

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17405

BEEF AND PORK IMPORTS

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that additional remarks be included in the permanent RECORD along with those which I made in the House on August 29, 1960, page 16986.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

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

[Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATS KILL CONSERVATION RESERVE

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of our most valuable and effective farm programs is about to expire without congressional action. I am referring to the conservation reserve program. On December 31, 1960, the Department of Agriculture will no longer have the authority to enter into new contracts for the retirement and conservation of productive farmland. For all practical purposes, this authority has now ended because contracts for next spring's crops should be made this fall.

The conservation reserve is the long-range program under which farmers voluntarily contract to take general cropland out of production and devote it to the conservation of soil, water, and wildlife for periods of from 3 to 10 years. The national average payment for these conservation practices is \$13.50 per acre per year.

We all know that during World War II farmers were urged to step up production. They responded magnificently. After the war, the wartime supports were continued and surpluses began to build up. Government controls for the main part have failed to balance supply and demand. Surpluses continue to mount. After the war, farmers were caught in a vicious cost-price squeeze which still continues to plague them and makes the transition to a prosperous market economy even more difficult. The conservation reserve program, though no cure-all or magic answer, has been a sound and constructive attempt to improve the farm surplus and income problems.

This is one farm program that makes sense. It has proved itself in operation. It has reduced surpluses, thus helping the taxpayer. It has benefited the general public by preserving for future generations the productive capacity of our soil, by conserving our water resources, and by establishing favorable conditions for our wildlife and game. The farmer has found this program extremely beneficial. Since it is completely voluntary, the farmer is not burdened with compulsory bureaucratic controls. Individual farmers can scale down their own particular operations to fit their own labor and cost needs. Farm income has been improved not only by rental pay-

ments, but by improved market prices. Soil erosion is being checked, farm ponds and waterways are being erected and better hunting and fishing are being provided. All these advantages make the program attractive.

If it were not for the Conservation Reserve program we would have right now another 183 million bushels of corn, another 61 million bushels of wheat and another 490,000 bales of cotton. On the basis of data from contracts, performance reports, and applications, the Department of Agriculture has computed the former cropping use of the total 1960 acreage and the production that would be expected at average yields appropriate for the quality and location of the land. The following table shows these acreage and production estimates for the leading crops:

Former cropland use	Estimated former acreage	Estimated normal production
Corn.....	4,600,000	183,200,000 bushels.
Wheat.....	3,100,000	61,600,000 bushels.
Cotton.....	660,000	490,000 bales.
Peanuts.....	148,000	182,000,000 pounds.
Tobacco.....	15,000	23,300,000 pounds.
Oats.....	4,100,000	139,600,000 bushels.
Barley.....	1,600,000	42,500,000 bushels.
Soybeans.....	1,100,000	21,200,000 bushels.
Sorghum grain.....	3,800,000	109,000,000 bushels.
Flaxseed.....	600,000	4,400,000 bushels.
Cropland hay and pasture.	5,000,000	7,600,000 tons (hay equivalent).

There are now nearly 28½ million acres of crop land in the conservation reserve. Some 75,432 farm families throughout the Nation participate in the program. In my home State of Iowa alone there are 7,690 such families who are retiring and conserving 656,221 acres. Total rental payments in Iowa since the beginning of the program through the 1959 crop year have been \$11,342,737.14.

Payments to Iowa's sister-States in the Midwest have been as follows: Kansas, \$30 million; Michigan, \$10.8 million; Minnesota, \$39.8 million; Wisconsin, \$11.3 million; Illinois, \$8.1 million; Indiana, \$9.6 million; Ohio, \$8.1 million; Nebraska, \$13.6 million; Kentucky, \$8.9 million; North Dakota, \$37.9 million; and South Dakota, \$28.7 million.

Early this year I introduced legislation which would have extended and expanded this valuable program. In addition, my bill would have allowed the Department of Agriculture to use our surplus grain for Federal rental payments. To date, there has been no action to extend the program. The Democratic-controlled Committee on Agriculture has refused to act and the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives defeated a conservation reserve amendment to the ill-fated wheat-feed grains bill on June 22, 1960, by a voice vote. This Republican supported amendment would have extended and expanded the program along with authorizing payments-in-kind, limiting payments to \$7,500 per year and limiting to 25 percent the amount of land any county or community could retire.

The record then speaks for itself. In spite of their two-to-one majority in the Committee on Agriculture and in the House and the Senate, the Democrats

have refused to act. In spite of their own 1960 platform which pledges "an orderly land retirement and conservation program" congressional Democrats have declined to act. In spite of the fact that the administration has repeatedly asked for action, and in spite of 11 bills to extend this program that have been introduced by Members from both sides of the aisle, and in spite of many moans, groans, and crocodile tears about the farm problem, this Democratic-controlled 86th Congress has failed to act.

The outright failure and the downright refusal of this Democratic-controlled Congress is just one more example of the Democrat Party's fundamental attitude toward agriculture during the last 6 years: There was no action, there is no action, there will be no action.

WILDLIFE, FISH, AND GAME CONSERVATION IN MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. BONNER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2222)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 6 and agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOTKIN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR G. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT.

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
NORRIS COTTON.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1 of the House bill provided for issuance of special State hunting and fishing permits and authorized the Commanding Officer of each reservation to administer such permits as agent for the State if the particular cooperative plan so provided. The Senate amendment struck out reference to the State. The conference accepted the House provision.

Section 3 of the bill as passed the House directed the Secretary of Defense to expend funds collected or transferred in accordance

with agreed cooperative plans. The Senate amendment omitted the authority to transfer these funds. This provision referred to funds that already might be in the hands of local Commanding Officers under existing plans. It was the sense of the conference that the transfer of such funds could best be handled through provisions in the individual cooperative plans.

The Senate amendments to section 5 excluded application of the law to national forest lands and Taylor Grazing Act lands. The action of the conference accepted these exclusions from the operation of the act.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,

file
TH
Managers on the Part of the House.

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—KEY TO PEACE

(Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the official observance of Captive Nations Week in the third week of July, a number of significant addresses were made throughout the country. I should like to bring to the attention of Members of the House the address given by my friend and colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, on July 20 in Buffalo, N.Y. This address was given before a civic luncheon in the Golden Ballroom of the Hotel Statler-Hilton, sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo in cooperation with the Buffalo Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week.

The title of my colleague's address is a very fitting one, "The Captive Nations—Key to Peace." Congressman FEIGHAN, as one of the sponsors of the congressional resolution which established Captive Nations Week, presented a realistic analysis of the human elements involved in the cold war. He points out that the overwhelming majority of the people in the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain have not and will not support the men in the Kremlin in times of peace or war. This opposition by the common man behind the Iron Curtain is a powerful deterrent to war because no dictator will start a war in face of the prospect that his empire will rise in revolt and defeat him from within.

Congressman FEIGHAN calls for a hard-hitting political action program in support of the people of the captive non-Russian nations, and suggests six major guideposts as the outlines of his program. These suggestions are timely for all who understand that the cold war is fundamentally a political conflict and that political action is necessary if we are to regain our position of leadership in the free world community.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record the address of my colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—KEY TO PEACE

(Address of Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, U.S. Representative, 20th Ohio District)

The great issue of our times is foreign policy and the conduct of our foreign affairs. This opinion is made self-evident by the realization that the question of a hot

war or a just peace will be resolved by the kind of foreign policy we support and the manner in which we carry it out. There are, of course, other important national issues and grave domestic problems such as an ever expanding free economy, full employment, civil rights, health protection for the elderly, the strengthening of our educational systems, urban renewal, and the human upsets of automation. Important as all these problems are they stand in the shadow of the challenge to our survival as a nation, and as a civilization, presented by the determined forces of international communism. If we fail to face up to this challenge and thus lose the struggle with the Russian Communists, these domestic problems will have no importance or relevance whatever. They will be disposed of summarily by the ruthless dictatorship which awaits any free nation falling under the rule or domination of imperial communism.

