

FOREIGN TRADE KNOTTIEST PROBLEM
 (By Gould Lincoln)

Of all the proposals which President Kennedy will urge upon Congress in his state of the Union message today, none will receive closer scrutiny than the recommendation that the Chief Executive be granted power to extend more freely international trade agreements—resulting in lower tariff duties—than the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act permits. For, bound up in the proposal may be life or death for some American industries. One of these is the textile industry which has been called second only to steel in essentiality for defense. There are many others that can be hard hit, too.

The President's recommendations relating to freer trade have not been spelled out in detail. Until they have them, Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee and Chairman HARRY FLOOD BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee are unlikely to commit themselves, beyond promising the President to give their close attention.

It is no secret that Senator BYRD regards the administration's proposals—which may look to direct U.S. dealing with the European Common Market—as the most momentous question which has come before his committee. Senator BYRD always has been sympathetic to the principle of reciprocal trade agreements and to freer trade thereby. He was able to put through the Senate the most recent extension of the Trade Agreements Act—for a 4-year period which ends June 30.

Although the approaching end of the 4-year period does not mean that the trade agreements already made will die (on the contrary, they will not), it does focus strongly on the need of some new trade legislation.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE

The administration has become convinced that something must be done quickly to make the United States able to compete for international trade, particularly to compete with a growing European Common Market, which Britain appears to be on the verge of joining. But how far it should go is the question that is stirring not only Members of Congress but also the industries themselves, including workers who might find themselves legislated out of jobs. A spokesman for the administration. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball has put it this way: "The problem is to find a way to shift American manpower as swiftly and painlessly as possible out of the industries which cannot stand up to foreign competition into those which have stood the test."

This statement has made some leaders of American industry see red. Floyd W. Jefferson of New York, chairman of the board of the Iselin-Jefferson Co., Inc., and chairman of the Executive Committee of Dan River Mills, Inc., has commented: "When did it become the function of our Government to destroy a segment of American industry to please and appease foreign nations? When did it become the function of our Government to shift manpower from one great industry to another, uproot families from their ancestral homes and move them to labor far from their communities of which they have become a part?"

Mr. Jefferson said the textile industry has been told it must do everything possible to make itself competitive and to increase its exports. To make itself more competitive would require it to run three shifts, spend money on rehabilitation and new equipment, take full advantage of automation, and cut wages. At present, textiles suffer from overproduction, and the flood of cheap imports accentuates this problem. Profits have dwindled to an extent that funds for improvements and additions are not available. Labor reacts unfavorably to automation. To cut wages would bring on a general strike.

"To make matters infinitely worse," Mr. Jefferson continued, "our Government sells cotton to foreign manufacturers at 8½ cents a pound less than they will sell the same cotton to our mills. This cheap cotton is processed in countries where labor costs are one-tenth to one-fourth our standards."

FEARS FOR WAGES, JOBS

This is the kind of argument which will be presented to the congressional committees and to Members generally. It is the kind of argument which is giving some of them pause, even those who favor reciprocal trade agreements. Through the system of agreements, the tariff duties contained in the last general tariff act—the Smoot-Hawley Act in 1934—have been reduced 75 percent. Foreign-made steel, as well as textiles, are flowing into this country. If this kind of thing is increased, it is feared that great unemployment will prevail. Labor wages and standards of living in this country have risen greatly. Any effort to cut wages would be followed by a general strike, even though the cuts were necessary.

One Member of Congress commented: "If we had control of labor instead of labor having control of us, something might be done." Yet this country must be able to compete in the markets of the world.

Congress probably will have to deal with this problem at the present session. But it may be slow getting to it. The House Ways and Means Committee is to take up first the Mills bill to plug loopholes in the tax laws, then medical care for the aged, and an increase in the national debt ceiling. After all these—the trade agreements legislation.

Address by Justice Michael A. Musmanno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, from time to time someone speaks out on love of flag and this brings a real joy to my heart because, unfortunately, sentiment for the symbol of our country is not often publicly declared. This reticence to display a deep feeling for love of our country and our flag has, I fear, brought about a certain indifference and often at times a disrespect for the flag. I had occasion recently to address this House twice on episodes which involved disrespect for the flag.

I respectfully ask you, Mr. Speaker, to authorize the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a brilliant address made by Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno on this subject. Justice Musmanno is certainly ideally qualified to speak on patriotism. He served his country in both World Wars. He was twice wounded in action. He is now a rear admiral—retired—in the U.S. Naval Reserves. Justice Musmanno's address follows:

SPEECH OF JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO AT BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER 11, 1961, 7 P.M., AT BANQUET OF 21 VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS CELEBRATING VETERANS DAY

I rise tonight to speak of patriotism, of the flag, and of the faith of the Founders of our Republic. I realize that if I were to

take this utterance in certain circles of supposedly higher intellectualism, it would be met with lifted eyebrows, cynic murmurs, and restrained sardonic sneers. To speak of love of country among certain classes of this high class snobbery is to be called old-fashioned and even antiquated.

When I was a boy we could hardly wait until Flag Day, Memorial Day; the Fourth of July and other patriotic holidays to unfurl the flag, salute it, caress it, and with hearts beating, faces glowing, and eyes sparkling, recall proudly and joyously its glorious history. Every public building and private home was bright with Old Glory glistening in grandeur and beautifying the very air in which it waved.

But today these patriotic holidays are days of frenzied hurrying off to the beach, to the mountains, to the lakes or other places no matter where, and the flag is forgotten in the rush. If a flag appears at random here and there, it seems as lonely as a forsaken housemaid, and I feel I want to approach the flag, to take it by the hand and say: "Don't worry, there are those who still love you."

So unimportant has the flag become in the frenetic, distracting life of today that there are communities where impediments have actually been placed in the way of exhibiting the flag. Some of you may remember that in the town of Fairless Hills only several miles from the sacred shrine of Valley Forge, a building restriction prohibited the erection of flag poles and, of course, without flag poles there are difficulties in displaying the flag. This prohibition was so drastic that there was not even a flag flying above the U.S. post office.

