

1960

in a lesser amount than recommended by such advisory committee.

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
GEORGE M. RHODES,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 192, on yesterday, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FREEDOM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, because of the limited calendar at our disposal in this session, I hesitated to ask for this time but felt the subject for discussion warranted the special order.

My purpose today is to speak of freedom. And I am sure that every Member of this body will be in ready agreement that there is no more important subject with which we can concern ourselves.

It is in no wise to minimize the patriotism of my countrymen to suggest that sometimes, in these days, we are inclined to take freedom for granted.

It is like the air we breathe; we expect it as a right, and accept it casually. Because freedom for Americans is an accepted thing, we are oftentimes disposed to assume that this is a commonplace condition throughout the world.

As a matter of fact, while we are gathered here, and at the very time I am speaking, millions upon millions of human beings are totally denied freedom, are in fact existing under the stern repressions and deprivations of Communist tyranny.

And so I address myself today to the all-important subject of freedom—freedom as a God-given right to be enjoyed by all men in all climes and in all the remote parts of the world.

Americans cannot be indifferent—nor are we—to the plight of our fellow human beings behind the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains. These slaves of Red tyranny are our brothers; their distress is our concern; their welfare our duty.

One has only to consult the pages of American history to quickly come upon the fact that the colonial forces in our Nation's war for freedom and independence were brilliantly served by patriots from the Old World. Gen. George Washington and his men were admirably assisted by such soldiers as Baron von Steuben of Germany, Kosciusko and Pulaski of Poland, and valiant warriors from Hungary and elsewhere. These men risked their all that America might have independence. And so it is now only a matter of conscience and sound

national policy, a matter of retributive justice that we now interest ourselves in our separated brethren who languish in the vast prisons of Iron Curtain land.

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning I would like to stress one simple fact: freedom is indivisible. To paraphrase Lincoln, the world cannot endure "half slave and half free," and further to remark upon the like thought of the Great Emancipator, just so long as the freedom of any one people is denied, then so is the freedom of the whole world in jeopardy.

Another fact I would like to point up at the outset is that nowhere on the face of the earth is there a Communist government that has resulted from a free choice by free men. Communist governments today are the result of bloody force, or the connivings of Red puppets who undermined the states by subversion and treason. The Red empire today rules by force—let the Red armies be withdrawn from the satellite countries and see how long the Communists would remain in power.

As we look out upon the world at this very minute, we see a real imperialist empire, a vast colonial enterprise, imposing its will on millions of people in many countries.

So we come to the all-important question of the captive nations—nations and peoples held in the vicious vise of Red tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Congress of the United States passed one of the most significant pieces of legislation in our time. That was the Captive Nations Week resolution, now Public Law 86-90. This year, Americans responded enthusiastically to the summons of this resolution and also to the Presidential proclamation which is based upon it. The first anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution was a huge success. The record of this year's Captive Nations Week observances must be taken account of, and the pressing need for the implementation of Public Law 86-90 must be needed. The citizens of our Nation have expressed themselves on this need, and we, their representatives, are obliged to fulfill it.

In proposing a House Committee on the Captive Nations I wish to describe in the most succinct manner possible the record of essential events surrounding the resolution and this year's observances. Allow me to approach this vital subject by, first, stating the meaning and significance of Captive Nations Week; second, presenting the preparations made by our citizens for this year's successful observance; third, showing the scope and extent of the observance; and, fourth, offering additional evidence for immediate congressional action in establishing a House Committee on the Captive Nations.

KHRUSHCHEV AND CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

In view of world developments this past year, and particularly in recent months, the urgency of recognizing the strategic importance of all the captive nations to U.S. interests in the cold war cannot be too strongly emphasized. Khrushchev himself provided conclusive evidence of this. It will be recalled that when Congress passed the resolution

last year and the President issued the proclamation, Khrushchev flew into a wild rage. There was good, sound reason for this violent and troubled reaction. The resolution for the first time struck at the tenuous bases of Moscow's propaganda pretensions and claims by which it seeks to deceive and influence minds throughout the nontotalitarian free world.

Month after month, Moscow and its organs continued the attack against the resolution and the enormous possibilities implied by it. Why should this so-called mighty power have been troubled so deeply? The reason lies in the critical threat posed by the contents of the resolution to Moscow's ideologic war against the free world. Realism in foreign policy necessitates that we be guided by evidence. This evidence of the past year cannot be ignored.

Unfortunately, the meaning of the resolution and Moscow's reaction to it was not fully understood or appreciated by many Americans. Some chided the Congress for confronting the sprawling Bear with the clubs of truth and ideals. Others failed completely in their understanding of the new qualities and dimensions of the resolution. They never bothered to ask themselves, "How is it, our leaders spoke in the past about captive nations and yet Moscow didn't react this way?" The reason for this was due to the fact that for the first time the resolution spoke in behalf of all captive nations, particularly those within the Soviet Union. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I should like to incorporate with my remarks a transcript of the program, "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week," staged by the award-winning Georgetown University Forum. It explains in detail the points I have been making here:

MOSCOW'S REACTION TO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Participants: Donald L. Miller, editor of Freedom Facts; Francis McNamara, executive member of the All American Conference To Combat Communism; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, originator and author of the Captive Nations Week resolution and chairman of the national committee organizing the observance. Moderator: Matthew Warren.

Mr. WARREN. "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week," the topic for the 711th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington.

The Georgetown Forum was founded in 1946. This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be on "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week." The participants are Mr. Donald L. Miller, editor of Freedom Facts and chairman of the Washington Captive Nations Week Committee; Mr. Francis McNamara, executive member of the All American Conference To Combat Communism and member of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, originator and author of the Captive Nations Week resolution and chairman of the national committee organizing the observance.

To begin our discussion, I should like to call your attention to the observance of Captive Nations Week which will take place this year during the week of July 17 to 23.

In 1959 Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution which is now Public Law 86-90. According to the law, the President is authorized to issue an annual proclamation. Committees have been formed in all major cities to observe the spirit of the congressional resolution.

One way to measure the worth of the Captive Nations Week observance is to analyze the Soviet reaction during the past year, which we propose to do during this program.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY: what was the purpose of such a resolution?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The purpose of the resolution was manifold, I believe. One could say on an overall basis that actually we sought to bring to the attention of the American people the strategic importance of all the captive nations to American security interests.

In addition to this, it is to serve as a vehicle for the advance of freedom in the areas of propaganda, psychological and political warfare. By emphasizing the contents of this resolution, not only during Captive Nations Week but in the course of the entire year, I sincerely believe that we would be able to offset the propaganda advances made by Moscow.

Mr. WARREN. Would you say, then, it was designed to stir up the people of the captive nations?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Yes; in the sense of stirring them up to this fact and realization, that the people in the United States are ever cognizant of their captive status and that we will explore every possible peaceable means to bring about their eventual liberation and freedom.

I want to emphasize that contrary to many of the speculations at the time the resolution was passed by Congress, and certainly after the reaction on the part of Moscow, when many newspapers claimed that actually the resolution sought to make the American people cognizant of the plight of these captive nations, it does more than that.

It is not simply to recognize that they are in this captive status but to see and understand, as I put it before, the strategic importance of all of the captive nations. I am not just referring to those in satellite Europe, meaning central Europe, but I am also taking into account the captive nations within the U.S.S.R. and those in Asia. And, taken in the aggregate, you have a very imposing factor here.

Mr. WARREN. How do American individuals participate in such an observance other than to be cognizant of it?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The resolution passed by Congress calls, of course, upon all Americans to observe Captive Nations Week. In the course of this week, which is the third week of July, individuals and groups in their respective localities are expected to engage in religious services, to have rallies, discussion meetings, even editorial comments through various journalistic media; and in the course of such thinking and reasoning about the captive nations—again, taken in the aggregate—it is hoped that our people would, in turn press for more formidable and really more successful cold war media on the part of our Government in offsetting the perilous threat of Moscow.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McNAMARA, shortly after this resolution was passed last year the Soviet Premier, Khrushchev, appeared to be very upset by asking numerous questions of the then visiting Vice President Nixon.

Why do you suppose he was so upset?

Mr. McNAMARA. Well, one reason, I would say, was because this resolution pricked his conscience; it hit him in a very sensitive spot. His violent reaction to the proposal indicated this. To quote Shakespeare, "He did protest too much." This usually indicates that they know they are wrong and they feel guilty. I think that this was the major reason for his violent reaction; that

he knew that this charge was true; and he screamed and protested the way he did in a more or less desperate effort to offset the effectiveness and the truth contained in this resolution.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Mr. McNAMARA, may I ask, "Would you agree that Khrushchev exploded and reacted violently against this resolution because of certain new qualities contained in the resolution?"

What I have in mind here is the fact that for years we have been talking about certain captive nations. The President and our Secretaries of State talked about them over the Voice of America and other media. Surely right up to the time of the Hungarian revolution there was a great deal of talk about the captive nations. But, significantly, the concept was largely restricted to central Europe; whereas here for the first time we have a governmental document which lists numerous and all the captive nations; in fact, the majority of them exist outside of central Europe, both within the Soviet Union and, in addition, in Asia.

Because of this new element—namely, this recognition that the Soviet Union is not a nationally integrated state, that, instead, it is really made up of numerous nations and that they are captive in the sense that the resolution conveys captivity—this, I think, rocked Khrushchev.

Would you agree with this interpretation?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do. I believe that is undoubtedly true. Another element is this, that Moscow has been demanding self-determination in all parts of the world for many years, always throwing the charge of colonialism against the Western Powers generally and demanding that the people in Latin America, who are allegedly enslaved by U.S. imperialism, the people in Asia, Africa, and so forth, be allowed to determine their own form of government, to give independence.

Here for the first time, really, the United States officially challenged Khrushchev on this point. We threw his challenge back to him and demanded that he permit self-determination in the nations that he, the great imperialist, has enslaved.

This, I think, was a very good thing. We have been more or less backing away and not doing much before in answer to this challenge and the propaganda that he had issued on the theme of self-determination.

Here we were answering him and doing it so very effectively, I might add.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Miller, do you recall some other incidents of violent Soviet reaction?

Mr. MILLER. I think the Russian Communist reaction to Captive Nations Week was quite dramatic. We have to remember that this was not a U-2 incident. We did not actually invade or cross Russian territory.

We merely stated a principle and a point of view. The reaction to that was somewhat surprising. A few days after Captive Nations Week began here, on July 22, Pravda came out with quite a vitriolic editorial which condemned Captive Nations Week and made a very strong point of the fact that the Socialist camp is firm and strong as never before.