The history of some 40 years of Communist aggression warns us that we are in a life or death struggle with the highly organized forces of tyranny. We did not create this contest. We were forced into it in 1947 when it became crystal clear that we had no other alternative—except gradual and peaceful surrender. It was then, you will recall, the Russian Communists were attempting the take-over of Greece and Turkey by armed aggression, when the subversive task forces of communism were gnawing away at the democratic governments of Western Europe, when Moscow was directing the Chinese Reds in the take-over of mainland China and when the Red Army stood guard over the ruthless imposition of alien regimes upon the nations of Central and North Europe. The Presidential decision to stand firmly in support of the freedom-loving people of Greece and Turkey was a far-reaching one. It went far beyond the immediate requirements of these two countries. That decision signaled a determination to hold back the Red wave of Russian aggression on all fronts. Hindsight gives perspective to the magnitude and the wisdom of that decision and the courage required to make it.

As a Nation we were ill prepared for this sudden shift to a wartime footing. We had dismantled the greatest military striking force in history within 12 months after the Japanese surrender. We had "brought the boys back home." Our defense industries had reverted to the all out production of consumer commodities and other non-military products. We had gone back to doing business as usual, in both our domestic and international affairs. We had but recently won a world wide victory for freedoms cause, a war to end all wars. This victory promised our people a long and happy era of peace in which justice was assured for all nations and all people. All these promises were written into the Charter of the United Nations. These were the war aims of the United States. These were the war aims of all the allied nations except one—Soviet Russia. The strange alliance which admitted imperial Russia into the camp of free men was exposed as a massive deception of the hopes, the rights, and the aspirations of the common man the world over. In the stark reality of this awakening we, as a Nation, entered what the Honorable Winston Churchill so aptly termed "the cold war."

Many chapters of sacrifice and heroic action have been written since, by men and women and indeed by children who know the blessings of freedom. All Americans sense the importance and accomplishments of the Marshall plan, the stand on Greece and Turkey, the Berlin airlift, and the refugee assistance programs just as they honor the resolute Presidential actions taken in Korea, the Formosa Straits and in the Middle East crisis. The hard lessons of the

past have brought home to us the imperative of the military shields against further Communist armed aggression which NATO, CENTO, and SEATO provide for ourselves and for all free people. Yes, we have learned a great deal in the days and years of the cold war. But I say we have not learned enough about the nature of the enemy who openly boasts that they will bury us, that they will communize the world and thus cast upon our children—if not ourselves—a mode of life which makes death a welcome visitor.

In our national efforts to build a defensive shield against Communist aggression, a matter of first priority, we gave more attention to armaments and alliances than we did to the basic human values and aspirations involved in the struggle. When we awakened to this shortcoming, we then limited our concern for the rights and the hopes of the common man to the free world community, thus neglecting in large measure the almost one-third of humanity behind the Russian Iron and Bamboo Curtains. By overly friendly relations and dealings with the Russian leaders and the various Communist regimes they have imposed upon once free people, we have cast serious doubts upon our willingness, our ability and our determination to weather the ideological storm which grips the world. The common man behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains has been shaken in his confidence in the United States as the citadel of human freedom. All too many leaders in the free world community have become convinced that the destiny of their nation requires a flexible position somewhere between the United States and Imperial Russia, a position which will permit them to shift gears gracefully when the winner becomes reasonably apparent. The newly emerging nations on the African Continent, the newly independent nations of North, South, and Southeast Asia, and the Middle East demonstrate a restless uncertainty in setting their course toward maturity and secure sovereignty. It is this uncertainty in the camp of free men which emboldens the Russian Dictator Khrushchev to taunt, to insult, to threaten, and to pour infamy upon the United States of America.

The time has come for a deep and realistic revision of our foreign policy. The hour is late, but I believe we still have time not, a moment of which can be wasted on such meaningless catch phrases as "agonizing reappraisal," "realignment of relationships," and "flexible adjustments." What we need is a simple recognition of the fact that those who seek to wipe out civilization as we know it, are anchored with a vulnerability which they cannot overcome and which haunts the inner sanctum of the Kremlin. The Russian vulnerability is a deeply human one. It is caused by the aspirations of hundreds of millions of non-Russian people in the captive nations for freedom and national independence. No less than 20 once free and independent nations have been overrun and occupied by the Russian Communists during the past 40-odd years. The regimes imposed upon these nations do not and cannot represent the freely expressed will of the people. Representative government has been denied these people and the mode of life imposed upon them generates a revolutionary spirit which can burst forth with devastating violence and retribution against the oppressor. This vulnerability is compounded by the fact that the number of people who support the Communist empire falls far short of a margin of safety. There are no more than 70 to 80 million Russians in the empire, together with some 5 million non-Russians who are reliable members of the Communist Party. This is the mortar of the empire, just as it is a most realistic evaluation of the human resources at the command of the dictatorship which threatens to bury us. While we may and should regret the tragedy

of history which has denied the Russian people a chapter of individual liberty and freedom, we must not allow our pity to cloud the honest judgment of history. Having had no experience with liberty and freedom, we must not expect the Russian people to rally to freedom's cause. Nor should we condemn them for their support of a regime which has brought greater glory to the concepts of a Russian empire than the wildest dreams of Czar Peter. Forgive them for they know no better. Political realism in this hour of terrible trial requires that we know the truth and face it with a feeling of compassion, accepting the duty of saving the Russian people from the evil leaders who see in them a tool to accomplish their selfish ends.

It was in this spirit that the Congress of the United States enacted Public Law 86-90, and made possible this national observance of Captive Nations Week. As sponsor of this law in the House of Representatives, I assure you that a long, deliberate, and careful study of all the evidence available, covering a span of 40 years, stands behind the language and spirit of this Federal law. The unanimous enactment of this law by Congress is eloquent testimony of its nonpartisan character and urgency. More than anything else, it carries a message of decision and the promise to enter a new phase of the cold war by carrying the political war into the heartland of the enemy.

Permit me to examine with you the language and intent of this law.

To begin with, this law takes official recognition of the fact that Communist aggression against free and independent nations began in the period of 1917-18 rather than in 1945, as all too many of our people have been led to believe. For it was during this period that a series of national independence movements, very much like that of our Founding Fathers, brought about the disintegration of the Russian czarist empire. Many nations long oppressed and exploited by the Russian aristocracy dissolved their political bonds with the empire and declared their national independence. The only nation of the empire failing to take such action was the Russian nation. In these circumstances the Bolsheviks seized control of the Russian nation and quickly consolidated their power. With the Russian nation as a base of operations and support, the Bolsheviks launched campaigns of subversion, terror and armed aggression against the newly independent nations. Between the years 1918 and 1921, the Russian Bolsheviks destroyed the national independence of White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural.

The second wave of Russian Communist aggression took place in 1939. Soviet Russia then an ally of Hitler, destroyed the national independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The third wave of Russian Communist aggression took place in the 1945 and thereafter, when in violation of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, the national independence of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Yugoslavia was destroyed.