I shall never forget the morning of August 11, 1959, when I visited Fairless Hills, a town of pretty homes and splendid streets, but without a flag. It had a magnificent supermarket, a park, impressive landscaping, but not a flag. Not a bit of color broke the skyline which was as bleak, gray, and empty of Old Glory as a Siberian village. The roof of the U.S. post office could have been the roof of a neglected warehouse in Cuba.

I called on the postmaster, I telephoned higher postal authorities, I visited the offices of the corporation administering the affairs of Fairless Hills, to protest this flagless spectacle. I ran into obstacles, evasions, subterfuge everywhere. One of the excuses advanced for the strange state of affairs was that the roof of the post office building could not sustain the weight of a flagpole with a flag.

I had brought with me a flag which had been given to me by my good friend and distinguished statesman, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD. This flag had been flown over the U.S. Capitol. Commanders Boehmer, Bosch, and Holzer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I climbed to the roof of the post office and planted the flag there to show that this could be done.

How was this official act of the Veterans of Foreign Wars received? The editor of the local newspaper of the community sneered that what we had done was a circus antic. Another editor in Easton wrote a scurrilous piece attacking me, seeming to find fault, I don't know why, because I wore my VFW uniform, even though I was a department official of the VFW and certainly I don't need to apologize to anyone for wearing the honor-blessed uniform of the VFW, made up of Americans who have carried the U.S. flag into every corner of the globe and over every ocean. Still another newspaper in Monessen viciously attacked me as if I had committed a crime. And what had I done? I had raised the flag of the United States over a U.S. post office because those who were charged with that basic, fundamental duty refused to do so. I had placed where it belonged the flag which is and should be the inspiration of all Americans, the flag for which my three brothers and I

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A143

that as they believe that all the governments of the nations outside the Moscow-Peking orbit will eventually and inevitably, collapse or be overthrown. When this happens, the Communists assert, these bourgeois regimes will be replaced by Communist governments. Therefore coexistence with such capitalist governments is thought of as strictly temporary.

COMMUNISTS APPEAL DIRECTLY TO PEOPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

Secondly, the Communists pursue a policy which they term "people's diplomacy." This means that rather than deal strictly on a legal, government-to-government basis in the tradition of Western diplomacy, the Communists appeal directly to the people of another country. To influence or subvert the foreign nation, the Communists use every means and weapon available. Such a policy is designed to sell communism, to discredit the United States and to promote Soviet aims among the peoples of the world.

This is an entirely new kind of foreign policy based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, but utilizing all the methods, power and resources of the modern totalitarian state.

The differences between the American and Soviet approaches to foreign relations can be summed up in three phrases: (1) self-determination, (2) limited goals, and (3) means.

1. Self-determination: The fundamental attitude of the United States toward other peoples is that they should have the right to determine their fate themselves, without any other nation telling them what they can or can't do. An important aspect of this principle is the closely related one of democracy, especially the right of the peoples themselves to determine their policies through democratically elected representatives. In other words, our policy generally has been "hands off"—unless other nations have threatened us, or unless they have asked us to intervene in some way.

The Soviet policy has been the opposite. While paying lip service to the principle of self-determination, they have repeatedly, and as a matter of policy, interfered with the affairs of other states whenever they thought it to their advantage, and whenever they thought they could get away with it. They have imposed oppressive governments on other peoples against their will, and have denied them the right of choosing their representatives democratically.

2. Limited goals: You might argue that there really is no difference between Soviet and American foreign policies—that the Russians want all the world to be Communist, while we want all to be democratic. But there is a difference.

While it is true that we would like for the whole world to be democratic, we have not adopted a policy of wholesale intervention in all countries of the world for the purpose of imposing America-style regimes on people everywhere. Our goals are limited. We are content to live peacefully with dictatorships and monarchies, as well as with democracies so long as they do not threaten us.

Soviet goals by contrast, are unlimited. Communist leaders have stated openly and repeatedly that their goal is world communism, and that they will not be satisfied until every country in the world has a Communist regime modeled after that of the Soviet Union. Since World War II they have helped to impose such regimes in 16 countries, and they are actively working every day to achieve their unlimited goal.

3. Means: The Soviet objective to enhance Soviet power and prestige and to establish communism throughout the world would not be such a threat to us if it were not for the fact that they are willing to use any means for achieving this goal.

Lenin preached and Stalin and his successors followed the idea that any means including lies, deceit, theft, subversion, sabotage, and murder are acceptable for furthering the cause of world communism.

The United States finds it difficult to combat such a ruthless foe by traditional, peaceful means. The Communists have no reluctance about using force. The United States does not use force to impose upon other people a type of government which they do not want. At times we have found it necessary to engage in what might be considered "dirty work."

For example, the United States, like all great powers, engages in espionage. We sometimes find it necessary to interfere in the affairs of other nations. But this does not mean that our hands are just as dirty as the hands of the Communists. We try to use honorable means wherever possible and to avoid dirty means. If the Soviet threat were removed, we could, no doubt, abolish such means altogether.

DO THE RUSSIANS REALLY BELIEVE IN DISARMAMENT OR THE UNITED NATIONS?

In answering the question—"Do the Russians really believe in disarmament or the United Nations?"—we must record a qualified "No" on both scores. Qualified, because the disappointing record of Soviet words and deeds adds up to the unpleasant fact that the Kremlin honors its agreements only when it serves Soviet interests. This means that we can never trust the Communists.

But this also means that we should not discount entirely all Soviet statements on disarmament or the U.N. If approached realistically, it is entirely possible that we may find in the future as we have in the past certain limited areas of mutual agreement and advantage between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

All of this does not, of course, change the basic facts of life—namely, that the Kremlin considers both the disarmament and the U.N. issue relatively unimportant. The idea of a sincere agreement or compromise with the capitalist world—as has been suggested—is simply not part of Soviet mentality.

