

Nixon Journeys Contrasted**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. George Todt, noted west coast columnist and commentator, whose column originates on the editorial page of the Valley Times which covers the San Fernando Valley out in California, has come up with some highly interesting observations growing out of Vice President Nixon's visits to Russia and Poland.

I think many Americans will share Mr. Todt's conviction that the existence of the Iron Curtain is not so much to keep news, and facts and people from getting behind the Iron Curtain as it is to prevent people unhappy with communism from fleeing their homelands.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

NIXON JOURNEYS CONTRASTED

(By George Todt)

What may very well have been the most significant feature of Vice President RICHARD NIXON's recent trip to Moscow and Warsaw seems to have been lost on many writers and observers who covered this event.

For the warm reception he received behind the Iron Curtain indicated pretty conclusively that those who know communism best receive most affectionately those who fight against it the hardest.

Conversely, Nixon's trip to South America a little more than a year ago—where and when he was stoned and spat upon—shows us the other side of the coin: Those who know communism the least are, at the same time, also the most antagonistic to those who oppose its expansion at the expense of free nations around the world.

There is a lot of difference between those who can afford to seat themselves on the sidelines and preach theoretical communism as an attractive ideology for their fellows—and others who are forced to live under its godless tenets as a working formula.

Let's think this one over for ourselves, shall we?

Speaking along such lines as we have been discussing here, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, one of the wisest and most solid of the solons on Capitol Hill, recently had this to say:

"I believe that several lessons can well be learned from the short interval of history which took the Vice President of the United States on the big jump from rocks in Venezuela to roses in Warsaw, on his good will mission for the people of the United States."

"I think the first lesson is clearly this: Communism has its greatest appeal to the people who live farthest from it.

"The second lesson is that to people living under communism, but once enjoyed freedom—as is true in the case of the people of Poland—the existence of freedom and its demonstration anywhere in the world, as exemplified by Vice President NIXON's visit to Warsaw and to Russia, is a cause of great rejoicing.

"The third lesson is, I believe, that the more one knows about communism, or the closer he lives to it and the more intimate

his connections with it become, the more he detests and abominates it—both as a philosophy and a way of life."

As so often is the case, the well thought out words of Senator MUNDT add up to commonsense and reason. The difference in the receptions afforded the Vice President at Caracas and Warsaw amply illustrate the point he has made for us.

The inhabitants of the first city, in Venezuela, are happily not infested, infected or otherwise inflicted with the plague known as Marxist communism: How easy for them to sit around and prate of what an excellent system of government it might be.

But the more practical denizens of the capital of Poland, which is Warsaw, are not the unrealistic theorists of the South American variety who, to put it in the words of the overrun Poles, may be said to have "never had it so good."

The liberty-loving people of Poland have had the Red colossus on their backs since the end of the Second World War. Although the cream of the Polish patriots and democratic elements of the stricken country have long since been liquidated by the Communists—first notable instance of Marxist mass murder there was the Katyn Forest massacre of 14,000 army officers while the late war was still in progress—those who yet remain have forgotten neither their former freedom nor hatred for the Communists who took it away from them.

The real reason for the Iron Curtain today, as it has been in the past, is not so much to keep us out—as it is to keep the poor, miserable wretches on the other side from running away.

"Do we need look any further than West Berlin to see that this is so? Actually, several millions of grateful East Germans have succeeded in gaining freedom for themselves via this escape route.

But how many West Germans—or how few—have gone the other way?"

Washington Report**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter of August 22, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 22, 1959.

The first session of the 86th Congress is struggling to a close, many Members think, although in the next breath some concede the possibility of endless debate ahead. Here's a roundup.

Controversial issues to be carried over include minimum wage, aid to education, aid to depressed areas, Federal unemployment compensation, Federal health insurance, social security expansion, interest rate ceiling removal (and others?).

Controversial issues considered earlier and scheduled for further action include labor reform, housing, and the farm program. New items for House debate include Public Law 480, (surplus food disposal), civil rights, highways and gasoline tax increase, and foreign investment tax incentive (H.R. 5).