The fourth wave of Russian Communist aggression took place in 1948 when the Red regime was imposed by military force upon the people of mainland China.

The fifth wave of Communist aggression instigated by Moscow covers the enslavement of East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

Public Law 86-90 thus recognizes that all the once free and independent, non-Russian nations of this vastly expanded Russian empire have suffered a common fate. Time, in terms of the date of their captivity, no longer has any practical point. They all suffer a common captivity. None will be free until all are free. And all must be free if freedom is to be secure anywhere in this relatively

small world in which we live. This is a reality of the life or death struggle in which we are engaged.

The spirit of this law recognizes that while these nations are now deprived of their independence, the hopes of their peoples have not been broken. The common man in these captive nations aspires for a return of his liberties, his freedoms, and the blessings of national independence. These aspirations stand as a powerful deterrent to war and the best hope for a just and lasting peace. The scheming despots in the Kremlin will not dare to launch world war III so long as these embers of freedom burn. We dare not fail to kindle this human fire because such failure is an invitation to the Russian tyrants to launch a hot war.

These are the outlines of a new and realistic foreign policy toward the Russian Communists. These are the outlines of a foreign policy of free people, who, knowing the power of their moral and political ideals, are confident of the future and fearless in defense of justice. Public Law 86-90 is a mandate from the American people to engage the enemy on his home grounds, to carry the political fight to the heartland of the Russian Communist empire and to exploit the human vulnerability of that empire as a positive action in support of world peace.

For all too long we have been on the defensive. Our Nation has grown weary of simply reacting to Communist actions. We have too often been second best in international political situations which demanded nothing short of unquestioned victory.

The summit conferences were initiated by the Russians. They needed a world propaganda platform and rigged the agenda to advance their evil purposes. We reacted to their initiatives, accepted the substance of their agenda rigging and ended up on the short and rather dirty end of the stick.

Personal diplomacy was initiated by Khrushchev as a means of securing a cloak of badly needed respectability. He arranged official visits to free countries and world tours for himself in order to demonstrate his contempt for the leaders of the free world. The State Department harangued and maneuvered President Eisenhower into this Russian bear-trap which, when sprung, found the subversive agents of Khrushchev showing contempt for President Eisenhower in Japan.

Khrushchev proclaims that the Monroe Doctrine no longer exists because the new Russian ruling class refuses to recognize its claims. By this he means that the entire world is his bowl of cherries and he will pick the cherry he feels is ripe regardless of in whose orchard it grows. What a contrast this is to the action taken by our State Department "Soviet Experts" at the time of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution. You will recall the revolution broke out on October 23, 1956, and that by October 28, the Hungarian patriots had rid their country of the Russian oppressors. A revolutionary regime took over and there was a political hiatus for 5 days. Then the State Department, allegedly concerned about the delicate feelings of the Communist dictator Tito, sent him the following cabled assurance of our national intentions in the late afternoon of Friday, November 2, 1956. "The Government of the United States does not look with favor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union."

It was no accident or misjudgment of consequences which led the imperial Russian Army to reinvade Hungary at 4 a.m. on the morning of November 4, 1956. The cabled message to Tito was the go ahead signal to the Russians because any American school boy knows that Tito is Moscow's Trojan Horse. It took less than 48 hours for him to relay this message of treason to

his superiors in the Kremlin. All the world knows the terrible consequences of that go ahead signal. This act of infamy was buried in the noise of the 1956 presidential campaign and the moral revulsion which followed in the wake of our failure to respond to freedoms call in captive Hungary. As we approach the promised new era in the conduct of our international affairs, I suggest the time is opportune for a full scale, bipartisan congressional investigation of this infamy. This would provide an appropriate answer to Khrushchev's rejection of the Monroe Doctrine.

No doubt you are asking yourself what, specifically, can be done to support and advance the cause of the captive nations without plunging the world into a hot war. This is a fair question that requires a straightforward answer.

I will take the last part of this question first because it rates the highest priority. Of one thing I am certain. That is the Russian Communists will launch a hot war when they believe they have a 50-50 chance of winning. They will not start 1 minute sooner or hesitate 1 second longer. There is nothing we can do to alter this basis of judgment while the Russian leaders adhere to what they call the doctrines of Lenin. While the Russians now appear to claim that war between communism and capitalism is not inevitable they have not abandoned war as an instrument of imperial policy. They are simply saying they now believe they can conquer the world without a hot war. Their belief is based upon a supposition that the free world, particularly the United States, is crumbling from within thus making a hot war unnecessary. Since I believe we are not breaking up from within, though we have slipped from a position of unquestioned military superiority, and I do not believe we can convert the Russian leaders from their belief in Marxism-Leninism, I propose the following courses of action as necessary to our survival.

The first is a high-speed rebuilding of our military defense capabilities. We must regain and hold a large margin of superiority over the Russians in all fields of defense preparations. This includes the immediate strengthening of our international treaty alliances. The 50-50 chance factor must never be attained by the Russian leaders.

The second is a hard hitting political action program in support of the people of the captive, non-Russian nations. I suggest the following specific actions be undertaken.

1. That the Voice of America be regarded as a political instrument, a mass media means of strengthening our alliance with all the captive peoples. Today it is nothing more than a nonpolitical news service, lacking color, imagination, and sympathy for the oppressed. The present overweighted broadcasting in the Russian language should be corrected, with major emphasis on the languages of the captive nations.

2. Our exchange of persons and cultural exchange programs must be revised and a note of realism interjected in their application to the captive nations. In particular, the exchange of persons program with the Soviet Union should be abolished because it is a fraud. They allow no one but hardcore Communists to visit the United States, most of whom are propaganda specialists rather than students, teachers, engineers, labor leaders or farmers. The public report of these so-called specialists issued upon their return to the Soviet Union are uniformly incorrect, incomplete, and generally slanderous of our free way of life. The people we send to the Soviet Union are no doubt well intended, but they tend to pose as experts on conditions of life under communism upon their return to the United States. Many of these 8-day or 6-week authorities have perpetrated dangerous misjudgments and illusions upon the American

people. We need a rapid step-up in our exchange-of-persons program with the countries of the free world. I have observed these programs at work in the United States and in many countries of the free world and I am convinced of their merit. More funds are needed to expand these free-world programs and the money saved by abolishing the exchange programs with the Soviet Union could be used for this purpose.

3. The United Nations should be regarded as a sounding board to expose and espouse the legitimate aspirations of all the captive nations. The Security Council, the General Assembly, and all organs of this body should be regarded as tools to advance the cause of free men, including the emancipation of the captive nations.

4. The United States should test the power of sanctions held by the United Nations, the expulsion of nonconforming member nations, by causing the Russians to abide by the United Nations resolution on Hungary or be expelled from membership in the United Nations. The United Nations resolution on Hungary condemns the Russian aggression against Hungary and calls upon the Russians to evacuate their military, political, and economic forces from that country. To date the Russians have demonstrated a studied contempt for that resolution. It is time they were made to conform or be expelled from membership. The survival of the United Nations must never be regarded as more important than human rights and justice.

5. The next President of the United States should reverse the international road posts pointing away from Washington by convening a meeting of the leaders of all free nations there to discuss our common problems and to hammer out a program of action to save the world from a third war and to win a just peace. The formula of invitation should be simple. Only those who believe in and will support the aspirations of the common man for self-government and democratic institutions should be welcomed at the conference table. This would be freedom's summit conference. The next President of the United States would go a great distance toward recapturing the political initiative by swift action in this direction upon assuming responsibilities of leadership.