The Soviet Union and Disarmament: A 641-page Brookings Institutions study (published in August 1961) of the Soviet record in disarmament negotiations over the past 15 years is hardly reassuring. The conclusion of the study is that in the past decade and a half the Soviet Union has not yet shown a desire to sacrifice its system of Iron Curtain secrecy in order to obtain real disarmament. As we know, the Kremlin broke a nuclear test-ban tacit agreement and despite the protests of the people of the world went ahead in the fall of 1961 with dangerous nuclear tests which have polluted the atmosphere with radioactive fallout.

The Soviet Union and the U.N. It is obvious from the record that the Soviet Union does not really believe in the U.N. They have repeatedly thwarted the will of the majority of the Security Council by imposing their veto. They have consistently refused to let the U.N. have jurisdiction over matters which the Soviets considered vital to their interests. They look upon the U.N. primarily as a sounding board for their propaganda, rather than as a world organization for the preservation of peace.

It seems clear that the Soviets would have preferred that the U.N. had never come into existence, and never really took it seriously. During the early negotiations for the creation of the U.N., Stalin showed that he had paid the question little attention. He seems to have agreed to the creation of the U.N. reluctantly, and as a concession to Western pleadings during the era of good feelings that existed at the end of World War II.

At one time, Stalin refused to send Molotov to the founding conference of the U.N. at San Francisco, and it was only after a personal plea from President Truman that he finally agreed to let his Foreign Minister attend. The Stalin record within the U.N. was correspondingly bad.

The Khrushchev record is even worse. It includes the astonishing spectacle of the Soviet leader noisily pounding his shoe on the rostrum of the U.N. General Assembly before the distinguished representatives of the nations of the world. This rude act is symbolic of the disdain and distrust with which the Kremlin looks upon the U.N.

WHAT DOES THE KREMLIN MEAN BY PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE?

Stripped of its propaganda content, peaceful co-existence may be defined briefly and precisely: By peaceful co-existence the Soviets mean simply the absence of nuclear war. Thus seen in the cold light of reality, Communist pronouncements on the desire for peaceful co-existence are both true and meaningless or misleading.

True, in the sense that Khrushchev is certainly for co-existence. Given the U.S. nuclear retaliatory striking power, the alternative to co-existence, that is nuclear war, is nonexistence—national suicide.

Such statements are meaningless and misleading because they are too often equated or confused with the concepts cooperation, agreement on principles, mutual trust, conciliation or friendship.

To the Kremlin, peaceful co-existence is no more than a necessary strategy and a clever slogan dictated by the relative power positions of the two great superstates and useful in convincing the naive and the uninformed that the Soviet Union stands for peace.

Foreign Trade Knottiest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the question of tariffs and their effect on our trade relations will be uppermost in the minds of many Members of Congress after hearing the President's state of the Union message.

There is one rather simple fact that seems to be completely overlooked both in the message and by the exponents of free trade in our midst—how can a man being paid \$2 an hour compete with one who is equally skilled and has equally efficient tools but is paid 83 cents an hour? Of course he cannot, and any child could answer this simple question; that of course never gets asked.

Would it not be well to suggest to our foreign friends and competitors that any nation who raises their wage scale to meet ours will automatically enjoy free access to our markets? This would be workable and beneficial for all concerned.

The following article by Mr. Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 11, has prompted these thoughts:

piece of real estate on which they were born. They saw in "God Bless America" something stale and commonplace. They saw what Dr. Eddy called cliches.

Why did these American soldiers inform on their comrades, make broadcasts for the enemy and even falsely declare that America was using bacteriological warfare? What was their reward? I turn to page 129:

"They yielded for strictly personal and selfish reasons. They were the sort who would inform, sign petitions, and make broadcasts because for this they would receive tangible benefits—freedom to walk outside the camp compound, an egg or two, cigarettes."

Another group of the defectors actually accepted communism. In explanation as to why they did this, the author says that they were youths "who for various reasons had been unable to form any strong attachments or loyalties in their past lives." Maj. Harry A. Segal of the Army Medical Corps said that "they were the kind of men who say to themselves, 'I'm just a kid. I don't know where I'm going. I don't know whether people actually like me. Will I ever really be a success?'"

I want to make clear that I in no way suggest that Dr. Eddy is in any way responsible for the reprehensible actions of these young traitors. His speech was made 10 years after the Korean War, but I do say that his speech in no way helped to break down the cynical attitude toward American institutions and the American flag unhealthily prevalent among a certain class of young people.

In his speech on September 19, 1961 Dr. Eddy quoted the archtraitor Whittaker Chambers. He called him a "far less worthy apostle of liberty" than Judge Learned Hand, but beyond this he did not criticize him. He quoted Chambers who said:

"The dying world of 1925 was without faith, hope, character. Only in communism had I found any practical answer at all to the crisis, and the will to make that answer work. If it was the outrage, it was also the hope of the world."

And there, Dr. Eddy let the matter rest, stating only that the students had to decide for themselves what is fiction and what is reality in communism and capitalism. Is there even a stone in the street that does not know that communism is the diametrical negative of belief in God, faith in democracy, and adherence to the Golden Rule?

Dr. Eddy left the situation as if the students could find something to admire and follow in communism.

On November 20th, the Communists in the United States will be required by Federal law to register. Will Dr. Eddy or anyone else who thinks like him urge students to doubt whether Communists should register on the ground that there could be the possibility of fiction in the congressional finding and in the pronouncement of the Supreme Court of the United States that the Communist Party is an agency of the Soviet Union determined to achieve world domination, even at the cost of oceans of blood?

As I already stated, Dr. Eddy exhorted his students not to inherit their religion or nationality. In other words he asked his students to doubt their own parents and the religion of their parents. As if there were not already today too much lack of appreciation on the part of children toward their parents who make tremendous sacrifices in order to give them the best living in the world.

