begin to put greater emphasis on agricultural assistance to the underfed parts of the world.

[From the Economist, Sept. 15, 1965]

WORLD FOOD—THE MALTHUSIAN DECADE

The world gets hungrier. Four years ago, on the best estimates, about half the people in the world suffered some degree of hunger or malnutrition, or both, between 10 and 15 percent of its 3,300 million inhabitants—at least 330 million people—were badly undernourished. Since then the situation has worsened. By 1959, world food production per person was about 10 percent above its level before the Second World War; since then it has stagnated, and each of the developing regions has lost some of its earlier gains. In Latin America, food output per person is less than it was before the war.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations now believes that there will be no cure without some real incentives to farmers in developing countries to increase their production. This means guaranteeing more stable returns, organizing marketing and credit facilities in such a way that they do not remain always at the mercy of landlords and inefficient middlemen. The FAO firmly believes that substantial progress in feeding the world's hungry must wait until developing countries' governments (most of them with only a few years' experience of independence behind them) make a better job of tackling social and political problems that the rich countries often shirk.

This does not mean that aid-giving developed countries should sit back fatalis-

October 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

26051

sibility, the hope, that such information might be forthcoming.

With several hundred thousand dollars in foreign funds supporting the efforts to get preferential sugar quotas, it taxes the imagination to suppose that none of these funds have found their way into political campaigns as part of the overhead.

Since none of the lobbyists have rushed forward to indicate the scope of their political activity, I suppose this must remain an eternal mystery.

Perhaps some enterprising reporter can do better. But until such time, the matter of the sugar money and how it spills into politics, apparently is destined to fade away, just like those little sugar cubes that dissolve in a cup of coffee.

Mr. Speaker, let us get to work and save the Nation from too much Central Government. I repeat, "the nearer the bone, the greater the bleeding."

NATIONWIDE, ORGANIZED ANTI-VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 15 AND 16

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1965, I spoke to the House on the "Communist Campaign To Oust the United States From Vietnam." On July 24, 1965, I delivered the main address before the annual convention of the Virginia Department of the American Legion at Roanoke, Va., entitled "Communist Attempts to Undermine U.S. Policy in Vietnam." This was inserted in the RECORD by Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB on July 29, 1965.

Today I wish to make my third and final speech of this session on this most important subject "Nationwide, Organized Anti-Vietnam Demonstrations Scheduled for October 15 and 16."

NATIONWIDE, ORGANIZED ANTI-VIETNAM DEMONSTRATIONS SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 15 AND 16

As we reach the final days of our session, I would like to draw to the attention of my distinguished colleagues some rapidly developing events on our college campuses and elsewhere relative to the Vietnam situation. I think you, and other Americans, will be interested in knowing the cunning, skill, and diabolical purposes of those who seek to vilify this Nation and undermine her policies of preserving freedom.

Last spring our campuses were swept by a giant conflagration of protest. Rallies, demonstrations, and teach-ins were common occurrences. Almost like magic, we heard epithets such as "aggressor," "warmonger," and "imperialist" used to denounce this Nation. Students vied with each other to find new ways of heaping scorn on American policies. Last Easter a student march on Washington was held in which some 15,000 persons protested. Many citizens were shocked by the vehemence and bitterness of many of the students and faculty members.

I want it to be absolutely clear that there are many citizens in this country, including students and teachers, who, for their own personal reasons, disagree with our policy in Vietnam. These persons are not by any stretch of the imagination Communists or even sympathetic with the Communist position. We must be extremely careful not to label all opposition to America's foreign policy as Communist. This would be wrong. I have emphasized this point many times in the past.

However, on the other hand, we must not overlook the sinister role which the Communist Party and its allies are playing in this situation, especially on college campuses. Just to view these demonstrations as "children's fun" or the pranks of an adolescent minority, without realizing what role they play in Communist strategy, is to take lightly our obligations of citizenship.

The position of the Communist Party has been one of unremitting hostility to American participation in the Vietnam hostilities. The party wants us to withdraw our troops and stop military aid to the South Vietnamese Government. In other words, it seeks a complete Vietcong victory.

As far back as March 1964, for example, the party's national headquarters in New York City sent a directive entitled "The United States and South Vietnam Developments" to all its districts. Party members were urged to send telegrams of protest to President Johnson, to place advertisements in newspapers throughout the country, to organize protest meetings and picket lines and to enlist the support of non-Communist groups.