The following day, as you probably remember, Vice President Nixon visited the Soviet Union and nearly the first word which Khrushchev addressed to him was to the effect, "Well, here you are coming to visit and take a look at the captives."

Throughout Mr. Nixon's visit to the Soviet Union, Khrushchev and a number of hecklers in the crowds came up to him and asked him about the captives, and tried to persuade him that the people in the Soviet Union really were not captives.

To demonstrate this, on July 22 Khrushchev took Nixon on a boat trip and showed him a number of Russian bathers. He used the phrase, "Here are your captives. See how happy they look."

But the most surprising expression from the Russian Communist came on July 30, when the propagandists told their own people that Captive Nations Week had failed. They suggested that the reason that they thought it had failed, was because during the week none of the peoples in the captive nations had revolted.

I don't believe that anyone in the United States had expected a revolt during that particular week, but apparently many of the Russian Communists did.

I think we can make two deductions from this. One is that Captive Nations Week hits a very weak spot in the Communist armor; and the second is that we can do this without even leaving our own communities.

Mr. WARREN. Dr. Dobriansky, it sounds to me as if Mr. Khrushchev was your best publicity agent.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. To that I would agree. As a matter of fact, the publicity agent served our purposes in many ways, having made this known to the peoples and nations within the entire Communist empire and, at the same time, having made it known even to our American people, despite the fact that many of them still down to this day don't really understand the meaning and the significance of this resolution.

But before saying anything about that, I would like Mr. McNamara to discuss perhaps some of the reactions in the so-called satellite area of central Europe. Moscow alone was not in this game of violent and vehement rebuttal against the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Would you first point up the difference between a "satellite" and a "captive nation"?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Frankly, I don't accept this distinction in connection with the various nations within the Communist world. A satellite, a political satellite in its true sense would be, let us say, Portugal in relation to Great Britain. One wouldn't say that Portugal was in any state of enslavement, but it was a satellite in terms of the general directions of British foreign policy.

Analogous to that, I imagine, one can justify somewhat the use of the term "satellite" to Yugoslavia. That was the reason Yugoslavia was not contained in this resolution.

But with regard to the countries that we oftentimes, I think, misapply the term "satellite," the term "captive nation" is vastly more accurate and appropriate.

What does it indicate? It simply indicates that each of these nations, those in central Europe, those within the U.S.S.R., those in Asia, have been subjected by force to a foreign yoke. They are under the domination of the policy of that foreign yoke, meaning Moscow.

I say this in full cognizance of the supposed cleavage between Peiping and Moscow.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McNAMARA.

Mr. McNAMARA. As Dr. Dobriansky mentioned, there was violent reaction to this resolution not only on Khrushchev's part and within the Soviet Union itself but in all of the other captive nations.

In Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Albania, East Germany, all the official propaganda media—radio, the newspapers, controlled press, and so forth—all were extremely vitriolic and loud in their denunciations of the resolution.

They charged that it was interference in their internal affairs, just as Moscow did. They charged it was a threat to peace, and so forth. I believe that this violent reaction throughout the Soviet empire indicates how fearful Moscow is of this resolution and the ideas contained in it.

You see, Khrushchev denounces this resolution very loudly. But if you just stop to think of it you can realize that, if this charge on the part of the U.S. Congress against the Soviet Union was false, he could so easily

1960

prove it by just allowing free elections within the Soviet empire. And if, as he claims, they are not captive nations, they would all vote for continued Soviet enslavement; and, then, he could turn around and laugh in our face and make the United States look ridiculous.

Of course, he will never risk this because he knows in truth that they are captive nations and, if given a chance to vote, they would overwhelmingly, from all the evidence that we can gather, reject Soviet and Communist rule.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. If I may interrupt; another aspect, I think, that should be mentioned is that this reaction on the part of Moscow and the puppets was not restricted in a time length to 1 week or 2 weeks at the end of last July.

On the contrary, the reaction was perpetuated so that going into the following months of the year, right down to December, as far as I know, the Communist organs continued to lambast this particular resolution.

For example, in August, you recall, the month before Khrushchev made his arrival in the United States, they played up an article of his that appeared in the Foreign Affairs Journal. It was an October issue, but an advance publicity was given to it. In this particular article, which I have before me, Khrushchev regards the resolution as "an act of provocation."

The interesting thing about this is that he offers a challenge to the sponsors of the resolution and the backers of it, in the sense that he raises the question: "How would America and Americans have felt if the Parliament of Mexico had, for instance, passed a similar resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be liberated from American slavery?"

Now, after this appeared, I prepared a question which was submitted to one Senator who eventually, the following month, presented this to Khrushchev at the tea party given by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. And the question was this: Fine, Mr. Khrushchev. In view of the fact that you used Texas, Arizona, and California, let us use comparable areas within the Soviet Union: Ukraine for Texas, the Caucasian nations for California, and Lithuania for Arizona. Let us, under U.N. supervision, have the respective peoples in their areas vote: in our area here, for example, whether our Texans want to remain with the United States, join Mexico, or be independent, and there, whether the Ukrainians want to remain with Moscow, join some other unit, or be independent.

The question, I understand, was posed to him and he refused even to recognize it.

Mr. WARREN. How many times has the United Nations rebuked Mr. Khrushchev in this connection and he has ignored it completely. Why should this particular thing worry him even more? Mr. Miller, would you like to answer that one?

Mr. MILLER. I think Captive Nations Week goes right to the heart of one of the great problems of the Soviet Empire, that is, the problem of nationalities.

Joseph Stalin a number of years ago built his reputation as a Communist theorist on the basis that he had solved the nationalities problem.

His solution consisted of saying, "Let's tell the people in the various nations that they can be free and equal within the Communist bloc, that they can maintain their own language and their own culture, and get the benefits of being in this larger group"; at the same time, all these nations are ruled by Communist Party leaders who owe their jobs and their loyalties to Moscow. So that in reality all the nations are ruled directly from Moscow.

This is a very thin kind of deception which the Communists have been using in respect to the captive nations within the U.S.S.R.

They have been using it in respect to the nations in central Europe.

To these people in central Europe, for example, Khrushchev says time and time again, "Your government is entirely in the hands of your own people."

Well, the people in these countries know this isn't true because they know that they are ruled by the Communist Party leaders and these party leaders are responsible to Moscow.

So that when Captive Nations Week and the American people come out and say the truth about this matter, Khrushchev feels that the very statement of the truth is a deadly threat to the whole unity and the so-called solidity of the Communist empire.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. That is a very important point, in my judgment, for it advances the weapon of truth. In the past few months we have been talking about the diplomacy of truth.

It would seem to me, in answer to your original question, that the contents of this resolution, if properly elaborated, would give us many new truths which we could use in this area of the cold war.

I am one who is convinced that this is the only course for us. Knowing something about the cold war pursued by St. Petersburg and Moscow even prior to the coming of the Communists, about the manner in which they built up their empire over the centuries, about the ways they have developed their cold war techniques, I feel that it is in the propaganda, psychopolitical area where ultimately the final decision will be made in this life-or-death struggle.

In this case the resolution gives us many channels, many dimensions that we could pursue, diplomatically, in the propaganda area, even in the economic area. If one considers, for example, the disposition of resources within the U.S.S.R., one finds that most of the important resources in any single area are concentrated in Turkestan or in Ukraine.

Turkestan is a huge area and it is properly listed as one of the captive nations in this resolution. I submit that Khrushchev and the others in the Kremlin began to suspect that perhaps there would be a popular appreciation in this country of the immense psychopolitical possibilities that are truly open to us.

Unfortunately, when one looks at the record—and I have here quite a number of news clippings, editorials, and comments by our analysts concerning the Captive Nations Week resolution and the President's proclamation—I must say that many of our people simply didn't understand it last year.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McNAMARA, what evidence do we have that the people in the captive nations are aware of this resolution?

Mr. McNAMARA. Well, they must be aware of it. We know this because of the extensive coverage given the resolution in the press, over the radio and in other communications media within the captive nations.

One thing I would like to point out is the importance of the captive peoples, in this respect, of maintaining peace in the world today.

We hear an awful lot about this and various plans are being advanced for preventing the outbreak of war, and so on. I believe the captive peoples have been possibly as important a factor as our atomic bomb, when we had a monopoly on it, in preserving peace in this world.

This is because of their resistance to the Kremlin. The Soviet Empire has a fifth column that is larger in numbers and more intensely hates the regime than any nation in the world has ever experienced before.

It is largely because of this resentment, as demonstrated in the uprising in East Germany in 1953 and Poznan, Poland, in early 1956, in Hungary in October 1956, that the

Soviet Union is afraid to start a war, because it knows that the moment that it does, there will be a huge outbreak behind its own lines and it will be sabotaged.

So I think this resolution is extremely important as a peace preserver because it shows the captive peoples that we are on their side, that we are working, thinking of their freedom and independence, that we recognize the fact that they are enslaved and captive.

This tends to keep up their resistance, bolster their courage so they will continue to be a thorn in the side of the Communist regime.

Mr. WARREN. Dr. Dobriansky, you said something a few moments ago that interested me in reminding us of the supposed cleavage between China and Soviet Russia. Would you call the people of China, first of all, captives?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Yes; and it is so indicated in the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. All right—

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Mainland China, mind you.

Mr. WARREN. Then do you suppose that your resolution would enable those captives in mainland China to be hopeful of some help in the future?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. That depends. It is one thing to have a resolution; another thing to observe a Captive Nations Week which is provided by the resolution; it is a third thing—and we are hopeful of this—to begin to recognize, as Mr. McNAMARA well stated here, that the captive nations in the aggregate are really one of our greatest deterrents against the outbreak of a hot war.

If we are interested in preserving peace; that is, no hot global outbreak, then we should be vitally interested in all of these captive nations, including those on mainland China.

This is what I meant when I said that this whole issue is significantly affected by a very important strategic factor in connection with American security and also in connection with our desire to maintain the peace.

Mr. WARREN. What would be the next natural step?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The next natural step would be to set up our cold war apparatus, and this doesn't mean leading us into a hot war; on the contrary, it means we will be implementing the intent and the purpose of this particular resolution to prevent a hot global war and to win the cold war.

We are finally becoming more realistic with regard to the cold war advances of the Russian totalitarians and the very nature of the cold war being waged by Moscow.

I ask you, "Must we always be subjected to shock treatments?" For example, an eruption occurs in the Middle East. Many of our leaders are shocked. Observers there knew what was transpiring right along. I am not suggesting that the problem of Arab nationalism is nonexistent, but also there is the problem of sinister Russian infiltration. The same thing in Cuba. The same thing in Japan. I would add also the same thing in San Francisco with the House Un-American Activities Committee. When we face these events, immediately people, as though babes in the wood, including Senators, Congressmen, and others, express their shock.