Controversial clashes of viewpoint continue and include the political front, for example,

who's for big spending, and the balanced budget; our international policy embodied in foreign aid (including food surplus disposal) and the Khrushchev visit.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, to dispose of surplus commodities, with amendments, was the week's big floor debate, centered around a barter provision. The big question—should the United States dispose of our surplus food products in exchange for strategic materials for our national stockpile rather than sell for foreign currency, which currency may or may not be of any use to the United States. If not, then the food in effect becomes a gift. The complicated, confusing, and at times self-defeating nature of this program led me to observe in debate that the problems confronting us arise because of a very basic problem, quite overlooked; namely, that the Federal Government is not set up nor intended constitutionally to be in the distribution of food, clothing or other necessities, neither at home nor abroad. The original emergency nature of disposal of farm surpluses has now, in my view, been distorted so that surpluses are encouraged, Government regulation fostered, and the free market destroyed in the United States and throughout the world. The fact is, our surpluses endanger the economies of other nations, too. This basic fault of the program itself was not debated. Government has been accepted as a food distributor at the taxpayers' expense. All I can hope to do is to keep the criticism alive, until the people demand an accounting. This I have done and shall so continue.

Civil rights, already through the Senate, will probably be before the House soon. The Democrat leadership is committed to advance in this field. The questions to be resolved: (1) A tough bill or a relatively innocuous one? (2) This year, or next (election) year? Odds are, in my opinion, an innocuous bill this year, because: (1) Few can show any real need (other than political in some districts) for further legislation; and (2) many Republicans may feel constrained to cooperate with those Southern Democrats who helped in enacting a legitimate labor reform act. I expect a bill to extend the Civil Rights Commission and give the Justice Department a little greater authority to investigate local election practices. The gasoline tax increase may take time, now that the Ways and Means Committee has voted out a 1-cent increase for 22 months and a later 5-percent excise tax allocation to highways. I am among those opposing a tax increase. (See newsletters of July 25 and August 1). Highways can be built without more tax, I believe.

Earlier controversial issues yet to be resolved are headed by labor reform, which is now in conference between the House and Senate. Housing could continue as a tremendous struggle in view of the veto, the Senate's attempt to override (both Texas Senators so voted), and the legitimate needs embodied in the earlier outrageous bill, that require that a bill be passed. The present suggested compromise is only a lesser degree of the faults of the vetoed bill, including more public housing direct loans for college classrooms (backdoor Treasury financing beyond Congress' control), urban renewal (though reduced), and others. As before, this bill probably will be held until the last minute and then railroaded through. As for agriculture, the general recommendations of the President for reduced price support levels and eased acreage requirements will get little if any attention, I believe, even though the President may urgently so request of Congress.

The interest rate ceiling's removal (see newsletters of June 13, 27, and July 11) so urgently requested by Treasury Secretary Anderson to reduce the cost of Government

financing has become a political football. By a party line vote (Democrats for, Republicans against), the Committee on Ways and Means voted to shelve such needed action until next year. The Government thus is forced to continue to compete with families and small business men for the available money in the short-term loan market. As I see it, it is wrong for Congress after spending the money to tie the hands of the Secretary in financing the Government debt.

So Congress struggles on, not all good, not all bad, but just like people. Congress will improve only as the people force improvement by demanding right action. Adjournment date is anyone's guess.

The Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. —Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD a recent article written by George E. Sokolsky on "The Captive Nations":

When Nixon and Khrushchev held their now famous debate in the American-style kitchen at the American Fair in Moscow, the cause for Khrushchev's unruly anger was that Congress had passed a joint resolution on July 17 providing for a Captive Nations Week. The President approved the resolution the same day. Several times, during Nixon's visits with Khrushchev, the latter referred to the "captive"—his captives. After his anger, it struck him as funny. It is not so funny for millions of human beings.

The nations referred to in the resolution are as follows: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others.

This is a long list of areas conquered by Soviet Russia, mainly during World War II and after. Some of them have been incorporated within the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics; others are so-called people's republics. It is a record of imperialistic success of the Kremlin. The resolution further states:

"These submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, and other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties."

This resolution seems to have bothered Khrushchev more than any criticism that has been made of his brutality or rudeness because it is a wholly true statement of fact. Following the theories of Treitschke, Stalin set out to establish a number of satellite countries that would take the first brunt of war.

To Soviet Russia, the captive nations represent a Chinese Wall against the West. However, that wall is realistically rubble now that war must be conducted by airborne bombs, rockets, and missiles. Nevertheless, it has been characteristic of Russian history that what the Russians take, they never give up willingly. Russia has been like a rolling snowball, gathering size as it rolled on and on.