Dr. Eddy called upon his students to "doubt democracy." The defecting Korean soldiers certainly doubted democracy. When they were asked to choose between communism with an egg, plus cigarettes, and America without an immediate egg and ciga-

rettes, they gave up love of home, of parents, of friends, and the boundless golden opportunities of America. They exchanged this priceless treasure for the rotten egg, the moldy cigarettes, the atheism, the blood-soaked ideology, the children-murdering, torture-inflicting, barbaric program of Bolshevism.

Mr. Kinkead, the author of this book, asks how this incredible thing could happen and he replies on page 18:

"The roots of the explanation go deep into diverse aspects of our culture—home training of children, education, physical fitness, religious adherence, and the privilege of existing under the highest standard of living in the world."

How can we avoid that such a disgrace should occur again. Mr. Milton says, page 211:

"The Army would like to see every American parent, every American teacher, and every American clergyman work to instill in every one of our children a specific understanding of the differences between our way of life and the Communist way of life, and, even more important, work to give every child, in the blunt, old-fashioned spirit, a firm regard for right and an abiding distaste for wrong."

Let us look at another educator, but first let me repeat that the overwhelming majority of American educators are patriotic, God-fearing citizens who have probably accomplished more than any other class or profession to make America great and strong because they have properly taught the dreamers and the builders of America. But we must look at the few who, wilfully or undesignedly are giving aid and comfort to the enemy that would destroy everything we hold dear.

On April 6, 1960, there appeared in the New York Times a full-page ad, of which I have a photostatic copy here, sponsored by 31 persons, one of them being Prof. Robert G. Colodny, professor of history at the University of Pittsburgh, an institution which receives appropriations from the Pennsylvania Legislature, that is to say receives money from the Pennsylvania taxpayers. What does Professor Colodny say in this advertisement? The ad is entitled:

"What Is Really Happening in Cuba?" In it Professor Colodny says:

"Cuba and visitors to the island remain freer in many respects than do U.S. citizens. For example, no police permit is required for a public meeting or demonstration, as in New York City. There is no censorship."

This is, and was at the time the ad was published, an unmitigated falsehood. Yet Colodny teaches the youth of western Pennsylvania.

Here is another statement sponsored by Professor Colodny:

"Although the word 'confiscation' has often been used by the press [he refers here to the U.S. press] in a context which would suggest illegal seizure, nothing has stolen from any American—or any Cuban."

This, of course, is and was at the time the ad was published, an unmitigated falsehood. Castro has stolen a billion dollars worth of property from Americans. He has killed Americans without trial. Yet Colodny teaches the youth of western Pennsylvania at the University of Pittsburgh.

Colodny approved of the statement that:

"Cuba's recent trade pact with the Soviet Union represents an effort to find new markets for Cuban sugar, and to obtain, not arms, but agricultural implements and industrial machinery for which credit has been denied in the United States."

This was a falsehood at the time the ad was published and more so now. Cuba has received arms, tanks, ammunition, and untold other weapons from the Soviet Union, all aimed at establishing a Communist beachhead on the Western Continent, in spite of

the Monroe Doctrine. And yet Colodny teaches the youth of western Pennsylvania and receives money taken from the pockets of Pennsylvania's taxpayers.

Here in Philadelphia the taxpayers were required by court order to pay unearned wages to a teacher who for 6 years was a dues-paying member of the Communist Party. The taxpayers were required further to pay unearned salaries to other school teachers who, accused of belonging to the Communist Party, while teaching school, refused to answer questions put by a congressional committee as to whether they were members of this criminal organization committed to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Another Philadelphia school teacher, a Mrs. Goldie Watton, was asked by a congressional committee whether she adhered to the precepts of the Communist Party and if she had ever participated in a movement to destroy the American school system. She declined to answer. There was sworn testimony that she had been a member of the Communist Party. She put herself above Congress, the sovereign body of the United States, and declared that "no power on God's earth" could compel her to cooperate with the congressional committee. Mrs. Watton's behavior was the worst possible example to schoolchildren on how to behave. How can children learn to love their country and respect its flag and be inspired by the examples of patriotism of its heroic defenders if their school teachers defy Congress, insult the school authorities, and ridicule loyalty to the ideals of America as exemplified by the deeds of the Founding Fathers of our Republic?

The time has come to return to the faith of the Founding Fathers. America faces the most perilous period in her whole history. We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord. Those who are not for us are against us. Our schools are to be training grounds for the responsibilities of citizenship, not for cynicism, not for mockery and derision of those principles which have given us liberty and opportunity unsurpassed in any other country in the whole world. The disgrace of those young American defectors in Korea must never be repeated.

Khrushchev and his criminal conspirators are determined to destroy America. He should not be encouraged in his criminal enterprise by allowing him to interpret from irresponsible utterances in this country that we are divided in our resistance to Communist tyranny.

I oppose preachments of fear and foreboding. I dislike what was said by the noted columnist Sydney Harris several months ago. He said he had a dream that in a nuclear war against Russia we won but that 60 millions of our people had been killed and other millions were dying. He then said:

"A 'free society,' as we now understand it, was no longer possible. In order to survive its dreadful wounds, the nation would have to forego the luxuries of competition and concentrate on collective welfare rather than on individual effort."

"The men who had pulled us into war crying, 'Life wouldn't be worth living under communism,' found that, having won the war, we were now living under something very much like communism. We had defeated the enemy abroad only to find it among us at home."

This is defeatism at its very worst. America will never live under communism. America will never live as slaves. Moreover, what Mr. Harris doesn't realize is that it isn't a question of someone pulling us into war. It is a matter of Russia forcing war upon us, and the way to avoid that war is to keep ourselves strong. We must never appease because appeasement is what precipitated World War II. There is no doubt in

fought in three wars, the flag which covered the grave of one of those brothers on a battlefield in France, the flag which symbolizes the sacrifice of all the patriot-martyrs who gave their all for America.