Since that date, the party's pressure has been relentless and unceasing. After President Johnson ordered air bombardment of North Vietnam military targets, the party voice became more strident. Communist leaders worked frantically to encourage rallies, demonstrations, and teach-ins. Key leaders such as Arnold Johnson—the party's top public relations man—and Michael Zagarell—National Youth Director—participated in the Easter March on Washington. From the party's point of view, the Vietnam student protest movement had become an effective tactic to promote its own subversive aims.

A key factor in the party's strategy, of course, was the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, its front group for young people. Founded in June 1964, this group became active on many campuses during the last academic year and participated in many of the student demonstrations. In Berkeley, Calif., Bettina Aptheker, daughter of Herbert Aptheker, well-known Communist, was one of the most outspoken of DuBois leaders.

In June came the summer recess. But the party and its associated groups were not inactive. As Members of this House, you will recall, for example, the demonstrations held here on Capitol Hill last August by the so-called assembly of unrepresented people. On October 15 and 16, we are to witness the first major nationwide organized anti-Vietnam dem-

onstration of the new academic year—what has been billed as "International Days of Protest." On these days massive civil disobedience is being planned, with demonstrations, parades, and rallies throughout the country. According to advance announcements, this is to be a shot heard around the world, designed to ridicule this Nation and its Vietnam policy.

Let us look a little more closely at this so-called international days of protest. Though some will want us to believe that this project is spontaneous and comes from the hearts of the students, actually it has been carefully and devilishly planned by those who would rejoice in our defeat.

The Vietnam Day Committee—VDC—was the original sponsor of the idea of an international days of protest. This group had its origin in demonstrations last May at the University of California at Berkeley.

What is the Vietnam Day Committee? Actually, it is a type of holding company consisting of representatives of groups which for some time have been firing the smudge pots of hatred, venom, and distrust against American policy in Vietnam. In the VDC we find such assorted types as the Progressive Labor Party, well known for its pro-Red Chinese sentiments, and its youth front, the May 2 movement. Who else, we might ask, would want a Vietcong victory more? This vociferous and dangerous splinter group represents the hand of Mao Tse-tung inside our country.

In addition, there is SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, one of the most militant of the civil rights groups, the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party and its youth front, the Young Socialist Alliance.

Still another group is the Students for a Democratic Society. This group is a militant Socialist-oriented youth group which preaches an anarchist-nihilist program of derisive mocking of American institutions and values. The SDS incidentally was the prime sponsor of the Easter march on Washington and reportedly has some 2,000 members in 80 chapters.

Early in September, the SDS held a national council meeting at Bloomington, Ind., attended by some 100 delegates. Discussion focused, among other things, on what steps could be taken to encourage young men to avoid military service. The national council eventually adopted a program of legal tactics relative to avoiding the draft, but much of the debate centered on support for illegal acts. Draft registrants, for example, are to be counseled to pressure their draft boards for exemption on the basis of conscientious objector beliefs. SDS hopes to secure the services of outside people, such as ministers and attorneys, to counsel young men in carrying out these tactics. In addition, SDS hopes, if possible, to file lawsuits against draft board actions and organize protest demonstrations. The whole purpose is to harass military recruitment.

Of course, as could be expected, the Vietnam Day Committee has felt the

touch of Communist influence. DuBois Clubs members are actively participating in the VDC. In July, for example, the VDC was one of the sponsors of a rally and march at the University of California at Berkeley. Among the speakers were Mario Savio, well-known leader of the university's free speech movement last spring, and Bettina Aptheker. Seldom has a young person—Bettina Aptheker—been more active in behalf of party causes. This young woman has been highly trained, disciplined, and taught by her father to carry on the work of promoting the interests of the Soviet Union in this country. In this father-daughter combination we see what fanaticism the Marxist-Leninist ideology can produce.

The Vietnam Day Committee was the driving force behind the recent widely publicized incidents of trying to stop troop trains proceeding to the Oakland Army Terminal in Oakland, Calif. This shows the extent to which these fanatics will go to jeopardize our national security and inflame others to support their cause. They believe in direct action, being virtual guerrillas inside the United States for the Vietcong.

Leading up to the international days of protest we have witnessed the outbreak in various areas of the country of what might be called preliminary brush fires—designed to build up enthusiasm for the October demonstration and to serve, as it were, as fire drills for the real thing.