6. We must prepare the American people psychologically for the prospect of more freedom revolutions, like that launched by the Hungarians. This does not suggest that we can or should stimulate them. It merely recognizes that such total political revolutions are a natural outcome of the oppression and human exploitation going on behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We may not know when or where the next will occur, but we must know that the destiny of free men demands that we be prepared to associate our Nation and other free countries with this healthy wave of the future. We must not be caught unprepared or stupefied by the power of revolt against tyranny, as we were in the case of Hungary. We are a nation born in the revolutionary spirit—we will live or die by the measure of our devotion to our political heritage.

As we face the challenge to our survival as free men, I leave you with this thought. In our daily lives we have learned that time and tide wait for no man. This same law of nature born with the divine order of the world, exercises a compelling influence upon the affairs of all nations. There are problems which will not wait for determination, and there are situations which demand immediate and resolute decisions. We may not, we must not fail to keep our appointment with destiny. We are destined to lead the peoples of the earth out of the darkness which has fallen upon so many nations—to that golden era of peace with justice for all nations and all peoples.

THE CRUSADE FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the official observance of Captive Nations Week throughout our country, from July 17 through 23, many fine programs were arranged by public-spirited citizens. These programs served to alert the American people to the importance of the aspirations of the people in the captive nations for freedom and national independence toward the winning of a just peace. All these activities were in accordance with the spirit of Public Law 86-90, more popularly known as the Captive Nations Week observance law.

It was my privilege to take part in the weeklong program of activities planned by the Buffalo Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week. While in Buffalo I had the opportunity to see firsthand the outstanding work accomplished by the Buffalo committee. All the religious faiths conducted prayers and religious ceremonies in the respective churches and synagogues on the opening day of the week's program. A civic ceremony was held on Sunday, July 17, the highlights of which were the reading of Mayor Sedita's proclamation, the placing of the flags of 14 of the captive nations in a colorful array around two large American flags at McKinley Monument, and talks by several leading citizens of Buffalo. On the following Tuesday the Erie County Bar Association conducted a ceremony on the meaning of justice to freemen in a special term of supreme court. On Wednesday the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo sponsored a civic luncheon in the ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel, where I was privileged to be the speaker. During the week public displays on the captive nations, the cultures of the peoples of those nations, and the true face of Russian communism were shown in several banks, department stores, the lobby of the city hall, and at the Ukrainian Home.

This fine program was climaxed by a freedom rally in Kleinhans Music Hall on Saturday evening, July 23. Mayor Frank A. Sedita was the speaker at this rally which also featured the native songs and dances of the captive nations.

Mayor Sedita has established himself as a real leader in the just cause of the people of the captive nations. He was the first mayor to establish an official city committee to observe Captive Nations Week. He urged similar action upon the mayors of some 18 metropolitan centers of the United States. The committee he appointed was chaired by Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, director of special projects at Canisius College, who is known well for his many years of leadership in government programs to assist the victims of Nazi and Communist tyranny, and to emancipate the captive nations from the yoke of imperial Russian communism.

The address delivered by Mayor Sedita at the freedom rally was a forceful call

to the American people to launch a crusade for peace with justice. It set forth the basic causes of war and marked out the guideposts to peace. This address stands as a challenge to the American people to demand that our National Government be rid of those appeasers who seek a status quo with the Russians and that our foreign policy, together with its execution, be returned to a moral foundation which befits our national heritage.

Under unanimous consent I include the address of Mayor Frank A. Sedita in my remarks:

THE CRUSADE FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

(Address of Hon. Frank A. Sedita, mayor of Buffalo, delivered during Captive Nations Week observance at the freedom rally, Kleinhans Music Hall, Buffalo, N.Y., July 23, 1960)

What a fitting close this is to our week-long observance of Captive Nations Week. How better could we end our program than with a freedom rally? The pleas to be made by individual spokesmen for many of the captive nations will give true voice to the feelings, the hopes, and the aspirations of our proven allies behind the Iron Curtain. The dances and songs of the captive people we will see and hear this evening will speak eloquently for cultures and a way of life which no tyrant, no dictator can remove from the hearts and minds of those oppressed by imperial Russian communism. And we, who enjoy the full blessings of human freedom, shall be reminded of our high moral obligation to those who look to us for emancipation from their present state of human bondage. I believe that we, as a nation, shall respond to this call, convinced of the obligations we carry as freemen and confident of the victory which awaits our common cause.

The members of the Buffalo Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week which I had the honor to appoint have brought great credit to our city and have won well-deserved acclaim for themselves. I am proud of what Buffalo has done to observe Captive Nations Week and to serve as honorary chairman of this great committee. I say that what we have done to carry out the spirit and purpose of Public Law 86-90 is a solid and practical work of peace.

We cannot be satisfied with works which seek only the prevention of war. We must work with all the energy and ingenuity at our command to win a just peace. For only in the winning of a just peace can we prevent the outbreak of a hot war. Twice in the generation of many of those gathered here tonight, including myself, we have seen two world wars result from the limited and negative objective of simply preventing the outbreak of armed conflict.

Prior to World War I the prevention of war was governed by what I prefer to call the "peace of empires." This was the handiwork of the Conferences of The Hague. While the imperial powers attending those Conferences failed to reach full treaty agreements as to how this peace would be maintained, they did, nevertheless, arrive at an understanding of status quo.

This understanding of status quo held that the territories of the then existing empires, without regard to the freely expressed will of the people concerned, were inviolate—they were not subject to change. This understanding among the imperial powers lasted but a few years. Kaiser Wilhelm found this loose understanding uncomfortable and the world was thereby plunged into its first global war. It is in-

teresting to note, in this connection, that the then Czar of Russia first proposed the concept of a "peace of empires" at the Hague Conference.

World War I brought about the demise of the German, Austro-Hungarian, czarist Russian and Ottoman Empires. The British, French, and Dutch Empires suffered mortal blows from which they have never recovered, nor can they expect to recover at this midpoint of the 20th century.

The Russian czarist empire, meanwhile, was reconstructed under the reactionary banner of communism. This was done at the expense of the national independence of Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaidjan, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, and Cossackia.

In 1934 a new dictator arose who promised the people of Germany a new and vast empire which he claimed was destined to last a thousand years. When he set about creating this promised empire the cry was heard, "We must prevent war." The voices of morality in the affairs of nations cried out then for a just peace, a just settlement of disputes which accorded with the freely expressed will of the peoples involved. But these voices went unheeded. The Munich Conference followed—a black mark in history when the demands of the tyrant on the march were met by appeasement. Prime Minister Chamberlain returned to London, an umbrella in one hand and a useless piece of paper in the other hand—calling out to the British people "Peace in our times." The Munich appeasement of the Dictator Hitler prevented war—but for how long? A few short years thereafter all humanity was plunged into the most devastating war in all history.

Now what are the political results of World War II. The empire of Hitler is nothing more than a black mark in history. The British, French and Dutch Empires are dismembered for all times. But the empire of Russian communism is vastly expanded, stretching like an octopus over the newly occupied territories of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, mainland China, Tibet, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Croatia, Slovenia, and Serbia. The tentacles of the Russian octopus now reach out to seize and strangle every free nation in the world, including the United States. Here in the Western Hemisphere one of those tentacles hangs heavy over Cuba.