Following the flag raising I communicated with Congressman Flood who made a powerful speech on the subject in the House of Representatives. He communicated with the Postmaster General demanding that the disgraceful situation in the Fairless Hills post office, with regard to the flag, be corrected. I called on Benjamin Fairless in whose honor the town was named. I conferred with officers of United States Steel Corp., and eventually the flag appeared over the post office and the town, and eventually the building restriction was removed.

I am happy to say that during this VFW fight for the flag, the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Philadelphia Bulletin gave excellent and absolutely fair coverage to the entire controversy, thus helping to bring about the excellent results I have indicated.

Even before this Fairless Hills episode, there was another incident involving the flag. This one will sound almost fantastic to you. In Pittsburgh, my hometown, arrangements had been made to publicly burn the flag of the United States on the steps of the city-county building which houses the supreme court, the courts of the county, the mayor's office, city council chamber, and other government offices. Those in charge of the project intended the flag burning as a demonstration of how an old 48-star flag could be destroyed. The whole enterprise was appalling to contemplate. The mayor, councilmen, judges, and other officials were to participate, a detachment of U.S. Marines was to conduct the actual burning. Camera-men, TV crews, newspaper photographers were all ready to record the sensational and disgraceful event. I visualized Communist newspapers throughout the world reproducing the pictures and proclaiming in headlines: American Flag Burned by Rioters in Front of Government Building; While U.S. Soldiers Look on Helplessly.

Of course, this would not be true, but who ever craved the Soviet press for telling the truth? And what would the American people think? Would they not be horrified to see an American flag being burned in what might seem to be a gala and festive spectacle?

I tried to persuade the persons in charge of the event to call it off. They refused. I ordered them not to burn the flag and served notice that if they dared to touch the tiniest flame or spark to the flag I would hold them in contempt of court. I then proceeded to the front of the building and stood there with a bench warrant prepared to jail the first man who put a violent hand on the flag. The flag was not touched.

Congressman Flood, ever vigilant, ever alert, spoke in Congress describing this near outrage to the flag of our country and demanded that the Department of Defense absolutely forbid any such future attempted desecration of the flag. It was not long until the Department of Defense did issue such a directive.

How could such desecration of the flag ever have been thought of? The answer is that the spirit of old-fashioned, heart-thrilling patriotism is lagging; it is because many persons who should be inculcating respect and reverence for the symbols of Americanism and the expression of patriotism are exhorting American youth to do just the reverse. In point, let me tell you of Dr. Edward D. Eddy, Jr., president of the Chatham College in Pittsburgh.

On September 19, 1961, Dr. Eddy at the opening convocation of the college, made this astounding declaration to the student body:

"Please don't inherit either your religion or your nationality. Subject them to your

own intelligence test. I plead with you, while you are a student, to question and to doubt the Judeo-Christian tradition and to doubt democracy. You will not become truly convinced of either until you have wrestled with both. Only then will the idealism of both be rekindled truly for you and your generation.

"The great majority of us find meaning in the Judeo-Christian tradition and in the democratic form of government—but we cannot pass on to you the will to make it work. You must find this for yourself. It would be senseless for us merely to wave a flag in your face, for you would be smothered by its folds."

What kind of language is this for a college president? "You would be smothered by its folds." He is speaking of the American flag, each fold of which is rich with the patriotic deeds of Paul Revere, Molly Pitcher, John Paul Jones, Captain Lawrence, Admiral Farragut, Commando Kelly, and the countless others who faced death to save the liberties which Dr. Eddy and all other Americans enjoy.

But Dr. Eddy didn't stop there. He said further: "It would be senseless for us to bellow 'God bless America,' for you would turn away from its abundance of clichés." Please note the verb Dr. Eddy employs: "bellow." He is, of course, being cynical and sarcastic, for only such a person or an outright boor would bellow "God bless America." And then he says that "God bless America" is abundant with clichés. What is a cliché? It is something stale and commonplace. Do you find anything stale and commonplace in any or all of the three words: God bless America? Has Dr. Eddy never thrilled to hear the dulcet voices of school-children singing with all their hearts and souls "God Bless America"? Did he turn away from that sweet music, finding it stale and commonplace?

But Dr. Eddy didn't even stop with that witless statement in his speech to the students of his college. He went on to say: "As Samuel Johnson said so wisely, 'Patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels.'" Note he says that Johnson spoke wisely in declaring that patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels. Was Nathan Hale, who said "I regret I have but one life to give for my country" a scoundrel? Was George Washington, who was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen, a scoundrel? Were the signers of the Declaration of Independence who offered their lives, their honors, and their fortunes for the independence and defense of their country, scoundrels? He said further: "We do not want you to grow up as breast-beating scoundrels but as students committed to a faith and a nation you have found for yourself. This is what we should mean by 'rediscovery.'"

I do not share Dr. Eddy's idolization of Samuel Johnson. In my estimation, Johnson was a bloated, slovenly hypochondriac so muddled in his egotistic British self-exaltation that he defended taxation without representation. He called the American Continental Congress a "congress of anarchy." It was he, Samuel Johnson, whom Dr. Eddy praises, who said contemptuously that Americans multiplied "with the fecundity of their own rattlesnakes." It was he who said that Americans "are a race of convicts and ought to be thankful for anything we allow them short of hanging."

This is the man Dr. Eddy apostrophizes as a man of wisdom.

I do not mention Dr. Eddy because I consider him particularly influential, and I certainly wish to emphasize that he in no way represents the teaching profession of America. I refer to him only because his words typify a kind of thinking which is doing considerable harm to America in degrading patriotism and smothering love for the flag.