Some dozen students and faculty members from Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., picketed an industrial firm, the Hamilton Watch Co., Lancaster, on September 27, 28, and 29. Known as the Lancaster Committee for Negotiated Peace in Vietnam, this group was protesting the company's manufacture of war material. Early last month students at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore passed out leaflets at Fort Holabird, Md., protesting U.S. action in Vietnam. The New Haven-Yale Committee for Peace in Vietnam and a group by the name of "End the Draft" held a demonstration in September in New Haven, Conn.

At Arizona State University, the Philosophy Club is planning to hold a public meeting on the university campus to discuss the Vietnam situation on October 15. The Students for a Democratic Society chapter at the University of Illinois plans to picket the University of Illinois Armory on October 14-16 as a protest against American intervention. In Austin, Tex., the University of Texas SDS chapter plans a cruel and gruesome project. It will sponsor a "death march," with participants wearing death masks. A hearse and coffin will be in the line of march, with the coffin bearing a child depicting a dead Vietnamese baby.

Important direction for this massive demonstration of civil disobedience and protest is coming from the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam with headquarters in Madison, Wis. This again is a holding type group and among its chief participants is the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs.

The Communist Party is overjoyed with the international days of protest. Party leaders are working feverishly to help prepare the mass demonstrations. From the party's point of view, these demonstrations will greatly aid its agitation and propaganda programs. National party headquarters, for example, has sent all party districts a list of slogans to be used in the campaign to end the war in Vietnam. Sample slogans include such phrases as "Withdraw all U.S. troops," "Halt all acts of torture," "End gas and chemical warfare."

What are these student rebellions leading to? What does the future hold?

These are serious questions which should concern my colleagues.

Last spring Prof. Eugene D. Genovese, of Rutgers University, was quoted as saying that he welcomed a Vietcong victory. A few days ago a press item noted that Staughton Lynd, professor of history at Yale, and James Mellen, a history instructor at Drew University, agreed with Professor Genovese. Here we have high-ranking intellectuals, in contact with youthful minds, pouring out a poison which seeks the defeat of this Nation. If ever professors were falling their students, here are prime examples.

It is my observation that the so-called new left, involving a combination of Communists—both Russian and Chinese styles—Trotskyites, and Socialist-oriented groups, such as the Students for a Democratic Society, represents a grave threat to our American way of life. Through civil disobedience tactics, they seek to disrupt the law, the peace of the community and the integrity of our colleges as institutions of learning. Some are virtually anarchist in spirit. They display a cruelly defeatist, negative, and antitype attitude. Their chief aim is not to improve weaknesses in our society or offer new avenues of democratic approach. Instead, they castigate, indict, and defame our values. These students are quick to denounce the barbaric actions of American troops, but say absolutely nothing about Vietcong atrocities. They are victims of a double vision—of self-righteous indignation about our cause and a complete willingness to overlook the evil of Communist aggression and inhumanity.

Let me illustrate, for example, the brazenness of communism on the university campus. Big posters were recently displayed on the University of California campus at Berkeley openly advertising classes in Marxism-Leninism. Here is the exact wording of one of them:

Register for classes in Marxism-Leninism taught by revolutionaries, Thursday, September 23, 142 Dwinelle, 7:30 p.m.

The poster was signed "Campus Progressive Labor"—the pro-Red Chinese organization. Here was a class in Marxism-Leninism being held in a university building.

The Communist hand is becoming more clear. It simply is amazing how in the past few years Communist groups in this country have grown in self-confidence. We find DuBois Clubs openly involved, even seeking publicity for their actions. Their great hope is that com-

munist will "go respectable," that Americans will accept it as a legitimate part of our democratic tradition. Nothing could be more disastrous.

The Communist Party will be the chief beneficiary from the international days of protest.

In recent days there have been indications that the sponsoring groups will not actually go as far in overt civil disobedience as they originally proclaimed—that is, trying to interfere with arms shipments or encourage the destruction of draft cards. But the danger remains that their inflammatory and volatile speeches may fall on the ears of some students who might be goaded into foolish and unlawful actions.

I call upon my colleagues not to be misguided, not to view the international days of protest as something spontaneous, as the genuine outpouring of the sentiments of innocent students. Instead, these days have been skillfully planned by people who do not love our Nation—by people who wish nothing more than to destroy America.

ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I refrained from voting on rollcall 369 because, under rule 8 of the House I felt that I might have a personal interest in the legislation.