Faced with the full realities of this dismal record of mankind's failure to prevent war, who can deny that the relentless quest of a just peace must be our only goal? Who can say that the present Russian demand for the recognition of a status quo is nothing but the demand of Tzar Nicholas II for a "Peace of Empires," dressed up in 20th century stalking clothes? Who believes that a just peace can be won by appeasing dictators on the march—in this case Khrushchev?

We must put an end to the last remaining empire in the world. This we can do by working with all the power and skill at our command to bring about its peaceful dismemberment. This we must do or suffer the same fate as has befallen the score of once free and independent nations now jailed in the Russian prison of nations. The leaders in the Kremlin have made it clear they leave us no other alternative.

It is these beliefs which find me shocked at the revelation made by Congressman FEIGHAN on Hungary. I do not doubt for one moment the accuracy of the astounding charge he has placed on the doorstep of the State Department. He is a recognized authority on world communism and a keen student of the internal workings of the Federal Government. All who know him respect his courage and admire his fearless honesty.

But I ask you, what has happened to us as a people, as a great Nation, under God,

to permit such an immoral action by our State Department to go unnoticed and unpunished? My heart aches when I think about those gallant people of Hungary, with little more than their bare hands, rising up against the Russia oppressor end in 5 heroic days driving the Red army from their beloved homeland. No one who loves liberty will ever forget those who paid the supreme sacrifice in winning that historic victory over the Russians. Think of the women, from aged grandmothers to school girls not yet in their teens, who fought side by side with the manhood of Hungary. I hang my head in shame to think that our Government would be a party to putting the Hungarian nation back in Russian chains. Only yesterday our friend, Dr. John Juhasz, reminded me that at this very hour there are hundreds of Hungarian youth who took part in that freedom revolution now languishing in the Communist jails of Hungary. There they await death by execution upon reaching their 21st birthday. Almost 4 years have passed since their incarceration so the whole world knows the tender age of all when they rose in support of freedom's cause.

No doubt you have thought of the full meaning of that message sent by the State Department to the Red dictator Tito for relay to Moscow. That cruel message said, and I quote Congressman Feighan, "The Government of the United States does not look with favor upon governments unfriendly to the Soviet Union on the borders of the Soviet Union." Permit me to analyze the full political meaning of that message.

First, it accords a finality to the geography of the U.S.S.R. It admits of no change in the status on the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Such great nations as Ukraine, Armenia, White-Ruthenia, Georgia, Turkestan, and Cossackia are condemned to permanent slavery.

Second, it accords de facto recognition to the Communist regime imposed by Moscow on Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Our Government has said over and over again that we will never recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Yet the Government of the United States has done exactly that by this declaration of foreign policy cabled to Tito. Could anyone imagine a legally constituted government in any of the Baltic States, a government which represents the freely expressed will of the people, being friendly toward the Soviet Union? Of course not. Only a rump Communist regime such as exists today in all three of the Baltic States could hold out such friendship. Let us not forget that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are on the borders of the Soviet Union. The State Department's declaration to Tito condemns the Baltic States to a permanent life under an alien Communist regime, despite promises to the contrary.

Next, what about Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and mainland China? All these captive nations are on the borders of the Soviet Union. I do not mention Hungary here because the State Department's cable to Tito had clear and specific application to that captive country. All these nations were thus sentenced to a miserable life under Communist regimes which defy the will of the people involved and would not remain in power 1 hour without the Red Army standing guard over their reign of terror. No freely elected government in captive Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, or mainland China would have feelings less than utter contempt for those who rule over the Russian prison of nations nor would they stand idly by once enslavement of any nation by the Russians.

Now what about East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Tibet? They do not have

common borders with the Soviet Union but they are part of the Russian Communist empire. Are they alone entitled to be free and independent? I think not, not by the language of the State Department policy cabled to Tito. Rather, I would read that cable to Tito to mean that our State Department had accepted a status quo with the Russian Empire, with Titoland remaining under the protection of Moscow.

Congressman FEIGHAN in his address before the civic luncheon last Wednesday, called for a full-scale bipartisan congressional investigation of our Government's response to the Hungarian freedom revolution, including the cable sent to the Red dictator Tito. I am convinced this must be done to clear away the dark clouds of doubt which hang heavy over our national honor. I hope you will agree with me and that you will raise your voices with the responsible leaders of Congress, urging them to take immediate action.

What we have done together this week to defend the human rights of the people of the captive nations is only a beginning. It is a significant beginning but our crusade does not end with this freedom rally tonight. Our fight for peace with justice for all nations and people must be maintained every hour of each day until we win through to victory. We are joined in our work by millions of Americans who have taken part in similar programs throughout our country during this week. We must spread this spirit of duty and dedication to freedom's cause, to every country of the free world. To this end I pledge to you my unwavering support.

I pray God's blessings upon our work, that we may have the strength, the wisdom, and the courage to continue the fight for true freedom and full justice for all men, for all nations, for all time.

PUBLIC LAW 86-90—FACT AND FICTION

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and timely actions of the 86th Congress was enactment of Public Law 86-90, more popularly known as the Captive Nations Week Resolution. This past July hundreds of committees made up of public spirited citizens observed Captive Nations Week in accordance with the provisions of this law. The response of the American people to the high purposes of this law have been most gratifying, and harbor well for the future of freedom's cause.

It was to be expected that the leaders of the Kremlin and their agents everywhere in the world would level a blistering attack against the high purposes of this law. Khrushchev and company have not disappointed us in this respect. It will be recalled that Khrushchev opened the attack the day after the President signed the bill into law, which was the same day Vice President Nixon arrived in Moscow. These attacks by the Communist leaders have not ceased and we can expect them to continue.

It was my privilege to cosponsor Public Law 86-90 with our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN

W. McCORMACK. I have therefore followed the actions in support of this law throughout the United States as well as the Russian Communists' attacks against it.

A timely and highly informative article on Captive Nations Week appeared in the summer edition of the Ukrainian Quarterly, titled, "Public Law 86-90—Fact and Fiction." The author of this article is Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, director of special projects at Canisius College in Buffalo, N.Y., and a realistic student of the Russian problem. This article analyzes the reaction to Public Law 86-90 by Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Attacks by Russians on the other side of the Iron Curtain were expected, but attacks by Russians living on this side of the Iron Curtain is another matter. Dr. O'Connor points out that the lines of Russian attack on both sides of the Iron Curtain have dangerous parallels which have raised a number of basic questions among well-informed observers of the Communist conspiracy. To correct these dangerous trends, he proposes the formation of an American Committee for the National Independence of Russia to provide a haven for political action by those Russian emigres who are convinced of the inalienable right of all nations and people to liberty, freedom, and national independence.

Among the features of this article is an analysis of Vice President Nixon's reactions to the challenge made by Khrushchev on Public Law 86-90. As a highly skilled observer of international political events, his examination rises above the much publicized "kitchen debate" to analyze the broad implications of Khrushchev's challenge and the Vice President's response. This feature alone would qualify this article as a must reading for those millions of Americans who have been asking, Why is our policy toward the Russian Communists such a failure?