Only 2 days ago the second secretary of the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, Irvin C. Scarbeck, was convicted of passing U.S. secrets to Polish Communist agents. He certainly did not love the flag. We all remember the infamous and malodorous Alger Hiss who also sneered at patriotism while giving state secrets to Russian agents. He held no small position in our Government. He was executive assistant to the President of the United States. A report made by a committee of the U.S. Senate revealed the revolting evidence that among those who lurked and worked at betraying our Government were such high-ranking officials as:

An Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs for the State Department.

Head of the Latin American Division of the Office of Strategic Services.

Member of the U.S. National Labor Relations Board.

U.S. Treasury attaché in China.

Secretary of the U.S. National Labor Relations Board.

They were all men who looked upon the flag as a painted rag and derided patriotic ceremonies.

Not long ago a young American aviator, Francis Gary Powers, went on trial in Moscow for flying over Russia, taking pictures. I don't know whether in school he listened to someone telling him that patriotism is the refuge of a scoundrel but certain it is he was never impressed enough by Nathan Hale to defy his accusers and say: "I flew over Russia because we did not want a repetition of Pearl Harbor." Instead he cringed and whined: "I didn't know what I was doing. I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible."

Dr. Max Rafferty in the current issue of Reader's Digest properly and indignantly comments on Powers as follows:

"Thank heaven, they're not all like that. But this one was. So were a sickening number of our young men just 10 years ago who sold out their fellow American soldiers, and licked the boots of the brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders, and made tape recordings praising communism. So are all the phony sophisticates who clutter up our colleges and agitate against ROTC and parade in support of Fidel Castro."

I would like to call to your attention a recently published book which shocked me more than if I had touched a highly charged electric wire. It is called: "Why They Collaborated," and was written by Eugene Kinkead, a highly competent writer, from personal investigation and from a study conducted by the U.S. Army into the conduct of American prisoners who during the Korean war collaborated with the Communist enemy.

I hold the book in my hand and turn to page 34 where Mr. Kinkead asks Hugh M. Milton, Assistant Secretary of the Army, the percentage of American prisoners who collaborated with the enemy. Milton replies: "One man in every seven, or more than 13 percent were guilty of serious collaboration—writing disloyal tracts, say, or agreeing to spy or organize for the Communists after the war."

Never had there been any such traitorous conduct in previous wars. And the reason is that up until this present cynical attitude toward patriotism and the flag among certain people in America, American youth was not embarrassed to speak of loving the flag and to tell about feeling the copules dancing in their veins as they listened to the stirring strains of the Star-Spangled Banner.

Why did so many of our young men wearing the uniform of the United States betray the United States as soon as they got away from the American forces? The answer, of course, is that they didn't love America. America meant no more to them than a

1962

my mind whatsoever that Hitler and the rulers of Japan would never have attacked America had they known that we would retaliate as we did. Khrushchev must know, as he is now being informed, that we will never tolerate abridgements of our freedom. This does not mean that we will be provocative or belligerent. It was stated beautifully by our wise and courageous President John F. Kennedy:

"Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

God through the instrumentality of our scientists and the determination of the American people has provided us with the means to protect this blessed land from barbaric invasion. President Kennedy has said:

"In terms of total military strength the United States would not trade places with any nation on earth. We have taken major steps in the past year to maintain our lead—and we do not propose to lose it."

We are invincibly armed with a protective sword of fire which we hold aloft not in aggressive attack but in warning.

We say to Khrushchev: "Come, join with us in the ways of peace, the good Lord has provided enough for all, the land is fruitful and the sea is rich; science has removed the burden from the back of man and put it into machines. The laboratory has not been confined to the discovery of engines of death, it has revealed new vistas for the conquering of disease, it has expanded the average span of life from 45 to 68 years, and we are gaining 6 months each year.

"Come, let us listen to the song of happy children, let us revel in the concert of understanding hearts. Let us work for the true world parliament of man.

"There is nothing which you possess that we covet: Keep your lands, your forests, your mines, your factories, your rivers, and your skies, but do not try to take ours. Do not seek to throw chains around the globe, do not aim to strip away from mankind its faith in the everlasting goodness of the Prince of Peace. We ask all this in the name of the Lord.

"We hold this sword of fire not for aggression but as a torch of freedom, a beacon of justice between man and man, but if you take one step of attack against this fair land, then that invincible sword will strike."

We are prepared for every sacrifice but that of relinquishing our freedom. Americans will never be slaves. We must and will be worthy of our Founding Fathers and bold for the right. With such a new Declaration of Independence, we will not; we can never, under God's guidance, fail.

The Uses of Wood—Speech by Miss Donna Axum, Arkansas Forest Queen for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in 1960 Congress passed a joint resolution setting aside the week beginning with the third Sunday of October as National Forest Products Week. The President promptly approved, thus extending proper recognition to an industry that has long merited such a signal honor.

This past October I had the privilege of participating in the observance of National Forest Products Week in my home

State, and I was greatly pleased to witness as a part of the ceremonies marking that event, the crowning of Miss Donna Axum as Arkansas Forest Queen for 1961. At that time Miss Axum made a most instructive speech on "The Uses of Wood." I believe her comments will be of great interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This young lady is extremely well versed in the subject of forestry, as her remarks so clearly demonstrate, and I ask unanimous consent that her speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THE USES OF WOOD

(By Miss Donna Axum)

I hold in my right hand a piece of wood. Man has always depended on wood. Our Pilgrim fathers established the first colony in Jamestown, Va., 352 years ago. Since that time man has developed over 6,000 uses of wood. I would like to invite you now to travel with me as we turn the pages in history, and review the uses of wood, past, present, and future.