There is nothing to be shocked about. You have had a whole series of these, and there will be more. Instead of depending upon shock treatments it is about time we realized fully the nature of this cold war process and proceeded to build up that kind of apparatus to cope with it.

There has been a host of proposals, well-rooted proposals, realistic proposals, along this line.

Mr. WARREN. We only have a few seconds remaining. Would you again tell us the dates of the upcoming Captive Nations Week?

Dr. Dobriansky, Captive Nations Week this year will be held and observed during the week of July 17-23, and in many major cities local committees have been set up to observe this week.

Mr. WARREN, Gentlemen, thank you very much for your participation in this discussion of "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week." The participants, Donald L. Miller, editor of Freedom Facts, chairman of the Washington Captive Nations Week; Mr. Francis McNamara, executive member of the All American Conference To Combat Communism and member of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, originator and author of the Captive Nations Week resolution and chairman of the national committee organizing the observance.

Mr. Speaker, a meaningful and knowing belief in the individuality of freedom does not permit a restriction of freedom to some nations, as, for example, the so-called satellites in Central Europe, and its exclusion as concerns others, as, for example, the more numerous captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. like Ukraine, Lithuania, Turkestan, Armenia, White Ruthenia, Latvia, and others. The resolution is founded on this belief. From the overall viewpoint of propaganda and psycho-political war, Moscow displayed its fear of any intensive American concern with the freedom of these captive non-Russian nations in the primary sphere of its farflung empire, namely the Soviet Union itself. The concept of captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is anathema to it because its proper development and elaboration would produce an entirely different and accurate image of the Soviet Union in world opinion. We have yet to develop this concept, this new dimension, and begin to take long strides in overwhelming Moscow's psycho-political offensive which necessarily has always been its chief mode of attack. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that the editor of the New York Times stress this very essential point in their August 8 editorial, titled "The New Imperialism." At this point I request that this illuminating editorial be made part of my remarks. In addition, I wish to introduce also an article on "The Myth of Soviet Unity" which appeared in the May issue of the Sign magazine. This article explains in detail the new imperialism referred to by the Times editor:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1960]

THE NEW IMPERIALISM

If the possibilities were not so grave, there would be much for the world to laugh at in Moscow's posturing over both Cuba and the Congo. In both these situations the Soviet Union is trying to appear before humanity as the great enemy of imperialism, the friend of oppressed peoples everywhere. The sad truth, apparent to anyone with an elementary knowledge of Soviet history, is that the Soviet Union is today the last remaining great imperialist state, the only colonial power which today rules more conquered territory and more subject peoples than it did a quarter of a century ago.

When Americans think of the captive nations, their thoughts normally turn first to the countries of Eastern Europe upon which Communist dictatorship was imposed by the Red Army a decade and a half ago. Of the Eastern European nations, only Yugoslavia today can claim to be truly inde-

pendent and sovereign, having survived almost a decade of Stalinist political, economic and subversive warfare aimed at turning it into a satellite. The bitterness of the Hungarian people at their enslavement broke out fiercely in the revolution less than 4 years ago, a revolution drowned in blood by Soviet troops. The real feelings of the Polish people were expressed a year ago by the tremendous ovation Vice President Nixon received when he visited Warsaw, but the Gomulka regime has to conduct itself in cognizance of the reality of Soviet military forces on either side of Poland.

But if the Eastern European satellites are still allowed to keep the trappings of outward sovereignty, the same cannot be said of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union. Twenty years ago the independence of the Baltic States—Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia—was extinguished by acts of crude aggression. Red Army invasion of those states was followed by farcical elections which ended those nations' freedom, though not their love of liberty.

The list of other nations imprisoned in the Soviet Union is long. The Ukrainians are today one of the advanced peoples of Europe, yet Kiev is a mere provincial capital ruled from Moscow. In the Transcaucasus, the Georgians, Armenians and Azerbaijanis have known freedom in their history, but know it no longer. In Central Asia the Kazakhs, the Uzbeks, the Kirghiz, the Turkmens, the Tajiks and other smaller peoples are denied independence and liberty.

If Moscow really were an enemy of imperialism it would give liberty to the non-Russian peoples now subject to its will. But in this era when the former Western colonial powers have been and are rapidly making their former colonies sovereign nations, there is no evidence of a similar trend in Moscow's empire. Rather the witch hunt against true patriots among the Soviet subject peoples goes on unceasingly, as does the campaign to Russify these peoples, their cultures and their histories. On the issue of imperialism, therefore, Moscow stands at the bar of world opinion with blood and dirt on her own hands.

[From the Sign, May 1960]

THE MYTH OF SOVIET UNITY

(By Lev Dobriansky)

Propaganda is the Russian Communists' most important weapon in the cold war. Out of a strange mixture of truths, half-truths, and bald lies, they have cunningly devised an amazing system of deception. Chief among their deceits is the myth of Soviet unity.

This myth is kept alive only as long as we remain ignorant of the facts. It is high time we exploded the myth with knowledge of the truth.

What Americans do not know about Russia came to light painfully last July when a joint resolution, unanimously passed by Congress, called for the observance of Captive Nations Week. Now Public Law 86-90, this congressional act is the first official recognition which our Government has made of the existence of non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

The act of Congress mentions many captive nations without and within the U.S.S.R. borders. Deceived by Russian propaganda, Americans had long thought of captive nations only in terms of the satellites in Eastern and Central Europe.

When the resolution was made public, reporters, commentators, and the public inquired, "Where is White Ruthenia? Where is Cossackia?" Many admitted that they had never heard of Idel-Ural or Azerbaijan or even Turkestan. Meanwhile, a number of writers and analysts continued along their merry but blind way to apply this act of

Congress solely to those minority captive nations in central Europe.

Those who investigated the situation were astonished to discover that there are more captive nations within the U.S.S.R. than there are without. They were surprised to learn that the people of those captive nations within the Soviet borders outnumber all the Russians combined.

When the joint resolution was passed, few Americans appreciated this fact. But Khrushchev did. Knowing the implications of President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, he exploded.

Khrushchev was aroused because he wants to hide from the free world the fact that Russia, although a political giant, is a giant with clay feet—a giant whose framework is made up of many different strands.

We must understand some important distinctions between tribes, nations, states, voluntary federations, and tyrannically constructed empires.

The state, it should be noted, is simply the political aspect of the nation. Sometimes you have several nations voluntarily existing in one state, as in Switzerland. Again, you may have one nation being ruled, in separate parts, by two governments, as in Ireland. Again, many nations, against their will, may be politically and tyrannically controlled by one superimposed government, as in the Soviet Union.

After World War I, the present captive nations within the U.S.S.R. were newly independent states. In the collapsing Russian Empire, after World War I, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and other non-Russian nations declared their political independence. They were free of Czarist control. Furthermore, they had no mind to submit to Communist control from Moscow. They established themselves as free democratic republics. Ukraine and Georgia were even recognized as separate states by Lenin's Soviet Russia.

We remember well the tragic fate that overtook independent Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and others in the forties. But what most of us forget is that similar tragedies befell Georgia, the Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and others in the early twenties. Trotsky's Red Russian Army had picked them off one by one after softening them up by infiltration, subversion, propaganda, etc.

By 1923, following the first wave of Red Russian imperialism, these non-Russian nations were forced into the spurious federation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Because of their large populations and their natural resources, these non-Russian nations formed the base for Moscow's further imperialist thrust into central Europe. Currently they form the base for Russian colonial designs in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa.

Yet—and here is a basic point which Americans must grasp—these non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. have not passively accepted the Soviet yoke. Each decade since the twenties has seen serious friction, resistance, even open rebellion scald the hand of their Moscow masters.

This struggle continues. Not a month goes by that Moscow does not launch a fresh attack against this nationalistic trend. Indeed, this opposition to Moscow pressured Stalin to bid for the inclusion of Ukraine and Byelorussia as original members of the United Nations. From time to time Moscow finds it expedient to pretend that the non-Russian republics are independent. Amendments to the U.S.S.R. constitution provide for these republics to have their own war ministries and to enter into direct diplomatic relations with other states. Moscow clearly does not underestimate the reality of these restless nations.

In December 1957 Khrushchev addressed the Supreme Soviet in Ukraine. He referred

to Ukraine as "a truly free and independent nation."

But Nikita Khrushchev is not fooling the Ukrainians—and he decries their genuine nationalism. Even during the illusory "Spirit of Camp David" his agents in Munich assassinated the Ukrainian nationalist leader, Stefan Bandera, and, under the economic disguise of voluntary resettlements, Khrushchev is currently engineering the deportation of families from western Ukraine to central Asia and the Crimea.

These non-Russian nations within the Soviet borders are ancient peoples with long histories and periods of national freedom. Ukraine has 42 million people, the biggest non-Russian nation within the U.S.S.R. The three Baltic nations number 6 million; White Ruthenia (Byelorussia), 10.8 million; Georgia, 4 million; Armenia, 1.8 million; Azerbaijan, 3.7 million; and Turkistan, purposely divided by Moscow into five republics, (Kazakh, Tadzhik, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Uzbek), 22.9 million. And to these some 10 million ethnic and nationally conscious Cossacks located above the Caucasus, and about 15 million Moslems concentrated in the Idel-Ural (Volga-Ural) country, and you wind up with the sizable figure of about 114 million people. This figure covers only 11 compact ethnic and national non-Russian units. There are many small tribal units besides. The Russians number 96 million. Kremlin propaganda concerning the economic progress of the U.S.S.R. would take on a different color if it were subjected to the searching light of reality.

Moscow is supervising an uneasy conglomeration of many nations within the borders of the U.S.S.R. and a restless system of additional colonies outside its borders.

An economy based on extensive captive resources can hardly be compared with a free national economy. Most of the resources within the U.S.S.R. are concentrated in non-Russian areas: agriculture in Ukraine, Turkistan, and Georgia; coal in Ukraine and Turkistan; oil in Azerbaijan and Idel-Ural; 90 percent of the manganese in Georgia and Ukraine; iron ore in the Caucasus and Ukraine. Turkistan, three times the combined size of Britain, France, and Germany, alone accounts for about half the copper, lead, zinc output, and is also rich in bauxite and silver.