I therefore answered "present" instead of casting a vote.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on page 25942 and page 25943 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 13, 1965, my extension of remarks on H.R. 11135 incorrectly appears. I had requested that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the first Findley amendment. Accordingly, I request unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected so that my extension of remarks, now appearing on pages 25942 and 25943, will appear instead immediately preceding the taking of the vote on the first Findley amendment, as it is indicated on page 25935 of yesterday's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL DAY OF THE MALAGASY REPUBLIC

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1958 the Malagasy Republic was proclaimed as an autonomous state within the French community. On this occasion I wish to extend best wishes to this friendly nation. The Malagasy Republic comprises the island of Madagascar and its dependencies.

October 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5807

may be a traumatic experience for some of us, but we teachers have never been known as namby-pamby milksofs.

In the old days, we followed the first Conestoga wagons westward, long rifle and McGuffey reader in the same saddlebag, fighting big, rawboned boys bare-knuckled for the right to teach them Latin conjugations, trading grammar for grain, Chaucer for chickens, arithmetic for apple cider.

WE HAD BETTER

What we did once, by thunder, we can do again, and we had better, because nobody else will.

Fifth, forget birdcage building and bookcase construction in the high school shop classes and teach these bewildered youngsters vocational English, vocational mathematics, vocational spelling—yes, and even vocational filling out of job application forms.

Above all, teach them the old, old truth that when you finally get a job you show up on time with a decent haircut, a shave, clothes that don't make you look like a delegate to a Hell's Angels convention and a willingness to keep your mouth shut and your nose to the grindstone for 8 hours every day.

GIVE KIDS IDENTITY

Sixth, try to make these kids feel a sense of belongingness, of community identity. The Watts riot were conducted largely by teenagers and they had no more feeling of identification with their Nation, their State, their city or even their own neighborhood than my cat. They were rootless, motiveless and hence shameless. Surely, the schools can give them some roots, motives and pride.

As he left my office, my Negro friend looked back over his shoulder.

"And don't forget," he said gently, "that about 25 percent of those rioters could neither read nor write."

In the greatest city of the West, this is an infernal disgrace. Oh, I know the reasons given—the great flooding in of illiterates from the Deep South, the lack of funds, the shortage of qualified teachers and all the other excuses.

MUST BE DONE

But somehow these vast cities like Los Angeles, Chicago and New York are going to have to get these people to read.

This is the first and great prerequisite to everything else.

Even if we have to postpone "social studies" and "language arts" and "sharing with the peer group," and teach reading to these mute and frustrated kids every living minute they're in school until they get it, then that's what should be done.

One pious hope in concluding. Let's teach them to read—not to try to recognize thousands of words by their "configurations" and "contours."

Solution for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, often times wonderful pearls of wisdom come from normally unnoticed sources, and I therefore insert in the RECORD and direct the Members' attention to an editorial which appeared in the Tri-City Advertiser, a community paper serving Dolton, Riverdale, and South Holland, Ill., in its issue of Thursday, October 7:

SOLUTION FOR PEACE

You need not be reminded that the world is in a chaotic state of fear, frustration, worry and despair.

The war in Vietnam and conflict of thinking and action in other sections increases with each passing day.

Many are asking why this Nation must assume the entire burden, with few exceptions, of the protecting of the rest of the world. Why cannot other nations contribute men and funds and supplies and spread the burden of defense to include the rest of the world—if the rest of the world sees the danger as we have been lead to see it? These are the vital issues.

Yet with stories coming out from the Far East of the miserable plight of the refugees and the youngsters one would have to be hard hearted to deny a measure of protection and relief. Stories just out on TV indicate that the refugee and orphan problems are assuming unheard-of proportions, and that already men are at work to relieve the miserable plight of these poor unfortunate children.

One would find it difficult to attempt to assess the reasons for all the mental and physical conflict now going on. Those who govern our Nation and others are in a position to know more of the details of the situation than we are. Regardless of what one may think of the method of approach to the solution of the conflict most will agree that men are doing what they think best for them to do for the good of mankind.

We have, for centuries, been trying statesmanship, guns, bombs and other paraphernalia of war seemingly without success for the passing of time makes clear all this has been futile.

Therefore, most of us will agree that the visit of Pope Paul to our country augurs well for here is what most men, regardless of their faith, see as a sincere and genuine effort to set in motion such counterforces as are necessary for the welfare of mankind.

We were especially pleased to note the pronouncement that spiritual effort alone will aid in the cessation of the present conflict.

Certainly this may well mean a giant step forward in a united effort to still the waves of error in the thinking of all of us.