Let's begin our journey with the colonization of the first settlers in Jamestown in the year 1609. There is John Smith, a perfect example of the first settler. His prime ambition in this country is to provide a comfortable home for his family, and it is here that he first turns to wood. With his home completed, John Smith realizes that wood is his best friend; for from it he carves tools for farming and weapons for hunting. The Smith family always rides in style on land or sea in their wooden boat and wagon. And Mrs. Smith's pride and joy is her wooden spinning wheel on which she creates the latest fashions of the day. After a good day's hunt, the delicious evening meal is prepared over a blazing fireplace. And when the wooden dishes have been cleared away, we see the Smith family enjoys sitting around the dimming fire and singing the current folk songs of the day. They are, of course, accompanied by the old wooden banjo. This family, as well as all pioneer families, are solely dependent upon wood for their existence. Construction, tools and weapons, transportation, fuel, machinery, and entertainment all show us the important uses of wood to the early settlers.

Let's continue our journey now as we move up to the present decade in our review of the uses of wood. Many years have passed, and many pages in history have been turned, and we see that man has developed over 6,000 uses of wood.

Progress has combined chemicals and other substances with wood to create thousands of products for our everyday living. We have just arrived in New York City, one of the focal points of the Nation in 1961. And as fashion takes the spotlight, we see that there is magic in wood. Famous designers create the most beautiful fashions from wood. Yes, many of today's synthetic fibers such as rayon are wood products. The homes of today have changed quite a bit since the time of John Smith. We have found that there is beauty as well as versatility in wood as an interior decorative material. Wood is the unsurpassed material from which the finest furniture can be made. And since it is flexible, it enables the craftsman to mold it into the most beautiful furniture imaginable. Something very popular in today's homes is wood paneling. By matching and combining the grains of wood, beautiful designs can be made to enhance the beauty of any wall. A telephone is an essential item in every home and office today. But you may ask this question—what does a telephone have to do with wood? The case is made of plastic, which is a wood product. Plastics

do play a large part in our everyday lives, for how could we ever do without our clocks, radios, and one very essential item that we use three times a day—our toothbrush. Here is one of the newest wood products on the market today. From the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis., comes Papreg. It is made of paper which has been soaked in resin and pressed. The result is a material half the weight of aluminum, yet, strong as steel. When this material is used in the construction of airplanes, it needs no finish, is not harmed by salt water, and will not tear or shread. It still will, no doubt, be a valuable material in the peacetime construction of refrigerators, radios, and many other similar items.

The last leg of our journey will be a fantastic one as we jump to the year 2000. It's a pushbutton world where automobiles have become museum pieces. And jetstream transportation will take you from New York to Dallas in only 30 minutes. Remember back in 1961, when the women thought the knee-tickling skirts were too short? Well, today's fashion designers have made them thigh-tickers, and in every fabric imaginable—all made of wood. That TV and telephone will bring your friends and neighbors right into your own home every morning for that regular chat over coffee. It is impossible for us to know everything about the future, but there is one thing that we can be sure of—that is that wood will continue to be one of the key materials in the production and development of thousands of useful products for our everyday living.

We must end our journey now and return to the present, but you and I have covered a period of over 491 years in only 5 minutes. We have visited the past, the present, and the future, and at each stop we have seen the important uses of wood to man. I think our journey can best be summarized in the poem by Henry Abby entitled "What Do We Plant?"

"What do we plant when we plant the tree?"

We plant the ship which will cross the sea.
We plant the mast to carry the sails,
We plant the planks to withstand the gales;
The keel, the keelson, the beam and knee,
We plant the ship when we plant the tree.

"What do we plant when we plant the tree?"

A thousand things that we daily see,
We plant the spire that out-towers the crag,
We plant the staff for our country's flag,
We plant the shade, from the hot sun free,
We plant all these, when we plant the tree."

How We Got This Way—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, part 3—October 22—of the New York Daily News series of editorials, "How We Got This Way," is as follows:

How We Got This Way—III

The American Revolution (1776-83) ended British rule over what had become the 13 Original States of the Union, but it also bred a legion of troubles for the new Nation and most of its citizens.

For one thing, Britain sought revenge for the Revolution by barring U.S. trade with the British West Indies. This brought on the bad depression of 1784-85.

But as most historians view the matter, the basic reason for the infant Nation's woes was the form of government under which it

January 15

A148

struggled for some years to live, prosper, and progress.

Back in 1777 (November 15), with the Revolution officially on only about 16 months old, the Continental Congress had approved a set of laws known as the Articles of Confederation. Ratification by the States was completed March 1, 1781.

The Articles of Confederation viewed the States as so many independent little nations, in most respects. These little nations agreed in this document to form "a firm league of friendship," to see to their common defense, and to advance their "mutual and general welfare."

Having so agreed, they proceeded proudly to disagree, on virtually every subject of importance to them, and to act like independent nations in almost all respects.

Each State, for example, was at liberty to issue its own money. They all did so. In seven of them, the farmers' fondness for paper money brought about the printing of huge wads of the stuff, which rapidly became almost worthless.

Again each State was free to levy tariffs on goods coming into it from anywhere outside its borders. New York was especially fond of collecting such duties on imports from New Jersey and Connecticut.

There was border fighting here and there between the armed forces of various States.

MISERIES OF CONFEDERATION

The State legislatures, all 13 of them, were the most powerful lawmaking bodies in the land. They could and did thumb their noses at Congress whenever they pleased.

Congress itself had no powers that amounted to anything, and lacked the ability to use what powers it had.

It couldn't collect the taxes it imposed, from anybody or any State that didn't want to pay them; couldn't raise and maintain a respectable Army and Navy; couldn't regulate interstate commerce; couldn't use troops to put down uprisings; couldn't compel States to live up to any treaties Congress might negotiate with other countries.

Consequently, a large number of intelligent Americans came to realize soon after the Revolution that something drastic had to be done if the new Nation wasn't to blow itself apart or be taken over by the first strong and determined country that might attack it.

The big question was what to do; and innumerable answers were offered from time to time.

A considerable number of people, including many veterans of the Revolution, wanted to set up a military dictatorship.