Soviet propaganda concerning the military might of the U.S.S.R. also acquires a different shade of meaning when confronted with facts. Forty-three percent of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. are non-Russian. Even apart from likely Russian defections, this is most significant. As for potential Ukrainian, Russian, and other defections, Hungary has furnished the most recent example of what may happen.

Despite their inner weaknesses, the Russians have not only manufactured a myth of unity and invincible strength but they have managed to have the myth accepted by America. The myth has been swallowed not only by the public but by newsmen, commentators, columnists, and political leaders in high levels of Government. A few examples:

The New York Times, October 21, 1958: "Cardinal Agagianian is Russian by birth, having been born near Tiflis." This statement makes about as much sense as asserting that "Cardinal D'Alton is English by birth, having been born in the British Empire." Cardinal D'Alton is Irish and Cardinal Agagianian is Armenian.

Returning from a visit to the U.S.S.R., Adlai Stevenson wrote: "Russia is still a land of sharp and vivid contrasts." He meant the U.S.S.R.

Last July the Governors Report on the Soviet Visit was issued. Referring to the United States and the U.S.S.R., the report stated: "Ways must be devised for the peo-

ple of these two major nations to understand each other." Even Khrushchev, speaking to various peoples within his Empire, would not go so far as to call the U.S.S.R. a nation.

We would expect the U.S. Office of Education would be correctly informed. Yet, in its U.S. Mission's Report on Education in the Soviet Union, we read: "The one fact that most impressed us in the U.S.S.R. was the extent to which the nation is committed to education as a means of national advancement." Actually, our Government still recognizes the free Governments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

I can almost hear my readers complaining that I am indulging in semantics. But this is not merely semantics. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY would resent it very much if people kept calling him RICHARD M. NIXON and vice versa. Everyone likes to retain his own identity, his own background, character, and intentions. So do peoples and nations.

The cold war today is being waged basically on the propaganda level. Hearts and minds of men are the primary targets. This has always been Russia's empire-building mode of attack. But Moscow's lies will eventually smash themselves against the hard reality of truth. Truth makes men free, and we can begin to triumph over imperialist Russian totalitarianism once we replace our misconceptions of Russia with knowledge of the truth. The captive nations resolution was a start. It is tragic that Moscow knows this better than we.

THE IDEAS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The millions of Americans who observed Captive Nations Week did so not out of any superficial sentiment for the oppressed and occupied nations, but by reason of certain basic convictions concerning the overriding issue of the totalitarian imperialism and democratic national freedom. The first of these convictions refers to the nature of the conflict. The chief struggle is not in the nuclear, military, or economic field as such, but rather in the overall, totalistic propaganda and psychopolitical area which embraces the products of the other individual fields. Recent events in Tokyo, Italy, Cuba, and elsewhere should bring home to us the methodical techniques of political abrasion that no amount of armament could deal with. The main arena is ideas and the ultimate weapon is man.

Observing Captive Nations Week, our citizens expressed a second important conviction. And that is that the only way to prevent a hot global war is to win the psychological cold war by the prime ideology of all the captive nations. As Winston Churchill once put it, "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, you may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is better to perish than to live as slaves." Of all the existing challenges before us, the prime and really only mortal challenge to our national existence is Moscow's imperialist challenge.

The third conviction is that our Declaration of Independence, wisely externalized and made applicable to all people and nations, provides the moral and political truths—as well as unsurpassable national purposes—for us to cage the bear. Many of us are simply unaware of the powerful ideologic weapons we have in our possession, but these weapons have yet to be skillfully and effectively used.

It is the height of irony that Moscow cynically exploits the principle of natural self-determination and independence in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, whereas we, the natural bearers of this principle, fear to apply it in the one area which is most crucial to us in any type of war, hot or cold. The area of the Soviet Union itself. Pertinent to this aspect is an address that was delivered over the Manion Network under the title "We Must Declare for Independence of Captive Nations." I include it as part of my remarks here:

WE MUST DECLARE FOR INDEPENDENCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

DEAN MANION. Emerson once wrote that "nature is an endless combination and repetition of a very few laws." Upon these dependable "laws of nature and of nature's God" the national independence of the United States was launched 184 years ago this week.

Just as nature wisely repeats its inflexible elementary laws, this program has repeatedly stressed the all important historic consequence of those same basic principles, namely, the sovereign independence of these United States.

The ringing declaration of these laws of nature, which made us a free independent Nation in 1776, needs endless reiteration now, an ominous time, certainly, when the laws of God and nature are being flouted in the satanic communist conquest of all mankind.

We now need to remember that the sacred principles that made us free can keep us free and, in the process, defeat communism and liberate the world.

This truth is the rationale of the captive nations resolution which Congress passed last year, and of our Captive Nations Week observance which a national committee of prominent Americans is now organized to promote.

I have the distinguished chairman of that committee with me at this microphone now. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is professor of economics at Georgetown University, and he is also a great champion of human liberty. Dr. Dobriansky, I want to take this occasion to thank you publicly for the leading part you played in the conception and adoption of the congressional captive nations resolution. It is a pleasure to welcome you to the Manion Forum.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Thank you, Dean Manion. Tomorrow we Americans, throughout this land and also abroad, will be celebrating the independence of our Nation.

To all patriotic citizens this sacred day symbolizes, under God, our national freedom, the untampered will of a sovereign people, our firm determination to meet any enemy who would attempt to destroy our hard-won independence.

It symbolizes, too, the spiritual and moral power of our great tradition, the liberal institutions of this country, and the warm humanism of its laws.

Friends, I am not sounding any super or ultrapatriotic note when I emphasize that our spirit of independence is at once our past, our present, and our future. Different peoples throughout the world see the meaning and essence of this Nation more objectively and even more appreciatively than many of us do.

The European writer, R. L. Bruckberger, in his remarkable book, "Image of America," rightly maintains that the religiously inspired perennial principles and tenets in our Declaration of Independence belong today not only to the American people but to all the peoples and nations of the world, particularly those in Moscow's farflung totalitarian empire.

16450

The philosopher, Jacques Maritain, in his book, "Reflections on America," views the development of this Nation as a unique and unprecedented historical phenomenon and says, "all this talk about American materialism is no more than a curtain of silly gossip and slander."

"Our Nation, built on the free and creative energies of people drawn from every quarter of the globe, is a unique historical experiment—indeed, the great experiment of mankind. Our Nation is a living revolution that moves the hearts and minds of freedom-aspiring peoples everywhere; again, particularly those in captive Eurasia.

In the full perspective of the history of mankind, we, as a united, prosperous, and peaceful people, have with all humility every reason to be proud of our unique development and rich tradition.

Our society, to be sure, is not perfect. But, by all evidence, it is unquestionably one that has given so much in so many ways to so many within a short span in the history of man. It is one which has made this Nation most powerful, exemplary, and respected everywhere.

Contrary to some false notions, we do possess an ideology which inspires our continued growth as a morally leading nation and remarkably equips us to contend successfully with the present threat of imperialist Red totalitarianism.

AMERICAN IDEOLOGY DEFINITE AND DISTINCT

This ideology is plainly and precisely spelled out in our Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. Normal American citizens, like you and myself, know the principles of freedom enshrined in these historic documents and the purposes they necessarily imply for the continued growth and leadership of our Nation.

A few in this country seem to think otherwise. It is a sad commentary on the faith that these few have in the strength and vision of the American people, no less in the political and moral foundations of our Nation, where they believe that by setting up a committee to define our national purposes, they could either improve upon or supplant the purposes and objectives of our Nation as provided by our own Declaration of Independence.

On this Independence Day it is vitally important for us to reflect upon the moral and political principles embodied in the declaration. Nuclear weapons, missiles, luniks, and the whole array of new technologic innovations—which by nature are only instruments and means—cannot reshape or antiquate these natural norms of civilized human existence.

Even more important at this time is the application of the perennial principles of national and individual independence to other nations and peoples. For, not only is the living application of these principles crucial to the further growth and development of our Nation, but it is also indispensable to the existence and survival of the non-totalitarian free world.

What a moving and powerful force our Declaration of Independence was on the various nations which were subjugated in the empires of the last century and a half.

Nations in the Russian, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires soon rose at the beginning of this century to declare their independence with a will to pursue an independent national existence similar to ours. But, in significant part, this was short lived as the unchecked surge of Russian totalitarian imperialism since 1918 once again reduced the many non-Russian nations of Eastern Europe and Asia to servility.

Today, we ourselves are seriously threatened by this barbaric peril. Worst of all, in our confusion, generated in great degree by the tremendous propaganda skill of the enemy, we aren't even aware of the enormous

opportunities we have to defeat this menace in the cold war and thus stave off a hot global war.

The way, I believe, was demonstrated last year with the passage by the Congress of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. What this resolution, now Public Law 86-90, calls for is, in essence, a universalized Declaration of Independence.

For the first time, our Government recognized the fundamental fact that the Soviet Union itself is an empire, in which the majority of people constitute captive non-Russian nations. In addition to the three captive non-Russian Baltic nations, there are White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Idel-Ural, and Turkestan—held captive and occupied by foreign Moscow.

Following World I, each of these—as did Poland, Finland, and others—broke away from Russian imperial rule, only to be reconquered one by one on the divide-and-conquer principle. Without these economically rich non-Russian colonies in the Soviet Union, Russia, with less than half of the population of the Soviet Union, would be only a second-rate power.

When Congress passed this resolution last July, you will recall that Khrushchev reacted violently and fearfully. He persistently sought to reassure Vice President Nixon that they were no captives in the U.S.S.R.

Unfortunately, in our country the greater part of our press was puzzled and bewildered by this development; in fact, many for the first time learned that there are nations like Turkestan and Cossackia in the U.S.S.R.

KHRUSHCHEV FEARS INTERNAL AWAKENING

Now, why did Khrushchev react with such verbal violence against this resolution? Our Government spoke often in the past about the few captive nations in Central Europe—the so-called satellites—and, yet, no such reaction was produced.

The answer lies in the fact that there is a serious colonial problem within the Soviet Union, which Moscow calls "bourgeois nationalism"; and if this is dragged out into the spotlight of world attention and opinion, the proper characterization of Russian Moscow as the last major colonial and imperialist power in the world would be devastating to its propaganda and cold war efforts. Khrushchev well understood this and ranted against the resolution months after; we remained puzzled and bewildered, and muffed our opportunity.

Our opportunity, I am convinced, will come once we realize the following:

1. That the Soviet Union is an empire in itself, holding in bondage the majority of the captive nations in the Red totalitarian world.
2. That the issues of colonialism and imperialism within the Soviet Union are prime targets for our national concern.
3. That the chief type of warfare Moscow—and, before it, St. Petersburg—wages is propaganda warfare, one that we must equal and surpass.
4. That the cold war will be as permanent as the colonial imperium maintained by Moscow from the Danube to the Pacific.
5. That the universalization of our own Declaration of Independence is the appropriate and most formidable weapon in this type of war. Initiative, positive action, imaginative ideas can be ours with these new dimensions of thought.