We've tried everything else. We agree a gigantic spiritual uprising is sure to be profound in its impact on the world.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the predictions of disaster and failure of our policy in Vietnam by beatniks and misguided peace demonstrators has not materialized. The teach-ins and howlers led some Americans to believe that resistance to Communist aggression in South Vietnam would collapse during the monsoon season. With the ending of the monsoons, our position in South Vietnam and our prestige throughout south-east Asia is immeasurably stronger.

The following article by William S. White appeared in the Washington Post Wednesday, October 13. I commend this timely and excellent article to the at-

tention of the Congress and to the people of our country:

VIETNAM SUPPORT: CRITICS FINALLY STILLED

(By William S. White)

For the first time, it can be said with confidence that the long attack upon the American policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam by candid military force is clearly failing, both in this country and in Europe.

The new isolationism of the sixties—an isolationism expressed in recommendations that in one way or another we should abandon the South Vietnamese and cut and run from Asia under elegant rhetoric protesting that we were not running at all—is dying at last.

Its death at home—and a slow death it has been through 2 years of almost constant biting at American purposes—is manifest, both in what is now happening and in what is now not happening. The shrill outcries formerly heard so often from a Democratic fringe in the Senate are heard no longer, except here and there and in very minor key.

The hostile student teach-ins are not altogether a thing of the past. But apart from the fact that proresistance teach-ins are now also being organized—for example, one to be held in Washington on October 16—these academic fevers were never more than a nuisance. And they never reflected in the least way any substantial opinion in this country, any more than the little band of complaining Democratic Senators ever represented anything more than a fragment of Congress.

The mischief of the teach-ins and of the clamors of the Senate splinter was that they warmed our critics abroad, particularly in Britain, with a suggestion of togetherness—the wonderful notion that the true intellectuals in the United States at all events were not standing with a line of resistance to Communist imperialism to which three American Presidents had successively given their word.

This implication that the real brains here were against the war of resistance was, of course, always absurd. Far the greater proportion of the intellectual community was always in support of this Government. Still, it was never so strident, so skilled at self-publicity. So it was the opposition that was largely heard in Europe.

Yet, as the Johnson administration on this issue has steadily enlarged its backing at home—and spectacularly so in recent weeks, as the Harris poll has just confirmed—so has our position improved in that focal point of important foreign criticism which is England.

Indeed, the Labor Government of Harold Wilson has now become the most useful of all our associates in beating back the mixed international group—of mere beatniks, of honest sempitarians, of decent ultraliberals enchanted with the delusion that it is always possible to halt Communist incursions by mere negotiation—that had so long given the U.S. Government so much trouble.

The magnitude of Wilson's achievement at the recent Labor Party convention at Blackpool in England in destroying their case has not been appreciated here. This erstwhile ban-the-bomber, this man who was once the very secular pope of the neutralist-minded men of the West, has done more than grow in stature as a Prime Minister when at last he had to confront headon the hard realities of this world. He has become a strong and courageous party leader as well.

For at Blackpool Wilson proved to even the most skeptical, point by point, historical fact by historical fact, that those who refuse an honorable peace in Vietnam are not bad old Yankees but rather Communists—and

A5808

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 14, 1965

mainly Chinese Communists at that. When he had done, the howlers had no case left.

His Foreign Minister, Michael Stewart, in his current visit here has in a quieter way done much the same thing. Neither publicly nor privately has Stewart given the smallest comfort to those Americans who had hoped to elicit from him some kind of sniping at some point of the policy in Vietnam.

A conservative government in London could not have been so helpful. For British conservatives, like American conservatives, are suspect from the word go on any rationally hardline enterprise whatever. When authentic very liberals like Wilson and Stewart stand with us nobody can possibly accuse them of professional Communist baiting. Anglo-American politics works in illogical ways, sometimes, its wonders to perform.

Citizens Spearhead Peralta Bond Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 8, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, California is indeed fortunate to have an advanced program providing an extensive opportunity for young people to pursue junior college and State college courses at conveniently located institutions provided by public funds.

The backbone of this higher educational system is the junior college, because at this level students who are interested in obtaining a bachelor's degree or higher are given an opportunity to do so very close to home. For those students who are not desirous of a 4-year college education, but want to perfect their technical acumen, the junior colleges are invaluable.

The ways and means of making the junior colleges possible are through bond elections. This is a basic community activity and in my congressional district, there is a citizens group working very hard now to push for a successful \$47 million bond issue election on October 19 to give Alameda County another junior college.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Times-Star of Alameda, Calif., September 25, 1965, which highlights the current endeavors:

CITIZENS SPEARHEAD PERALTA BOND EFFORT

Subcommittees of the Alameda unit of Citizens for the Peralta Colleges are hard at work generating support here for the forthcoming \$47 million bond issue.