Men's memories are short. We, in America, forget, for instance, that the United States brought into existence the most progressive Slavic state, Czechoslovakia. It was the great friendship of three men, Woodrow Wilson, Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, and Charles R. Crane that carved out this nation, liberated it from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and obtained its independence at the Paris Conference after World War I. Czechoslovakia became a democratic republic with Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk as President and Dr. Eduard Benes as Prime Minister. Hitler seized this country on the ground that the Sudeten Germans (Bohemia) were ethnically Germans and therefore belonged to him. The Kremlin succeeded to Hitler's ownership. Czechoslovakia is now practically an integral part of Russia with no life of its own.

Americans were excited when Hitler marched into this peace-loving country of hardworking, energetic people. We are not excited today when Czechoslovakia is, for all practical purposes, a province of Soviet Russia.

In fact, it has become fashionable to go to Russia. Those who do not go there are not "in." I cannot imagine what they are "in" or not "in" but they all went to Russia this summer like bees swarming together. This winter, we shall be hearing all about Russia from 10-day experts who saw the Red Square in Moscow, the Nevsky in Leningrad, and whatever it is they can see in Kiev—possibly the ancient cathedral. They will all tell of the wonders of the one big department store in Moscow—something like Gimbel's basement. They will say that all Russians smile when they see Americans. It looks more like a belly laugh watching the fools part with their money.

Controversy Still Waxes Warm Over Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the past few days, I have made several comments to express just how I feel about the prospect of Premier Khrushchev's visit to America. I have tried to emphasize that I, for one, do not wish to extend any festive welcome and great show of comradeship for this international tyrant.

As a sort of footnote to my previous remarks, and to illustrate that quite a number of other Americans feel as I do in this respect, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a group of letters to the editor which were published in the August 17 issue of the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

CONTROVERSY STILL WAXES WARM OVER KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

It is surprising that few people question the assumption that Khrushchev is in many ways ignorant of conditions in the United States. Harriman returned from Russia stating that he found the Soviet leader badly informed; Nixon took up the same line; then

the President said he would like to show Levittown to Khrushchev so he can see that the U.S. housing exhibit in Moscow is typical. A little thought ought to convince Americans that Khrushchev cannot be so uninformed. Consider the size of the Soviet Embassy staff in Washington; consider the mass of reports that are surely being sent to Moscow; consider the ease with which information of such a nature can be obtained in the United States from personal inspection, newspapers, official sources. Khrushchev's purpose is quite transparent. He wants to minimize the effect of the housing exhibit on the Soviet people, make them think Americans are not as far ahead of them as is actually the case. How Khrushchev must chuckle when he sees how this simple ruse has pulled the wool over some eyes.

H. C. NEAL.

Khrushchev is coming. Where are the Paul Reveres? One if by land, and two if by sea, and three—the manifesto calls for us to be brought down as a free nation.

With some, I think of the peoples of the world who will see pictures of the hammer and sickle flying over our land. Why don't we keep the flags after Khrushchev leaves so as to have them ready when he comes again as victor instead of as visitor?

I am one citizen of this country who does not wish to see diplomatic courtesy extended to this man who has bragged of our forthcoming demise.

BETTY M. BONNETT.

Premier Khrushchev's visit and President Eisenhower's return visit should not be considered as "missions of peace," but merely as opportunities to examine more thoroughly and closely conflicting world policies.

To interpret these informal talks as gestures of good will would be a misconception. However, it is hoped that Americans will pledge their full-fledged support to the President and demonstrate to Premier Khrushchev that we are peace-loving people, educated, informed, and enlightened as to the international variances at stake.

SUZANNE R. STALLING.

All the way from Union Station
 And along the city's parks
 The crowds sing their hosannas
 For the salesman of Karl Marx.

The day is warm and sunny
 And brimming with good will
 But in J. Edgar's dwelling
 There's an autumnal chill.

He looks out of his window
 And he views with jaundiced eye
 The hammer and the sickle
 Beneath the summer sky.

But then, let's all be jolly
 And let no one frown
 For Khrushchev's in the White House
 And the Reds are on the town.

HYMEN R. KAPLAN.

We see that for Premier Khrushchev's first American visit it is planned to fly the hammer and sickle flag from Washington lamp-posts. In his plan to bury us, we can only assume that he will hang statesmen, Congressmen, and reporters from lampposts on his second visit to Washington.

JURI BARTHOLD.

It was a shock to me, and I believe it was to the average citizen, when our President gave out the news that he had invited a criminal like Khrushchev to become a guest of the United States. How low have we sunk when our Chief Executive can shake hands with and entertain a man who has murdered thousands of people and has boasted that he will bury us?