

With permission, I submit the text of the News editorial of November 18:

SAGGING MAIL BAG

One reason the Post Office must ask Americans this year to mail their Christmas cards and packages early is that—figuratively speaking—the postman's legs are buckling under the weight of his mail bag.

Now at 82 million pieces annually, the volume of mail has more than doubled in 20 years, equal half the world's total and seems destined to top 100 billion pieces by 1976.

Yet the system responsible for handling this soaring volume is often archaic. The vast majority (90 per cent) of federally owned office space was built in the 1930s or earlier. Many postal operations are 30 years behind current technology, according to Postmaster General O'Brien. And despite advances made with the ZIP code, the sorting of most mail is still a peek-and-poke operation alongside rows and rows of pigeon holes.

"Unless we face up to the need for quick and far-reaching changes," Mr. O'Brien said recently, "our postal service may collapse under the weight of the fast-growing demands heaped upon it."

With deterioration so prevalent, it's not surprising that the post office reacts to the challenge of delivering a record nine-billion pieces of mail by Christmas a bit like Santa on his big night: with great longing to get an early start.

For the long run, the department has a new Bureau of Research and Engineering, headed by former Buffalonian Dr. Leo Packer, to design the most appropriate types of modernization. But this large investment must be phased over the years. Meanwhile, most Americans had still better heed those plaintive post office pleas to "mail your Christmas cards early this year!"

lie that all the talk they had been hearing of how the U.S.A. was in the grip of hysteria in the course of which "people of liberal opinions are dragged before inquisitorial committees to be defamed and insulted on the unsupported evidence of informers of the lowest character," was a lot of bilge.

In the course of her article Miss West reviewed the successes which the Communists had had in penetrating the American "power structure," and then raised the question: Why do people in America and Britain denounce those who seek to expose the Communists as "witch hunters"?

Miss West's answer was this: "The immediate reason is the hypnotic power of the word 'McCarthyism': the belief that the United States is at present practically governed by a dictator named Joe McCarthy, that he invented and controls the investigations and uses them as the instruments of his tyranny."

Miss West went on to demonstrate the absurdity of this myth and added that the myth has been of tremendous use to the Communists, for one reason because it caused a large section of the public to "regard persons called before the committees as delicate Davids braving a gross Goliath, and such of them as were Communists would get the benefit of the doubt."

Despite Miss West's thoughtful analysis—to say nothing of what those of us who "lived through McCarthyism" could see with our own eyes—the myth is still routine doctrine among liberals and is taken seriously by too many others who ought to know better.

It is no surprise to find Archibald MacLeish blasting off with the plain fabrication that in the "McCarthy era" to dedicate a public library was "an act of defiance and protest—defiance not of a demagogue in Congress alone, but of the whole miasma of suspicion and censorship he had let loose on the country." This is the kind of fiction which liberals feed each other.

More disturbing is to find a careful historian like A. L. Rowse in *The Churchills* comparing the anti-Papist hysteria in 17th Century England to "that which the United States experienced under McCarthy." However, in the American edition of the book the phrase "under McCarthy" is changed to "a short while ago," and Mr. Rowse concedes that "there was a certain amount of justification for this fear."

And how! Now we have the Philby case, and with it the revelation that the belief in "McCarthyism" is not just something to argue about with liberals, but, as Miss West predicted, a weapon which the Communists have used most effectively in their effort to paralyze the will of the anti-Communist West.

Who doesn't recall the obscene performances of liberal columnists doing their best to be "persecuted" by Sen. McCarthy in order to pose as heroic fighters in the battle for free speech? But how many of us then recognized these exhibitionists as instruments, willing or deluded, in the Communist plan to blunt public authority in its far from determined effort to thwart the conspiracy?

The extent of the damage caused and the number of lives lost because of the success of Soviet agent Harold Philby in worming his way to the top in British intelligence may never be fully known. Through the virtually unimpeded operations of Philby, George Blake and the two dipodiplomats Burgess and McLean, the Soviet apparatus doubtless possesses an impressive dossier on Western anti-Red activity, supposedly "secret" and otherwise.

We do not know, of course, how many other Communist agents and their local subordinates have managed to carry on without interference because government officialdom has been hesitant to act lest the cry of "McCarthyism!" be raised.

In Great Britain, the former Tory Prime Minister Harold Macmillan used McCarthyism to explain the outcry against Philby, after our own CIA had tipped off the British on Philby's activities. This was as early as 1955, but Mr. Macmillan fatuously dismissed the matter with the statement that there was "no reason to conclude that Mr. Philby had at any time betrayed the interests of this country."

Old Boy network? Well, Philby and Macmillan are both "public school" Old Boys, but the more probable answer is the same one that Mr. Macmillan gave in another crisis over a suspected spy (Vassall): fear of being sneered at as a McCarthyite. As Peter Simple of the *London Telegraph* put it, "the word McCarthyism [has] the paralyzing effect of nerve gas."

It is indeed a shocking indictment of liberalism that its major contribution to "social advance" was to hand the Communist conspirators a defensive weapon probably more potent than the 5th Amendment's provision against self-incrimination.

The fiction of "McCarthyism," which deluded even some of Joe McCarthy's colleagues in the Senate, has become a sort of Terror operating against anybody in public life, or in the press and education system, who undertook to expose or frustrate the Communist drive to take over the world.

It has been, as Miss West wrote 14 years ago, "much easier, much more popular, much safer, to follow the middle-class fashion of today and repeat what may or may not be true, but is certainly irrelevant; that we are all much superior to Sen. McCarthy."

It's all pretty humiliating, but Americans have a distaste for being "had" twice and we may be fortunate enough to experience a New Wave of McCarthyism. Should that happen, the Communists might conceivably find their erstwhile liberal errand boys really terrified, this time terrified enough to refuse to pull more Communist chestnuts out of the fire. Or is that just too naive?

The M-16 Rifle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 27, 1967

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall recently wrote an article which appeared in the *New York Post* which takes note of the M-16 rifle in the war, and the congressional study and report it provoked. His article adds much useful background to the discussion and should be available to the Members in providing perspective to their analysis. I offer it for the RECORD:

M-16 CRITICISM CALLED SUPERFICIAL

(By Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall)

Following a battle, American combat forces do not systematically collect and analyze the data on how small arms have functioned.

The fact is that they have never done so. The death of dependable data on this subject is not more conspicuous in Vietnam than was the case in Korea or in France during either World War.

Artillerymen, on the other hand, insist on knowing. Any failure is a major event requiring searching investigation and conclusive findings. The experts take over and determine whether it was the fuse, the round, the piece itself or human error at the scene that did the damage.

McCarthyism Used To Shield Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 7, 1967, and again in the Appendix of the RECORD of November 21, I quoted articles dealing with subversion in high echelons of our Government and the modus operandi of the individuals and agencies concerned.

The facts presented in those articles require investigation by authorized committees of the Congress with the spotlight of full publicity—a procedure that will undoubtedly evoke a cry of persecution as an emotional shield to protect those under investigation.

A most enlightening article by Frederick Nelson on how such smear weapons—as used by subversives in the Philby case—was published in the November 25, 1967, issue of *Human Events*, a weekly newspaper of Washington, D.C.

As the article should be of interest to all Members of the Congress, especially those on investigating committees, I quote it as part of my remarks:

HOW CRIES OF "MC CARTHYISM" AIDED PHILBY

(By Frederic Nelson)

Back in 1953 Rebecca West did a pair of articles for the *London Sunday Times* in which she sought to inform the British pub-