The article to which I have referred, written by Dr. O'Connor, is as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 86-90—FACT AND FICTION

(By Edward M. O'Connor)

Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain are engaged in a concerted effort to discredit the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86-90), enacted last year by Congress. This assault against a Federal law, which does nothing more than officially recognize the importance of the national independence movements within the present-day Russian Empire as a deterrent to war and the key to peace with justice, was launched by none other than Nikita Khrushchev himself. Within a matter of hours after President Eisenhower signed the resolution into law, Khrushchev was confronting Vice President Nixon with the question: "How could you do this to us?" The Vice President had just arrived in Moscow, ostensibly to open the American Exhibition, to find the Kremlin leaders in a state of shock as a result of the political bombshell launched by Congress. Time and time again, in the days which immediately followed, Khrushchev would call upon groups of Russians to bear testimony for the Vice President as to whether they considered themselves as captive. The response was always the same: "No. No. Peaceful coexistence."

This proved nothing new because Public Law 86-90 does not define the Russian nation as a captive nation. The spontaneous

response Khrushchev got from the Russians did, however, confirm the commonsense of not defining them by law as "captives."

The results would have been radically different if the Vice President had visited any of the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union and there had Khrushchev raise the same question among the native population. It was poor political judgment in the first place for the Vice President to restrict his visiting time in the Soviet Union to the Russian nation. In reality he did not tour the Soviet Union as claimed because Russia is not the Soviet Union, it is but one of the nations of the Soviet Union. This neglect of the majority peoples of the Soviet Union reduced the political impact of Public Law 86-90 and compounded the serious error of equating Russia with the Soviet Union. On the other hand it would have been an act of political wisdom and statesmanship if the Vice President had under these circumstances demanded a revision of his itinerary to allow for visits to several captive, non-Russian nations. The Khrushchev reaction to the Captive Nations Week resolution should have made this course of action self-evident. Here was a golden opportunity for the Vice President to publicly reject the Russian demands for status quo by officially assuring our proven allies in the captive non-Russian nations that the United States would never recognize the finality of their captivity. Lost opportunities such as this, where a logical followthrough was called for, are characteristic of the failure to understand the nature of the threat we face and a timid reluctance to use power of our political ideals in winning a just peace.

Nevertheless, the noisy and frantic efforts by Khrushchev to discredit Public Law 86-90 were helpful in making all the people of the Russian empire aware of its contents and purposes. The controlled press and other mass media of the empire featured the Khrushchev statements but in so doing gave excellent publicity to the fact that, at long last, we Americans had officially recognized the national independence movements as the most powerful political dynamic behind the Iron Curtain. In a very real sense the deep-rooted fears of the ruling class in Moscow were so aroused that they inadvertently violated their first rule of propaganda, which is, never to publicize the explosive political ideals of free men. Communist organs in the free world took the line from Moscow and gave additional propagation to the "Captive Nations" concepts of the public law. It is no exaggeration to estimate that Russian Imperial Communism suffered a severe net loss as a consequence of these initial reactions, based upon deep-rooted fears that the United States was about to stimulate the explosive dynamics of the national independence movements within the empire. The new aristocracy, the new elite class can never forget it was the national independence movements which contributed to the collapse of the Russian Empire of the Czars in 1917, that the national independence movements would have disintegrated the U.S.S.R. during World War II but for the racial policies and imperial intentions of the Nazis. Freedom riots in East Germany in 1953, in Poland during 1956, and the all-out efforts by the Hungarians to regain their national independence in 1956 serve to remind the Russians that they are sitting on a human powder keg many times more powerful than intercontinental missiles and hydrogen bombs.

The initial reaction of the Russian leaders to Public Law 86-90 was too useful to the cause of free men to expect them to continue it for very long. Their tactics have now shifted to a reliance on polemics as a means of propagating "Russian truths" with respect to the captive, non-Russian nations. Khrushchev laid down the new line in his propaganda article which appeared in the

October 1959 Issue of Foreign Affairs under the title of "On Peaceful Coexistence." Here Khrushchev introduces the techniques of confusion, false comparison and distortion of the language of the law. For example, he charges the law contemplates "rolling back communism" which language is not included in the law, nor does the language of the law express this intent. In fact, the law expresses the opposite conviction. Rather than the concept of "roll back" which carries overtones of a hot war the law recognizes the practical prospects of spontaneous, internal political explosions on a scale which can end the cold war and bring peace with justice to all humanity. Political realism dictates that we recognize the possibilities of a chain reaction should another full blown revolution break out anywhere within the empire. This almost happened during the Hungarian revolution as the Poles, Ukrainians and Slovaks demonstrated a restiveness which alarmed the Russians. Had the U.S. Government and other free world nations given any support, even political, to the Hungarians it is entirely possible the chain reaction of revolutions would have resulted. Once this chain reaction gets underway there will be no stopping it. The Red army will be of little use in these circumstances, it is multinational and as such will prove unreliable. The Hungarian revolution proved this basic Red army vulnerability as the non-Russians in it, particularly the Ukrainians, quickly went over to the side of the Hungarians, taking tanks, guns and ammunition with them.

There are not enough Russians in the Empire to hold it together in the face of internal revolutions reaching from the Baltic to the Caspian Seas. Dependable estimates on the number of Russians in the Empire range from 70 to 90 million but the more realistic figure is in the neighborhood of 70 million. World War II losses among the Russians were exceedingly heavy due to the fact the non-Russians refused to fight in support of communism. The latest population figure on the Soviet Union is 207 million, which means the non-Russians number not less than 117 and more likely 137 million. Added to this are some 90 million non-Russians in the more recently occupied nations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and East Germany. One can readily understand how unpleasant it must be for the Russian aristocracy to contemplate the prospects of over 200 million non-Russians rising up in revolt, demanding their national independence. It is this haunting specter which causes Khrushchev and company to demand that the free world recognize a status quo, that is, to cause the people of the free world to join with the Russians in an all-out effort to preserve their prison of non-Russian nations.

Khrushchev resorted to the old trick of false comparison in his article which appeared in Foreign Affairs when he asked how Congress would react if the Mexican Parliament called for the "liberation" of Texas, Arizona, and California. Obviously he sought to compare favorably the status of the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., with these States. There are absolutely no grounds for valid comparison. To begin with the people of Texas, Arizona, and California consider themselves as free, self-governing and loyal Americans. The people of Ukraine, Latvia and Armenia, for example, do not consider themselves as free or self-governing and to call them Russians, loyal or disloyal, would be a grave insult to their national heritage. If there is a national independence movement underway in Texas, California, or Arizona this is the best kept secret of the century. On the other hand it is a matter of common knowledge that the national independence movement is gaining momentum in every non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. No one can deny that the people of Texas, Arizona, and California have full,

popular representation in the Federal Government, unless they have never heard that a rugged Texan named Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON is the majority leader of the Senate, and another son of Texas, SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, that a revered Senator named CARL HAYDEN from Arizona, has long been a powerful voice in our national affairs or for that matter that Vice President Nixon is a native of California. No rational individual may claim that the people of Lithuania, Byelorussia, Estonia, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural, for example, have a representative voice in the affairs of the Russian Presidium or the Communist Party. There are but a few of the many pertinent comparisons which could be made if space permitted.