The recent events in Paris, Japan, Cuba—indeed, in our own San Francisco—are not shocking to those who understand Moscow's traditional techniques. It has built an unprecedented empire by them.

These events should bring us back to the realities of the main struggle, for which, we are unhappily poorly prepared. Toward this end, citizens throughout the country have formed in Washington the National Captive Nations Week Committee. In accordance

with Public Law 86-90, the committee is stimulating a nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week beginning July 17.

We earnestly hope you will join in this observance. The independence we enjoy, and will celebrate tomorrow, can only be preserved if we begin to translate it for all of the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union, 2 weeks hence.

Don't be fooled by the slogan "coexistence or coconstruction"; the real alternative is a policy of emancipation, beating Moscow at its cold war propaganda game. This we can do with hitherto unused weapons of truth; and year by year we can truly find ourselves deserving to rejoice as a free Nation in 1976, the 200th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence.

In addition to these convictions, Mr. Speaker, the recent countrywide observances of Captive Nations Week expressed also an important view regarding alleged Soviet unity. It holds that the myth of Soviet unity and power must be exploded so that the entire world may see what the Soviet Union really is—a loosely knitted quilt of captive nations where economic colonialism and political imperialism are rampant. Not only in the interest of truth but also in behalf of our stakes in the cold war we should be doing this. Instead of abetting this myth with such misleading concepts as Soviet nation, the Soviet people, and the Soviets, we should be stressing the empire nature of the U.S.S.R.—really the last imperial and colonial center in the world. It requires little reflection to see how this valid conception alters our other fallacious notions about Soviet military power, the Soviet economy, and the like. Mr. Speaker, we can have no hope of successfully competing with Moscow in the main struggle of ideas, argument, and propaganda, until we correct our own misunderstandings.

By tradition and principle our overall policy cannot but be one of independence aimed at all the captive nations, which necessarily includes those in the Soviet Union. This would be not only in our strategic interest, not only in the interest of the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations, but it would also best aid the approximately 96 million Russian people to attain their independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule. When asked about the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, the President rightly stated:

The United States would never believe and never accept the idea that a true peace had been established in the world until every single nation had the right to express its own views about its own destiny.

It makes little rational sense to hail the new States of Africa which have far less national sines of historical continuity, geographical contiguity, religion, customs, language, mores, law, common experiences of war and peace, laws, heroes, and arts than the majority captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., and to overlook these nations which are situated at the very base of the enemy of the free world.

THE NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

In accordance with Public Law 86-90 our private citizens established the National Captive Nations Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Lev E. Dobrian-

sky, professor at Georgetown University, and the executive directorship of Thomas F. Connor. This committee planned and successfully stimulated the observances of Captive Nations Week this past July. As early as last January, Dr. Dobriansky called for such private action in an address delivered to the 1960 Women's Forum on National Security. Because of the pertinent contents of this address, I include it as part of my remarks at this point:

JUSTICE AND FREEDOM FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

(Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University Faculty member, National War College, 1957-58, before the 1960 Women's Forum on National Security, Hotel Statler-Hilton, Washington, D.C., Jan. 30, 1960)

Ladies of America, your fellow citizens cannot praise you too highly for convening annually in this vital forum to deal with problems of our national security. This year, far more than in previous years, the forum is properly charged with a consciousness of urgency and solemn decision as we face the momentous and determining events of this new decade. It is both a privilege and pleasure for me to exchange with you certain basic thoughts on peace with honor at the very beginning of this decade of decision.

Hypothetically (and it couldn't be otherwise) if Khrushchev were standing here this morning, he would be forced to eat the words he uttered in the spirit of Camp David 2 months ago. Mimicking past dictators, he claimed that the West is hit by old age. (Interview by Maj. Salah Salim, Reuters, Cairo, November 10, 1959.) He illustrated his point by quoting Tolstoy: "When I was young, I was strong with women, but now I feel pain and bitterness—I have a great desire for them but I have no strength." "This," opines Nikita the sanguine, "is exactly the West's attitude." It is obvious that one of the many fundamental subjects he failed to learn during his triumphant cold war visit here is the full power of an American woman. That boundless power is reflected here. And it is this power, diversely generated in the sanctity of the American home, that provides the inspirational drive, the intuitive vision, the courage and will, the principled behavior which help to shape the soul of America. Poor Nikita Sergeyevich, he will never understand that behind American thrones rests the power of American women.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

The unique feminine capacity for placing first things first, for planning under the guidance of fixed principle and toward well-defined ends, is a faculty by which the so-called intricacies of international relations could be easily unraveled. A study of foreign affairs and how they impinge on our national security demands the exercise of not only the mind but also the heart. Our gestures, our appeals, whether executed through economic, military, diplomatic, or other means, are necessarily directed at both the minds and hearts of peoples elsewhere. The success or failure of these efforts depends primarily on what we stand for, how well and passionately we articulate it, and why we are determined by common will to uphold and advance that for which we really exist. Basically, no matter from what angle of interpretation, the security of our Nation is inextricably tied up with this what, how, and why.

Peace with honor has no meaning without the principles, operational means, and objective ends that are respectively implied by our what, how, and why. Peace with honor carries a price set by these three determi-

nants: by nature, it precludes peace at any price. The very formidability of our military defense structure is also founded on the what, the how, and the why. Billions of dollars worth of the finest military equipment could easily become a heap of junk if the national will to fight were successfully sapped by Moscow's cold war maneuvers. The being of our Nation—what the United States is, means, and symbolizes for people everywhere—subsists in the what of our principles, the how of our methods, and the why of our certitude, will, and vision. Peace with honor is only another way of expressing this national being.

JUSTICE AND FREEDOM FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

Let us examine first the what—the principles by which our Nation has become the most powerful on earth. Derived from our rich Judeo-Christian heritage and natural law, the moral and political principles of intrinsic personal dignity, equality before the law, individual liberty, private opportunity and enterprise, communal welfare, and national self-determination have formed the very foundation of the great tradition which is America. These principles are enshrined in our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and our Bill of Rights which in whatever age—the machine, the atomic, or space—have steadily mirrored the hopes and aspirations of peoples and nations throughout the world. These documents spell out a living and expanding revolution which affects peoples and nations not only in Africa and Asia but also within the Soviet Union itself. Freely blessed for self-criticism, we are the first to say that in the perennial light of these principles, many of our institutions require improvement, reconstruction, and change; but this is no reason for us to shy from the prodigious truth that our society stands in a contrast of day to night to the totalitarian jungle of Moscow's empire.

Those who today are virtually uttering "I'd rather be Red than dead," had no faith in these principles or in themselves before sputnik, no less after. But since the launching of the sputnik and, with it, Khrushchev's concentrated cold war campaign against the United States, many strange voices have been raised in this country. Their number and their depth attest to the effectiveness of Russian cold war propaganda. Without even knowing it, many have become efficient, costless tools of this propaganda. Worse still, in addition to the many other gaps thrown at us daily, they give witness to the basic intellectual and spiritual gap found in many quarters of our society. Their rantings about coexistence or codestruction, accommodation or war, evolution as opposed to revolution, disarm or perish, and other catchworded themes are not even poised on logic, not to say active, directing principles. Often among these fear mongers, the conception of self-preservation is a crudely physical one and their exhortations amount to an open invitation to national rape.

Ideologically, our firm bent as a nation can only be along the path of justice and freedom for peace and friendship. Given our time-honored principles, our tested rules of national conduct, logically it could not be otherwise. Khrushchev's offer of peace and friendship is as spurious as his issue of capitalism versus socialism. Yet it is amazing how many in this country uncritically permitted their thoughts to slide into these contrived conceptual slots. As with Hitler, the overriding issue with Khrushchev and his puppets is freedom and slavery. One imperialist system was smashed, another surges forth to threaten our national existence. Peace and friendship are the effects, the consequences, of justice and

freedom, not their cause. Only through the advance and establishment of justice and freedom can the harmonization of relationships into normal concourse be attained to weld the true bonds of peace and friendship among nations as well as between individuals and groups. As in the case of his predecessors of many centuries, for Khrushchev the slogan of peace and friendship is only an instrument of calculated deception. Its logic rests only in the complacency, doubt, confusion, and naivete it can breed in the camp of the targeted non-Russian victim.

By simple analysis, justice and freedom for peace and friendship is the essence of peace with honor. It logically places first things first, it clearly transports the reality of our national being, and it demandingly calls for activity in thought and deed toward the creative growth of a free world environment. It suggests a more active agency for our thoughts and behavior than does the passive guideline of peace and friendship in freedom. Unending stress upon justice and freedom for peace and friendship alone can provide us, like the trained fighter, with maximum flexibility of action and maneuver against the already compromised opponent. Less than this means our own compromise and thus our curtailed flexibility.

THE COLD WAR GAP

Now let us turn to the how—the means, ways, methods by which we articulate, translate, and objectify the what. The efficacy of our methods—the how—depends on how well we understand and perceive the object against whom they are forged and employed. This involves our own conception of the cold war, our knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union, and our awareness of the primacy of propaganda in the cold war arsenal of Imperial Moscow.

We are barraged nowadays by unbalanced complaints about the missile gap, the big boster gap, the narrowing economic gap, and a host of other subsidiary gaps. This frenzy is doubtlessly to the keen delight of Khrushchev. For the past 2 years his masterful propaganda machinery has so well utilized old Potemkin Village tactics in connection with costly and pointedly concentrated scientific, technologic, economic, military, and cultural projects that acute political neurosis has burst out in many sectors of our society. This was calculated to aid him immensely on the primary politico-psychological front and at the bargaining table on the diplomatic stage. The psychological treasures of Pushkin, Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, and others are paying off vastly more than anything Marx was able to produce. Without casting self-reflections, one is almost inclined to say, "It takes a Slav to know a Slav."