Numerous others thought for a while that it would be a good idea to crown some American as king of the new Nation. Gen. George Washington would have been the logical choice for this honor—which he did not want.

DICTATORSHIP—KING—OR WHAT?

It was Washington himself who set the machinery in motion for the solution that was finally worked out. In 1783, he sent a letter around to the Governors of all the States, pointing out the dangers of the 13-independent-nation setup and calling for the creation of a more powerful Central Government.

Alexander Hamilton, another veteran of the Revolution, began soon afterward to attack the Articles of Confederation in speeches and print, and to demand some sort of convention to draw up a new and much stronger set of ground rules for the united-in-name-only States.

Washington, Hamilton and their less well-known colleagues in this movement had a very rough time selling their ideas to most of their fellow Americans. The States did not want to give up any powers for the Nation's benefit; many a citizen dreaded a re-

turn to the sort of tyranny he had endured under King George III.

At last, though, in May of 1787, the Constitutional Convention assembled in Philadelphia; and the next editorial in this series will describe what happened there.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story— Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dale Wright of the New York World-Telegram and Sun who experienced at firsthand the shocking conditions confronting migrant farmworkers. I hope to continue to bring to the attention of my colleagues this excellent series of articles:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—MIGRANT PAY \$4.32 A DAY IN FLORIDA TOMATO FIELD

(By Dale Wright)

(Four migrant farmworkers burned to death last Sunday in their squalid shack in a Suffolk County labor farm. The tragedy typifies the shocking abuse of "The Forgotten People" which, according to an on-the-spot survey of the World-Telegram, still persists today despite some protective laws. This survey started last April, when staff writer, Dale Wright, was assigned to work in Florida as a migrant laborer, and continued until last month. Today his article tells of his first day of overwork, underpayment and exploitation.)

On a warm, humid morning last April, a rickety old bus jolted along at its top speed between rows of carefully manicured estates along Route 1 from Miami south to Homestead, Fla. Although the vehicle had seats for 35 persons, it was cramped with 64 passengers.

I was one of them.

I was on my way to my first day of work as a migrant farm laborer in the lush tomato fields of southern Dade County. I had shaped up (reported for assignment) earlier that morning on a Miami street corner and was hired—with no questions asked—by a fat character known as a labor contractor.

In the South, labor contractors round up crews of workers for transport and assignment to farms where crops are to be harvested.

SALES PITCH SOUNDS GOOD

"Everybody that gets on this bus," he promised reassuringly, "makes \$10, \$12, \$15 today if you want to work. There's plenty of tomatoes to pick and there will be no cheating, nothin' taken out of your pay. And it will be clean work."

His pitch sounded good but I wanted to see for myself. The smirks on the faces of the seasoned migrant workers around me raised my doubts.

In a vast patch of ground outside Homestead our crew joined about 150 other farmworkers. They were busy when we arrived gathering a crop of "red ripers," tomatoes ready that day for shipment to the markets and canneries. It was just after daybreak and a bright sun already had begun to broil the pickers as they stooped in the long rows.

The job was to pick and pack the tomatoes into baskets that contained five-eighths of

a bushel. Each loaded basket weighed 60 pounds. When we had them filled we lugged them to the end of the row where they were loaded onto trucks. Pay promised was 12 cents a basket.

KIDS GOTTA EAT

In the row next to mine, an emaciated man of about 40 coughed and spat incessantly as he bent to his task. When I noticed the blood and spoke to him about it, he muttered:

"Yeah, they say it's consumption. It don't make no difference. I gotta keep working. The doctor, he can't do nothing for me. I got no money for medicine. I got a woman and a lotta kids. I gotta keep pickin' tomatoes."

Obviously, the man was seriously ill and belonged in a hospital. But he was trapped by the need to work for his family in the only job he knew how to do. Later, when we stood up to smoke a cigarette, he said to me:

"Been doin' farm work all my life. Don't know nothin' else. I can't go to a hospital. Kids gotta eat."

CHILDREN SICK, TOO

He said his name was Alonzo and that he lived in a tin and tarpaper shack near Goulds, Fla., for which he paid \$10 a week rent. He added that three of his children—the small ones—had dry, hacking coughs and probably had caught the misery he had in his chest.

Medical treatment? No. None of the youngsters had ever seen a doctor.

Despite his illness, Alonzo was a hard worker. As we worked along the endless rows of tomato plants, he loaded basket after basket of tomatoes and was soon far down the field from me.

Later that day Alonzo told me he soon would be moving north from Homestead because the harvest was "going down." To keep living, he explained, he'd have to load his family and his belongings onto a truck or bus going north, where other crops were ripening.

"It's the same," he said. "This job is just like the last one. Next be just like this one. Never no different. Never will be."

TYPICAL CASE

This sick, frustrated laborer, doomed long before his time, was summing up the lot of today's migrant farmworker.

The back-breaking labor of stooping close to the orange-tinted Florida earth begins as soon as a picker can distinguish red tomatoes from green ones in the gray dawn of an endless day.

His work ends when he no longer can see the tomatoes to pick them. At the promised rate of 12 cents a basket, a good picker can fill 70 to 80 baskets a day and earn—it says there—from \$8.40 to \$9.60 a day.

As bad as that kind of pay is, it generally worked out that the man in the fields received considerably less than the promised rate. Often the rate dropped on payday to 8 cents a basket and the field hand who actually "took home" \$7 a day for his work considered himself lucky.

On my first day in the fields, I worked 10 hours with only a 15-minute break for what they called lunch. It was the hardest, most punishing work I had ever done.

NO TOILET FACILITIES

In the first hours of that miserable day, my hands became grimy and encrusted with the green insecticide they spray on tomatoes. It covered my khaki pants and ate its way into my legs. It collected under my fingernails, covered my shoes and socks and festered in the scratches I received from the tomato vines.

But picking the tomatoes was the easy part of the job. The hard part was lugging the heavy baskets to the end of the rows—often