Khrushchev also claims that the Soviet People consider the passage of the Captive Nations Week Resolution by Congress as an act of provocation. Now, just who are the "Soviet People?" If such people do exist it is pertinent to ask, how and when did Khrushchev test public opinion on this vital issue? The fact is, however, that the false concept of "Soviet People" was created by the new ruling class as a means of disguising the realities of life within their empire. Khrushchev and company would like the people of the free world to believe that communism had purged the 207 million peoples of the Soviet Union of their ethnic diversity, of their respective native languages, of their individuality, of their centuries-long customs, traditions and aspirations. Such a distortion of reality would create the mirage of a homogeneous people, a united people working harmoniously and enthusiastically for the goals of communism. What communism has in reality failed to accomplish during forty some years of organized terror and oppression Khrushchev now seeks to hide under a propaganda rug labeled "Soviet People." The people of the captive, non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union would consider it an act of grave hostility if we referred to them as "Soviet People." So too would the Russian people because their national characteristics and aspirations have not changed during the course of the past two centuries and they are proud to be called Russians. At the time of Stalin's death in 1953 the triumvirate of Malenkov, Beria and Molotov took great pains in the funeral orations to distinguish the Russian people as the "superior people" of the Soviet Union, the people upon whom the government and Communist Party could always count for loyal support. The so-called Council of Nationalities which is part of the Government apparatus but which exercises no power is additional proof that the Kremlin is compelled to recognize the multinational character of the empire. So it is clear that Khrushchev seeks to create confusion when he makes reference to the existence of a "Soviet People."

The Captive Nations Week Resolution has also provoked a negative reaction from some Russian activists living in the United States. This was to be expected because there are covert individuals and organizations at work in our country for the preservation of the Russian empire no matter what form of government is in control of it. Some have no quarrel whatever with the present regime, some would prefer a monarchy to the Communist Party, some would prefer more individual freedom for all the peoples of the Soviet Union but all have one thing in common—a determination to preserve the Russian empire no matter what the consequences may be.

The most articulate Russians living abroad who pose as spokesmen for the Russian emigration consider the national independence movement behind the Iron Curtain as a frightful heresy, as an invention of Hitler and the antithesis of everything Russian. It is a well-known fact that a harsh ideological

discipline is exercised over many Russians living abroad which explains this unnatural state of affairs. This discipline is by no means exclusively Communist because doctrinaire groups of non-Communist Russians follow the same line as Khrushchev with respect to the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. Where Khrushchev regards the population of the U.S.S.R. as Soviet people, the doctrinaire Russians in the free world consider everyone in the U.S.S.R. as a Russian, more or less. Both points of view are imperialistic, seeking to conceal the true identity of the peoples of the submerged nations who are no more Russian than was Patrick Henry.

It is a startling fact that there is not one organization or committee in the United States or elsewhere in the free world working for the national independence of the Russian nation. On the other hand every captive non-Russian nation of the Soviet Union has at least one national organization or committee in the United States working in support of its national independence. Similar committees are established in Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Turkey, Indonesia, and other free countries. The obvious conclusion is that Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain are unmoved at a time in history when the powerful human appeal of the national independence movement has changed the political complexion of South and Southeast Asia, the Middle-East and Africa. Subjugated people everywhere are demanding their national independence, viewing this course as the road to individual liberty, progress and human dignity. Great empires have collapsed before the tidal wave impact of this movement. Nor has the dynamics of this movement spent its full power against the resistance to change in the non-self-governing areas of the free world. Hard won victories have strengthened its forward motion to the point where cold logic requires us to recognize it as the wave of the future. It is only a matter of time before the remaining remnants of imperialism in the free world will give way to the popular demands for self-government. One fact of mid-twentieth century life must be clear to all responsible statesmen. That is, the alternative to granting genuine self-government to non-self-governing people is the use of armed force. Those who resort to this alternative have found that the results do more to strengthen the solidarity of the non-self-governing people than anything their leaders could possibly do in this direction. For every martyr in the cause there are hundreds of new political activists created. In these circumstances armed force is a weapon of tyranny and the answer of mankind to tyranny has invariably been revolt.

It would be a grave error to assume that the non-self-governing people behind the Iron Curtain, that is the people of the captive non-Russian nations, have been immunized from these rapidly moving political developments in the free world. No Iron Curtain, no power of the police state is able to seal out or filter great ideals or political movements, particularly those which now grip two-thirds of the population of the earth. These ideals find a fertile ground in all the captive, non-Russian nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains because historical developments in all these nations have been moving steadily in the same direction. This historical process has been slowed down by czars and commissars but it can not be disrupted or diverted from its course.

Articulate Russians in the free world, particularly in the United States, seem unwilling or unable to grasp the significance of these worldwide trends. They see the Russian Empire, whether it be the Soviet Union or some other forced and unnatural political arrangement of the Eurasian Con-

tinents, as divorced from the rest of the world, perhaps another world, and certainly not subject to the deep political reformation taking place in our world. Herein lies a great human tragedy for Russians on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It has been the ages-long role of emigres from tyranny and oppression to work and sacrifice, in the countries of their adoption, for the emancipation of the people in the homeland, for the removal of both persons and systems which nourish tyranny, human degradation and suffering.

The Polish, Lithuanian, Armenian, and other emigres living in the free world during the course of World War I played a major role in securing support for the national independence movements in their homelands, resulting in the national emancipation of these nations from the yoke of the old imperialism. Meanwhile Russians in the free world, that is, White Russians, were working and fighting for the restoration of the Czarist Russian Empire, thus preparing the way for the new imperialism of the Russian Bolsheviks. Now some 40 years later we find this same peculiar state of mind exists among the emigre Russians, even those who recently came to our shores, based upon the statements, charges, and writings of the articulate among them. The real victims of this political sterility among the emigre Russians are the Russian people behind the Iron Curtain. It is little wonder then that the Russian nation has failed to produce a national patriot, that imperial-minded tyrants have been able to employ the Russian people as tools in their schemes and that the Russian people have failed to undertake one, single uprising against the Communist regime during the past 40 years. In the absence of political stimulation from their compatriots in the free world, stimulation which is compatible with the hopes and aspirations of free people, it would be both unfair and unrealistic to expect the Russian people to oppose the Red imperial regime. Having had no experience with freedom and self-government as we know it, the Russian people should not be condemned for failure to demonstrate a strong yearning for their national independence. The Russian emigres who have lived in and enjoyed the benefits of our free, open society, who have seen first-hand the full meaning of national independence, can not be excused lightly for their failure to advocate national independence for the Russian people. Prudence requires a careful examination of the causes which impel the Russian emigres to pursue a course of action which spells certain disaster for the Russian nation and grave consequences for the rest of humanity.

Turning to the reaction by Russian emigres to Public Law 86-90 we find an abundance of evidence reflecting the political sterility of their thinking. The views made public in both the English and Russian languages can be broken down into these main categories:

(1) That Public Law 86-90 is the handiwork of skilled Nazi agents operating in the United States and holding a powerful influence over the Senate and House of Representatives. To support this charge it is claimed that many of the captive nations named in the law were nothing more than creations of Hitler's propaganda machine. Cossackia and Idel-Ural were singled out for special treatment as nonexistent nations.

The facts: All the nations named in the law as captives established their national independence during the period of 1917-18 or before. Concerning those nations which established their national independence during the period 1917-18, which seem to be more at issue than the others, documentary evidence on all may be found in two official sources: (a) the Reports of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression,

83d Congress, and, (b) Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States with Russia (1918), three volumes published by the Government in 1931.

Comment: Hitler and nazism were unheard of until the 1930's, making it difficult to understand how his propaganda machine could have been responsible for events of the 1917-18 period. It is understandable why official Russian history seeks to conceal the true identity of these submerged nations but we are not Russians nor are we subject to control by Russians. The official records of the U.S. Government are a far more reliable source on political questions relating to the Russian Empire. Such charges as Nazi agent influence on Congress are also a good example of "Russian truths," so well known to the natives of central-east Europe.