Here, too, it is amazing that in all this dither about gaps, the truly most essential gap—the gap that will determine whether we'll plunge disadvantageously into a hot war or face, in moral surrender, a cold war defeat—is scarcely mentioned. The cold war gap, rather than any other gap, has accounted for freedom's tremendous losses these past two decades. Just bear in mind that the tides of freedom even receded when the other gaps were nonexistent. "From Atomic Monopoly and Air Supremacy to the Fear of Annihilation" might not be a pretty caption in the book of some future historian, but it cannot be denied that no nation in modern history has lost so much in so short a time as ours. Even during World War II we failed to understand our hot war ally who bore also the face of our cold war enemy. In the present, we witness the strange spectacle of our USIA Director indicating, in effect, himself and the Agency by trying to rationalize that the sputnik precipitated a worldwide belief in the scien-

ing and technological superiority of the Soviet Union over the United States. By the same token, American Motors is supposed to be superior to General Motors by first exploring the Rambler field.

"The best way to eliminate war," said Khrushchev last year, "is the gaining of power by Communists all over the world." This statement alone gives one an insight into the nature of the cold war. On every continent Moscow is feverishly pursuing its goal of world domination while at the same time professing efforts aimed at a lessening of world tensions. This cold war maneuver has even succeeded in generating the illusion of a cold war cessation here. The plain fact is that cold war activity is a necessary coefficient of the Russian imperialist system and totalitarian structure. On smaller scales, it has always been. In the same way that the elimination of the Iron Curtain or a genuine and extensive liberalization of conditions in Moscow's empire would seal the demise of this empire, so the cessation of cold war operations would dry up its motivating forces of being. In short, the cold war is a basic motive force for the necessary expansionism of Moscow's empire without which its internal totalitarianism would have no justification for existence.

If eventually, we are not to be cornered into making the drastic, or better, disastrous choice between a hot war at considerable disadvantage or humiliating cold war surrender, it is indispensable for us now to face up to the cold war gap, to grasp the traditional Russian cold war methods, to establish an efficient cold war apparatus, and to pose our own freedom challenges to Moscow. Those who counter that this might lead to a hot war, not only hide from the realities of the cold war but also, in their thinking, wind up with the reductio ad absurdum of this disastrous choice. In a military condition of mutual deterrence, the weight of net advantage naturally favors the one better equipped to wage the cold war. With the cold war gap, this advantage is Moscow's. Missiles, boosters, and evidences of the other gaps have no place in so-called intensive revolutions sparked off by patient subversion, infiltration, blackmail, and other devices in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, South America, and even in Cuba. Unless one is so far gone with haunting hallucinations of pushbutton coannihilation, a skillfully executed cold war operation could even balance off, with much to spare, the effects of the other gaps. After all, man will always be the ultimate weapon; and freedom-aspiring men and nations in Moscow's empire are yet our most formidable weapon.

I have defined the cold war as a twilight condition of neither peace nor hot war where all the basic elements of a hot war—predatory design, aggressive strategy, tactics, and techniques—are present, except for open military combat between states. But the cold war, as waged by Moscow, is also a planned process leading to victorious results in time. This is why it is an illusion to speak of peace while this process is going on relentlessly and with increasing Russian confidence and arrogance. The prevalence of peace, thus, is measured not only by the absence of a hot war but also by the absence of a cold war and all that it entails.

Our situation in the cold war gap today embraces both a supreme paradox and an imposing irony. The supreme paradox is that while we fear to meet the demands of the cold war because it might lead to a hot war, Moscow shows no fear of a hot war resulting from its intense cold war operations. The imposing irony is that in any hot war we wouldn't think twice about establishing a politico-psychological apparatus which is the same that is desperately needed in the present cold war. For reasons of survival, if not national goals of

expanded freedom, the cold war gap must be closed. Foreign economic aid, military alliances, and our own adequate Military Establishment cannot in themselves cope with Moscow's cold war operations.

Of course, the present Russian totalitarians possess the wealth of centuries of experience in cold war methods and techniques. From the 16th century on, their predecessors built an unprecedented empire with these self-same techniques of subversion, infiltration, conspiracy, blackmail, and divide and conquer. There isn't a century for which cases cannot be given of the skillful use of these methods. Lenin learned these from the history of the empire, not from Marx or Engels. Being a true Leninist, Khrushchev exploits the fake philosophy of communism as a cold war instrument in the same way that the previous czars manipulated the equally fake philosophies of Russian Orthodox supremacy and pan-Slavicism. Also true to tradition, he bellows noninterference as concerns free interest in his captives just as his forebears had done in connection with their enslaved nations. Interference, in the Russian view, is only a one-way street outside the empire. The czars were also masters in instigating anti-Jewish agitation to discredit legitimate movements and institutions: Czar Nikita shows equal mastery in dipping into the sewers of prejudice to accomplish similar ends.

These and more are not just academic historical parallels. The past lives very much in the present. Khrushchev himself attests to this. Only last month, in Budapest, he compared himself with Czar Nicholas I who helped put down the Hungarian Revolution in 1848. Had we been prepared for the glorious opportunity provided by the Hungarian Revolution of 1956—and without involving our own forces—he wouldn't have had this chance to compare himself with a previous czar. Khrushchev today is playing a triadic role: like Nicholas, he is seeking Western consent and acquiescence toward his empire; like Lenin, he is advancing the ideas of nationalism, anticolonialism, and anti-imperialism in Asia and Africa; like Stalin, he is holding firm to the totalitarian reins, accomplishing even more adroitly police state measures which Stalin handled crudely.

Khrushchev may have this wealth of experience in cold war operations, but we have to our enormous advantage the most fertile field for cold war application. To make use of this field in the interest of our own freedom, as well as others, necessitates the overcoming of a serious intellectual gap in our knowledge and understanding of the Soviet Union.

THE INTELLECTUAL GAP RE U.S.S.R.

When I authored the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, little did I anticipate that its able sponsorship and passage in our Congress would provoke Khrushchev to think that this intellectual gap in our country has been spontaneously closed. His actions showed that he fears this deeply, and with good reason. Once this gap is filled, in our eyes and the eyes of the free world, Russia will dwindle to proper size. Russian propaganda, which exaggerates the Potemkin Village achievements of science, technology, economics, and education in the U.S.S.R., would suffer irreparable losses. Our added knowledge, understanding, and perception of the Soviet Union, if skillfully used, could render Moscow indefinitely insecure within the Soviet Union itself. They would eliminate, too, many of our baseless fears.

It is not a stroke of superpatriotic rhetoric to declare that, on the basis of projected current trends, easily within the next 50 years no nation could be compared in total power and capability with the United States. The Soviet Union, factually and historically, is not a nation. In addition to Russia and

its approximately 96 million people, the Soviet Union consists of many non-Russian nations which, significantly, make up the majority of captive nations in the entire Red Empire. One of them, Ukraine, with its 40 million people, is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. Moscow has its internal satellites as well as its external ones. If the external ones, like Poland and Hungary, are deemed unreliable for Moscow's global purposes, the record of the past 38 years shows that the internal satellites, like Ukraine and Turkestan, are equally unreliable. Without the rich captive resources of these internal satellites, Russia would be a power no greater than an integrated Germany. Most of us are even unaware of the fact that about 35 million Moslems, many with strong ties with Turkey and Pakistan, are held captive in this primary empire of Moscow.

Give some thought to these fundamental facts and what they signify. These facts are expressed in the captive nations resolution and Khrushchev recognized well their significance and their portent. Unfortunately, many of us still don't. Our economic and military comparisons are drawn on the basis of false and misleading concepts and definitions. There is no more a gross national product in the Soviet Union than there is a gross global product here. A gross imperial product, with phonetic emphasis upon the gip, is truer to fact. We approach a far more accurate and different picture of relative economic strength by only comparing the total output of Moscow's entire empire, which includes mainland China, with that of the free world alliances. The difference is staggering. Comparing the United States, which is a Nation, with the Soviet Union, which is an empire of many subjugated nations, cannot suit Moscow's propaganda mill better. It conceals all the facts of economic colonialism within the U.S.S.R. itself.

For the same basic reasons, our military comparisons are askewed. If we deem the armed forces of the external satellites as being unreliable for Moscow, there are firm grounds for a similar evaluation of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. About 45 percent of these forces consist of captive non-Russians, and these, by basic policy, are largely dispersed from their respective homelands in this substrate empire. Our memories are short, and our perspective are narrow. Only in the past World War, millions of these non-Russians deserted to take up arms against Moscow. In the Hungarian revolution, Ukrainians, Russians, and others joined with the Hungarian patriots. In Napoleonic times, Alexander I threatened Europe with his armed might; before World War I, Czar Nicholas II scared Europe with the steamroller, his imperial armed forces; and now Czar Nikita engages in nuclear blackmail. In three major wars in this century, the multinational forces controlled by Moscow disintegrated early in the deadly game. On the basis of these facts and more, one can understand why at the end of the recent 2-day session of the Supreme Soviet, the delegates were whisked away to see a performance of Tolstoy's "War and Peace." Their self-assuring theme song was that "no conqueror will ever again march through Moscow." Contrary to popular myth, both Napoleon and Hitler were defeated not by the empire's forces but by the emptiness of their ideologies. Both had nothing but continued slavery to offer to the Russians and non-Russian nations in Moscow's empire.

We, of course, seek to conquer no one. But we richly possess an ideology which emphasizes that freedom is indivisible. And in the permanent cold war it is the deadliest weapon against Moscow's totalitarian empire, the Soviet Union. Terms like "the Soviets," "the Soviet people," "the Soviet nation," or Russia as an equivalent for U.S.S.R.

are marks of our intellectual lag regarding this basic empire. This lag is shown, too, by the fact that nowhere in our Government is there any continuous study made of the sensitive relations between Moscow and its internal satellites. Our ignorance along this fundamental line is appalling. We're like a football team facing an opponent without the advantage of a scout's briefing on his basic weaknesses. You wouldn't believe it, but 2 years ago an obtuse attempt was made to eliminate the non-Russian languages beamed by our Voice of America to the U.S.S.R. Thanks to a few alert Congressmen, the peoples there were spared listening to our programs in the language of their Russian captor.

THE WILL FOR FREEDOM

Now, finally, the why of our position on peace with honor. Principles and know-how are mute without the human will to enforce them. Our will for freedom is not just an emotion; it is a certitude, a vision with a rational outlook. On the basis of our principles and the capabilities set by our know-how, this will works creatively to mould that world order allowing for the free and maximum fruition of individual and national potentialities. Our conception of world order, based on rights and law, is the very negation of Moscow's colonial and imperialist totalitarianism. This will for freedom creates, not just preserves; it moves forward, not just rests; it is determined to see things through on the time-honored principle that the best defense is the offense. We are so growth-conscious today about our economy, foreign trade, the underdeveloped countries, space exploration and other fields; the one area we should be most growth-conscious about is the state of world freedom.