The bonds, to be presented to voters in the six-city junior college district October 19, will bring a college campus to Alameda if the bond issue is approved.

The 20-member precinct subcommittee, headed by Howard Brownson, is currently circulating petitions locally asking residents to back the bond issue.

The precinct subcommittee is also conducting a "get out the vote" drive for the approaching election.

WORKERS

Working with Brownson are Lowell Mell, Earl Hamlin, Mrs. Catherine Jones, C. W. Moore, Mrs. David Denyvan, Robert Winne,

James Bryan, Mrs. Donna Buck, Mrs. M. E. Walser, Mrs. Kathleen Gibbs, John Towata, Sam Tasoulas, Bob Kreitz, Mrs. Don Johnson, Mrs. Pat Calkins, Rabbi Gunther Gates, Alvin Kidder, and the Key Clubs from both Alameda and Encinal High Schools.

The endorsement subcommittee, headed by Norman Jachens, includes the Reverend Wilfred Hodgkin, Reva Jackson, Eric Essex, and Roger Hooper.

FINANCE

The finance subcommittee is under the chairmanship of Russell Spillman, president of the Alameda First National Bank, and has as its members Arthur Strehlow, Lester Johnson, Donald Lum, and Melvin Schwartz.

All financial contributions to the bond election may be sent to Spillman at the bank and made out to the Citizens for the Peralta Colleges, Alameda unit.

Cochairmen of the Alameda unit are Mrs. Verla Smith and Roy Kayser.

New Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we in America are not and have never been prisoners of the past.

We say all habits—and patterns of thought—should be suspect. We are willing to change, and not bury our head in the sand when change is due.

Now, because we were willing to face the future, negotiations for a new treaty governing the operation of the Panama Canal are proceeding smoothly.

The Fall River, Mass., Herald-News has said:

The harmony of the discussions up to date is one of the most encouraging developments in recent years in Pan-American relations.

The editorial will be of general interest, and I offer it for the RECORD at this time:

NEW SPIRIT

Negotiations for a new treaty governing the operation of the Panama Canal are proceeding smoothly. Although the final draft of the treaty may not be ready for some time, a progress report has now been published by both President Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama. The harmony of the discussions up to date is one of the most encouraging developments in recent years in Pan-American relations. Considering the open and violent hostility to this country in Panama just a few years ago, the present amicable negotiations reflect a new spirit there and here.

The present Panama Canal itself will soon be obsolete. A commission here is trying to determine the best site for a new sea level waterway to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The new canal, which will not employ locks, may be located elsewhere in Panama, or it may be in Colombia, but there is no doubt that it will only be built with the full agreement and cooperation of the country chosen. This, too, reflects the vast change in the attitude of the United States toward Latin America since the time of Theodore Roosevelt.

Too often it is assumed that we are prisoners of the past, and that patterns of thought and behavior accepted in other generations are not susceptible to change. The gradual evolution that has been taking place in our

attitude toward Latin America and its attitude toward us is proof of the reverse. There is reason to hope that, unless our pace is too slow considering the desperate state of affairs in many South American countries, we may yet achieve a workable and harmonious relationship.

H.R. 7315

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, curators and directors of museums throughout the United States, and there are more than 5,000 museums in our cities and towns, are watching anxiously during these closing days of the session for action on H.R. 7315, a bill that would authorize the Smithsonian Institution to undertake a program of research, training and publications which would improve and strengthen their institutions.

Known as the National Museum Act of 1965, an identical bill already has passed the Senate without opposition.

I am told that a number of Members of Congress are receiving telephone calls and telegrams regarding the bill from people back home who are interested in or supporting local museums. These expressions of support for H.R. 7315 are the outgrowth of recent conferences under the direction of the American Association of Museums. Resolutions supporting H.R. 7315 have been adopted by representatives of the following States at their regional museum conferences: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Hawaii, and Alaska.

For the convenience of many Members who are receiving these messages, I include the text of the bill at the end of these remarks:

H.R. 7315

A bill relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution

Whereas the museums of the Nation constitute cultural and educational institutions of great importance to the Nation's progress; and

Whereas national recognition is necessary to insure that museum resources for preserving and interpreting the Nation's heritage may be more fully utilized in the enrichment of public life in the individual community: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Museum Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. The Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall—

(1) cooperate with museums and their professional organizations in a continuing study of museum problems and opportunities, both in the United States and abroad;