(2) That Congress indulged in racism by enacting Public Law 86-90. To support this charge it is claimed that some of the nations included in the law are primitive, tribal groups who lack national identity and having been under Russian domination so long must now be considered as Russians. The racism angle is developed in the context of inciting primitive, tribal groups to think they are not Russians.

The facts: In no manner, directly or indirectly, is racism referred to in the law. On the contrary the law is a sharp indictment of racism and those who attempt to impose their racial superiority theories and beliefs upon others. All the law does is identify clearly established nations which are held captive by Russian Communist imperialism.

Comment: It appears that on the basis of "Russian truths," to recognize the true identity and aspirations of any submerged people is to engage in racism. This is typical of the upside-down thinking which is so characteristic of Communist propaganda. It will be a sad day when free Americans hesitate to see oppressed people in their true lights for fear of being charged with racism.

(3) That Public Law 86-90 has for its objective the dismemberment of Russia and as such is an unfriendly act toward all Russians. To support this charge two claims are made. The first is that many non-Russian people do not want to be separated from "Mother Russia." The second is that any suggestion that the present geography of the U.S.S.R. is subject to revision will stiffen the support of the Russian people behind the Communist regime.

The facts: The law expresses no intent to dismember Russia. On the contrary the Russian nation as such is not even mentioned in the law. There is no reliable evidence to support a contention that it is "captive" and it could not in truth be so recognized. The logical assumption involved in this omission is that Congress studiously avoided any action which could be construed as interference in the internal affairs of the Russian nation.

Comment: In examining this charge a distinction between the Russian nation and the Russian Empire is imperative. Whereas the law recognizes the right of the non-Russian people to freely choose a national life to their own liking, it provides likewise for the Russian people. Here the basic question of the national independence movements in the captive, non-Russian nations comes into proper focus. It is clear that the very nature of these independence movements herald the dismemberment of the Russian Empire. The political concept of national independence is the antithesis of the political concepts of empire and all forms of imperialism. Moreover, this historical process will eventually bring a form of national independence to the Russian nation. As the captive non-Russian nations emerge into national independence and freedom, separating their destinies from the present forced relationships with Moscow, the na-

tional frontiers of the Russian nation will be secured and the Russian people can live as they please behind those frontiers.

As to the claim that many non-Russian people do not want to be separated from "Mother Russia," it is pertinent to raise the question: "Why get so inflamed about Public Law 86-90 if this claim is true?" History teaches us that national independence movements are based upon the will of the people involved—if they don't want their political independence they won't fight for it. In this connection it should be noted that a political smokescreen has been organized by Russian activists and their collaborators called the "Federalists." This is a group of alleged non-Russians who want to preserve the Russian Empire through a vague system of federal union. Investigation has revealed that most of the members of this group are Russians, along with a handful of non-Russian opportunists, concerning whom a strong suspicion exists that they receive financial rewards for use of their names. This enterprise serves as a reliable barometer of the strength behind the national independence movements as the emigre Russians would not go to the trouble and expense involved in the "federalist" adventure unless a disruptive counteraction was sorely needed.

As to the second claim, the effect of which is that unless we accept the present geography of the U.S.S.R. as unchangeable the Russian people will stiffen their support of the Communist regime, a number of timely questions must be raised. The first is, should the American people desert their political and moral ideals in exchange for a dubious hope that the Russian people will be too strong in their support of the regime? What about the majority peoples of the Soviet Union, the non-Russians—how will they feel toward us if we turn our backs on their legitimate aspirations for national independence? Will bowing to the imperial sensitivities of the Russian people, which the emigres now claim they have, drive the captive non-Russian people into the hands of the enemy? In truth, can anyone claim that the ordinary Russian people would object to actions taken by the people of the captive, non-Russian nations which would lift from their backs the twin burdens of communism and imperialism?

(4) That Public Law 86-90 is essentially an anti-Russian law, an act intended to inflame the American people against the Russian people. This charge is based upon a claim that the United States has no right to blame the Russian people for the many Communist crimes against humanity, or for Communist aggressive policies of world conquest.

The facts: In no manner does the law blame the Russian people, as such, for either Communist crimes against humanity or Communist schemes directed toward world conquest. The law simply recognizes that the struggle of the peoples of the captive non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. central Europe and Asia for their national independence, liberties, and freedoms constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just peace. Commonsense dictates that so long as these captive peoples are pulling in the opposite direction to that pursued by the Russian Communist leadership the dangers of war are reduced and the hopes for a just peace increased. No dictator, Communist or otherwise, can launch a successful war under conditions wherein the vast majority of the peoples under his control will seize upon the internal conditions war creates to destroy the very system which supports the dictator. This is as true today as it was 20 years ago, despite intercontinental missiles and hydrogen warheads, because in the final analysis wars are won or lost by people.

Comment: There is a tendency among the Russian emigration to give credit to the Rus-

sian people for everything behind the Iron Curtain which does not offend the conscience of civilized people and to disclaim Russian responsibility for all that is evil or offensive to free people. Frequently an effort is made to put all the blame of communism on the non-Russian peoples of the empire. They remind you Stalin and Beria were Georgians and Mikoyan is an Armenian. They forget that Lenin, Molotov, Malenkov, Suslov, Bulganin, Zhukov, Gromyko, and Khrushchev, just to name a few of the real leaders, are all solid Russian products. Over a century ago a French visitor to the Russian Empire, Marquis de Custine, was warned as he was about to depart for home that he should speak no evil about the Russians regardless of the truth of this statement else great calamities would befall him. We in our times are passing through the same experience, unless we praise the Russians, regardless of how untrue such praise may be, we are charged with being anti-Russian. A great loss to the current body of Western knowledge and thought on the Russian character would have occurred if Custine had been driven from the path of truth by threats of dire consequences. No American could display less courage or dedication to truth under the circumstances which prevail today. If being truthful makes us anti-Russian then let us accept the charge as a compliment to our heritage.

These are the reactions, in summary form, of the most articulate among the Russian emigres to enactment of Public Law 86-90. No claim is or can be made that these reactions reflect the thinking of all the Russian emigres or for that matter a majority of them. In the absence of any positive public reactions to Public Law 86-90, or public objection to the position taken by the articulate Russian emigres, the entire Russian emigration stands in the shadow of doubt created by those who represent themselves as the leaders. This is a situation which should bring forth the enlightened and realistic elements in the emigration, those who have grown weary of the constant embarrassments caused by the reactionary but articulate elements. Those among us who wish only the best for the Russian nation and people in the future would welcome the support of responsible individuals and groups in the Russian emigration.

Meanwhile, thought should be given to steps which could be taken to fill the gap in the ranks of the national independence movement by the failure of the Russian emigration to produce such leadership. Solidarity of purpose is the keynote of this movement and this solidarity could be strengthened by the cooperation of our Russian friends in the emigration. Therefore, consideration should be given to the establishment of an "American Committee for the National Independence of Russia." This would undoubtedly require initiative by well informed Americans to get the committee organized and functioning. With time, enlightened and responsible emigre Russians would gravitate to the committee and become active in its work. Eventually this committee would emerge as the true voice of the Russian people, working hand in hand with the national committees supporting the independence movements in the non-Russian nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Thus a vital unity of purposes would be welded in a critical area of international political affairs which is now beset by confusion, uncertainty, and imperial mischiefmakers. The attainment of this goal of unity presents a real challenge to all thinking Americans. An American Committee for the National Independence of Russia therefore merits serious consideration.

(The proceedings of the House of Representatives will be continued in the next issue of the RECORD.)