In this eventful year, you and your organizations can do much to further this will for freedom:

1. The year 1960 is a Lincolnian year, the centennial of a Presidency whose immortal words on the impossibility of half free and half slave applies on a global basis today. The year 1976 will be the 200th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence for which we should prepare with clean consciences and firm hearts. Instead of long-run economic plans, let us initiate in the spirit of our living revolution a 16-year freedom plan for spiritual rededication and a politico-psychological force that would stir the hearts and minds of people throughout the world;

2. More than anything else, Khrushchev wants our acquiescence and consent to the permanent captivity of the over 20 nations in his vast empire. His sputniks, lunicks, and missilenicks are all diversionary means for attaining this crucial objective. Unless we are bent upon suicide, this we could never allow to happen. In terms of our principles, not to say national strategy, such an accommodation is unthinkable. Your organizations can give full expression to this by preparing now for the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week this July;

3. The record shows that all recent summits have resulted in grave disadvantages for us. Two years of clever propaganda by Moscow has sucked us into another summit and perhaps a series of diversionary talk-fests. Even now Khrushchev is reviving pressure on West Berlin. You and I can urge our President that the summit agenda include the basic issues of the captive nations and an integrated Germany and that our stand on West Berlin, which is only the tail of these issues, be firm and uncompromising. Before long we shall learn that the only self-respecting way to treat a totalitarian Russian is by firmness and confident resolve;

4. To close the serious cold war gap, your organizations can help immensely in this by supporting the important bills in Con-

gress (H.R. 3880 and S. 1689) proposing the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy; and

5. We are constantly told to learn about and understand other peoples and nations. By all means. From the viewpoint of our own national security, I believe you will agree that a working knowledge and understanding of the many non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. ranks high in priority. You can develop this important interest which basically is in the interest of our own national security.

By doing what you believe in is the true exercise of the will for freedom. Our will for freedom is the backbone of the will to freedom among the enslaved. This will is at the core of peace with honor. This will is ably represented by you.

Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of Congress, it has been my happy privilege to become an honorary member of this committee. This national committee of over 250 prominent Americans represents every major sphere of our society—labor, management, education, the press, fraternal, the entertainment world. The committee's preparations for Captive Nations Week were extensive and impressive. It stimulated the formation of local committees in about 50 major communities throughout the country.

It is not possible for me here to present all the evidences of this preparation, but the following selected items are sufficient to give an indication of the work of this committee. I include at this point the prayers printed in the colorful brochure, "Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, 1960," prepared and distributed in tens of thousands of copies. Dr. Alexis Carrel, a famous scientist, once said:

The most powerful form of energy that one can generate is prayer. Only in prayer do we achieve that complete and harmonious assembly of body, mind, and spirit, which gives the frail human need its unshakable strength.

Khrushchev scoffs at this because he fears it. Through such energy the committee released a letter to the President prior to the summit, statements on "The Summit Debacle" and "Nekulturniy Khrushchev," and on the eve of the observance letters to our newspaper organs, which also I include as part of my remarks:

PRAYERS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

O Lord, the Blessed One, through Thy blessings and Thy unique compassions, succor all the human beings who are suffering under the oppression of the tyrannic and brutal acts of imperialist totalitarianism.

May they have the opportunity to enjoy their freedom and liberty, for they were equally created; may we, with courage and strength, always work to magnify this opportunity. (Prepared May 1960 by Geshe Wangyal, graduate of Buddhist Seminary, Tibet.)

Our Father God, Author of liberty, grateful for our own freedom we lift our prayer for the millions of God-fearing people—Thy children, who look up to Thee crying "how long, O Lord, how long," even as they are bound with the chords of a temporary tyranny.

In this desperate hour when the world's hope for a brighter tomorrow is so largely committed to our frail hands, strengthen us in Thy name to challenge all evil forces which deal in fetters of the body and mind and which seek to degrade human person-

Without ceasing we would remember the captive nations in their cruel bondage—proud peoples with their precious traditions stamped into the dust while alien Caesars exercise their ruthless sway over them. Above all the tumult and shouting of these volcanic days we hear the summons of Thy voice as in centuries past. "Let my people go."

May we play our full part in the restoration of human rights everywhere. May no denial of human freedom by those who would crush the liberties of others contaminate our souls with the blight of expediency. Strengthen us with Thy might that the arrogant boasts of entrenched tyranny may but put steel into our purpose to break their grip upon the governments and lives they now enslave.

We thank Thee for the inner shrine in human hearts which no dictator can desecrate, and where blaze the candles of faith which no iron fists can snuff out.

Give us to see that to acquiesce in the crucifixion of freedom anywhere is ultimately to nail our own liberty on the same cross, knowing that with what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again.

We ask it in the Name of the Redeemer who came to proclaim liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. Amen. (Prepared May 1960 by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate.)

O Almighty Creator, who has endowed every human being with the power of free choice, hear the cries of Thy children from whom this precious birthright has been stolen. In this day when whole nations groan under the yoke of godless oppression, let those countless martyrs who have willingly shed their blood for Thee give testimony of their desire for the blessings of liberty.

O God of our Fathers, once Thy Chosen People begged Thee for deliverance from captivity in the Land of Egypt, and Thou didst take pity on them. Show forth Thy power today and lead from bondage the millions of Thy people enslaved by men who revile Thy very name.

O God of Wisdom, whose beloved Son has said, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," let the light of Thy divine truth penetrate the hearts of those who hate and persecute Thy people. Only Thy truth can bring that peace which the human race has ever sought—not merely the absence of armed conflict, but peace based on justice and freedom for every human creature.

O God of Mercy, regard not our unworthiness, for we do not pray for ourselves—but for the unknown millions who are suffering in silence for love of Thee. For their sake, O Lord, we earnestly beg Thee to hasten the coming of Thy reign of peace. Amen. (Prepared May 1960 by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John B. Roeder, vice chancellor, archdiocese of Washington, D.C.)

O Thou who are the peace of the world: Save our generation from the terror that cometh by night and the arrow that flieth by day; from the pestilence that walketh in darkness and its destruction that wasteth at noonday:

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant; quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire free men toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise of a new age:

O Thou who hast been our refuge and our fortress through the ages, our altar of devotion, light our lives with Thy sacred fire and our hearts with Thy flame so that with strength of spirit and courage of purpose we will strive toward a world bringing Thy light and Thy peace unto the children of men.

Bless Thou the men who raise the standards of Thy law in our own time; the men who are not neutral in time of evil nor turn

16454

their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for a mess of red potage; the men who would rise to new sacrifice so that the captives will be freed and the age of a free church in a free state shall come for all Thy children;

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this moment of history we shall be the witness of Thy covenant and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. (Prepared May 1960 by Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, rabbi, Washington, D.C., congregation.)

MAY 12, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of your departure for the summit meeting in Paris, I wish to take this opportunity to express the one central idea which binds the rapidly growing membership of this national committee, namely that in the light of our traditions and our moral leadership among the nontotalitarian nations of the free world it is unthinkable that we should fail to press the fundamental issue of the captive nations—those within as well as those outside the Soviet Union—as a paramount subject of summit discussion. Indeed, the U-2 incident and Moscow's distorting propaganda abuse of it necessitate that at long last we face the reality of all the captive nations, not just the minority of them in Central Europe.

In accord with the written intent of Public Law 86-90 enacted last year, this committee is a natural response to the reasoned convictions and judgments of countless American citizens who properly view the captive nations issue as a subject of cold logic and national strategy, not just one of warm sentiment and humanitarian concern. The surging nationwide support for Captive Nations Week observance is impressive evidence that the rank and file of the American people view with abhorrence the slavery status of whole nations, the result of Moscow's imperialist totalitarianism. Our American people, thank God, are not reconciled to the captivity of millions by Red totalitarian tyrants, nor do we regard this as their permanent condition. We thus urge you, Mr. President, to expressly convey at the summit both the spirit and the contents of the captive nations resolution which our Congress passed last year.

Developments of the past 3 years, highlighted by sputniks and other basically diversionary Russian performances, cannot but cause us to recall here the apt words of Karl Marx—words which still are unquotable in Khrushchev's supposedly relaxed empire:

"They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way."

Applied to the current scene, this is doubtlessly a strong statement and, in part, exaggerated. But when one faces the paramount fact that, in this past century, of all the major colonial empires the Russian one was not only able to survive but also, behind the legalistic mask of the U.S.S.R., now even threatens the security of the nontotalitarian world, the aptness of the statement could scarcely be denied. It is most significant that this observation was made during the reign of Czar Nicholas I with whom Khrushchev now openly compares himself, as witness his Budapest address last December. With secrecy and espionage in the air today, we can all profit by reading

the illuminating chapter on "The Secret Life of Russia" in Marquis de Custine's classic "Journey for Our Time," a work written in the days of Khrushchev's present model and about whom the author says: "when I gaze upon this personage, unique in the world, from close at hand, I believe his head has two faces, like that of Janus" (p. 215).

The cold war techniques of Khrushchev who has clearly earned the imperial title of Nikita the Surly, are essentially those of Nicholas I, the former and equally arrogant gendarme of Europe. Nuclear blackmail threats, exercises in Potemkin Village economics, and many other stratagems have their substantial precedents in the history of Russian empire building, written by the blood of both the oppressed Russian and non-Russian peoples. The peace-at-no-price attitude shown by Moscow toward the summit indicates in itself the manner by which it seeks to exploit this given opportunity. Its propaganda machine has even gone to the length of attempting to compromise the position of Western Germany by unjust attacks upon Theodore Oberlander, the Refugee Minister of our ally, in whose defense scores of witnesses in this country could be supplied. Its propaganda exploitation of the U-2 incident, which may well backfire, is more generally known. In short, Moscow's carefully calculated game of bluff and bluster has reaped for it another summit: its aim now is to exploit it fully.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the irony of the current situation lies in the overall fact that Moscow is able to advance diplomatically and propagandawise though it is really operating from basic weaknesses and multifaceted necessity. Our memories are short. All evidence shows that at the time of the Hungarian Revolution the Red totalitarian empire was in grave trouble. Surely the passage of 4 years has not erased the inherent weaknesses in the structure of this far-flung empire. Plainly, a ruler secure in his empire would certainly not erupt as Khrushchev had upon the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution last year. Out of necessity and the need for time to consolidate, Moscow is clearly pressing for Western accommodation to its empire under the spurious label of "peaceful coexistence," along with the hope that its calculated propaganda of bluff and bluster may twist any indication of Western timidity into real concessions.

Unleashing Marx at Khrushchev, our actions should be completely guided by the historical truth that "there is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." Disarmament, nuclear test bans, the misnomered topic of East-West relations, involving trade and cultural exchange, are in reality secondary issues. Khrushchev's overriding objective is free world assent and acquiescence to his empire. His emphasis upon disarmament and other subsidiary issues is designed to deflect our attention from the basic issue. The omission of this subject in summit discussion will certainly be propagandistically exploited in the empire to mislead the captives that the free world's interest in them has waned.

This committee, therefore, strongly urges that our Government seize every opportunity to insist upon this crucial subject as a major point of summit discussion. Failure to do so would be, in effect, an accommodation to Moscow's empire and a victory for Khrushchev, far surpassing anything his unreliable multinational military forces could achieve. We would be bolstering the security of his totalitarian, colonial system and undermining one of our most powerful deterrents against overt totalitarian aggression and a hot war, namely, the captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union. The very implication of an assent to the status quo would make mockery of the Captive Nations Week resolution and also

of the proclamation issued by you, Mr. President, last year. In terms of bargaining position, the captive nations are of enormous and strategic value to the security of the nontotalitarian world. Any rationalization to the effect that this fundamental subject might be discussed later in a possible series of summits would not mitigate some of the above effects.

This summit is truly a ripe occasion for the expression of our initiative, diplomatic offensive, and asserted knowledgeability as concerns Moscow's empire, which includes the Soviet Union itself. At every point we could express these qualities and place Moscow on a retreating defensive. The U-2 incident has revived the open skies plan and the need for breaking through the Iron Curtain. We could also point out that most of the territory flown over by the plane is captive non-Russian and forthrightly bring into question the legitimacy of Moscow's argument on international law. A law which in truth and history is not founded upon the inalienable rights of people is hardly one commanding of dutiful observance. We earnestly hope that after all that has been sensationally revealed by this incident, our Government will manifest at the summit that power of fearless initiative without which the unending challenge of Moscow's imperialist totalitarianism cannot be met.

With God's many blessings upon your historic venture and best wishes in our firm policy of justice and freedom for peace and friendship among all nations, including those in the Soviet Union, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman.

THE SUMMIT DEBACLE: A LESSON AND AN OPPORTUNITY

MAY 18, 1960.—The firm and honorable position taken by our President with regard to Khrushchev's arrogant demands at the summit warrants the praise and admiration of every American. The National Captive Nations Week Committee, made up of citizens dedicated to the spirit, principles, and content of the Captive Nations Week resolution, proudly lauds the President's forthright rejection of the Red czar's ultimatum. The President monumentalizes our stand of no Munich with Moscow's totalitarians.

The collapse of this summit should at long last signalize for all sober-thinking Americans the basic need to face up to the realities of the incessant cold war. Taking a leaf from Russia's imperialist history, the cold war will exist so long as captive non-Russian nations exist, both within and without the Soviet Union, and the Russian people themselves are kept in totalitarian bondage. It is a pity that our President had to be subjected to the indignities of an ill-bred leader who in the captive world has the fixed reputation as the "Hangman of Ukraine" and the "Butcher of Budapest." But perhaps this event will serve as a lesson to the many naive elements in our country who pressed these past 2 years for a deal with Red imperialist totalitarianism.

Khrushchev's insulting behavior was a calculated part of the zigzag cold war game played by Moscow, a game designed to undermine the resistance of freemen. Contrary to obtuse statements that the cold war will now be resumed, the stubborn fact is that the summit itself was an instrument of Moscow's cold war game. The cold war is merely in a state of continuation. It is fervently hoped that by this acid experience we will now begin to recognize the dire need for preparing and seizing the opportunities open to us for victory in this protracted conflict. Moscow's brand of peaceful coexistence or a hot war is certainly not the only choice before us.

The blustering Khrushchev statement on the opening day more than confirms the

contents of our memorandum delivered to the White House last week. His statement and timed behavior provided the third phase in the summit development since November 1957: first he pressured for it; then, long before the grossly exaggerated U-2 incident, he arrogantly propagandized against free world interests; and now he brazenly prostituted the organs of international diplomacy by his design to humiliate the spokesman of the leading power in the nontotalitarian free world.

As we stressed in our memorandum last week, Khrushchev is operating from a position of weakness, not one of strength. All his bluster about military power, retaliation, space satellites and rockets—of secondary and tertiary importance in themselves—cannot conceal the deep, inherent weakness of his empire, which necessarily includes the numerous captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Khrushchev's statement at the summit is in reality a statement of self-indictment. It attains to the same summit of diabolical fraudulence as his atheistic appeal to God as his witness. The entire statement is girded to the spurious sovereignty of the Soviet state, standards of international law, and the lofty principles of the United Nations Charter. It even alludes to the Soviet Union as being a nation.

The premises of this statement should not go without challenge at this time. The whole issue of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is tied up with these premises. Our diplomacy of truth should be pursued to lay before the world the full truth of all the captive nations. On the basis of historical fact and truth there is no need to apologize for the U-2 incident. Most of the territory flow over, namely Turkestan, is captive non-Russian territory anyway. Clearly, in point of logic, if before the summit it was a distasteful necessity to conduct aerial reconnaissance over this non-Russian territory and the fringe of the territory of the Siberians, it is no less now. The promotion of an open society plan is only another way of calling for the emancipation of the captive nations. We should press for this now, with pointed concentration on the captive nations within the Soviet Union. We would be building up further one of our greatest deterrents against a hot war and, with truth as our weapon, defeating Moscow's cold war challenge. Needless to say, Moscow could ill afford a hot war with a progressively insecure empire. How frightened Moscow is by this prospect was plainly shown last July when the captive nations resolution was passed. Its three major wars in this century clearly demonstrate that even improved military technology cannot possibly overcome the basic forces of nationalism and human freedom. In all three, its military forces disintegrated early.

Khrushchev likes to compare himself with the equally arrogant Czar Nicholas I, the gendarme of Europe. For our time we cannot but quote again the apt remarks made by Karl Marx in Nicholas' time: "There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." A persistent campaign of truth about Moscow's empire—its economic colonialism, militaristic imperialism, and barbaric totalitarianism—would be enough to cage even a raving bear with a club.

NEKULTURNYI KHRUSHCHEV

It is nothing short of amazing that in all the verbal furor over the U-2 incident and the summit, two fundamental facts are completely ignored. Indeed, a persistent oversight of these two basic and determining facts hardly speaks well for those who today are most vocal on the issue.

The first clear fact is that the U-2 plane flew over mostly captive non-Russian territory in the U.S.S.R., specifically that of

Turkestan, as well as over a fringe of the area occupied by decentralist Siberians. From the viewpoints of geography, history, and demography, Russian territory as such was not even involved in this incident. Unless we subscribe to the notion of sovereignty based on conquest and colonial domination by totalitarian Moscow (and many in this country unwarily seem to), this essential fact should forthrightly be put before the American people.

Curiously enough, when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution last year, it rightly manifested to the world its solid understanding of the captive status of Turkestan and parts of Siberia. If we are truly dedicated to a diplomacy of truth, the time is now to bring into full question the fictitious sovereignty and hollow standards of international law which imperialist Moscow exploits to conceal its more basic empire from the world. An open debate grounded in essential fact and truth would be most salutary at this time.

The second notable fact which eludes the understanding of many in this country is the full and open exposure of the Nekulturny Khrushchev (the uncultured Khrushchev) at the summit. Note is taken, to be sure, of his uncouth, boisterous and arrogant behavior, but these are only symptoms of his essentially uncultured character. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the effects of this exposure are felt in the hearts and minds of the Russian intelligentsia itself.

Khrushchev pretends to represent the Soviet people. He, of course, does not represent the captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the U.S.S.R. His reputation among them is that of the hangman of the Ukraine and the butcher of Hungary. But also vitally important is the fact that Nekulturny Khrushchev does not represent the culture and intellectual attainments of the Russian nation itself. Against the rich background of Russian culture and civilization the barbaric behavior of Nekulturny Khrushchev at Paris is unquestionably an ineradicable blot in the pages of Russian history. Without doubt, this barbaric spectacle has brought nothing but disgust and shame to the minds and hearts of the present Russian intelligentsia.

Whereas the Russian intelligentsia cannot express itself on this score, we as a free people can do it for them. Khrushchev clearly established his reputation at Paris as Nekulturny Nikita. This appropriate nomen, Nekulturny (ne-kool-toor'ny) Nikita or Khrushchev, deserves to be heard throughout the nontotalitarian free world. Its general use would provide that free expression to the disgust and nausea that now dwells in the minds and hearts of cultured Russians.

A LETTER TO THE EDITOR

JULY 12, 1960.

EDITOR,
Washington Post and Times Herald,
Washington, D.C.:

Captive Nations Week will be observed on July 17-23. In accordance with Public Law 86-90, the National Captive Nations Week Committee was founded to prepare this observance. In most major cities, local committees have been formed to conduct the activities of this significant observance.

In view of the world developments this past year, the urgency of recognizing the strategic importance of all the captive nations to U.S. interests in the cold war cannot be too strongly emphasized. It will be recalled that when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution last July, followed by the President's proclamation, Nekulturny (uncultured) Khrushchev broke into a wild rage. There was good reason for this violent reaction. The resolution

for the first time struck at the tenuous bases of Moscow's propaganda pretensions and claims by which it seeks to deceive and influence minds throughout the free world.

Unfortunately, the meaning of the resolution and Moscow's reaction to it were not fully understood by some of our observers. Your editorial then "Irritating the Bear," July 24, 1959, essentially held that we must not confront the sprawling bear with the club of truth. In the recent light of Paris, Tokyo, Italy, Cuba, and elsewhere, we earnestly hope you and others will now understand our position.

Our observance of Captive Nations Week expresses these convictions: (1) That the chief struggle is not in the nuclear and military field but in the overall propaganda and psycho-political; (2) that the only way to prevent a hot global war is to win the psychological cold war by the prime ideology of the freedom of all the captive nations; (3) that our Declaration of Independence, wisely externalized, provides the moral and political truths—as well as unsurpassable national purposes—to cage the Bear; (4) that the myth of Soviet unity and power must be exploded so that the entire world may see what the Soviet Union really is, a loosely knitted quilt of captive nations where economic colonialism and political imperialism are rampant; and (5) that by a firm and unwavering policy of emancipation and independence aimed at all the captive nations, including those in the U.S.S.R., we can best aid the Russian people to attain their independence from centuries of political barbarism.

Toward these ends and dynamic, programmatic action, we urge (a) the establishment of a permanent Congressional Committee on Captive Nations, (b) the creation of an executive agency on the self-determination of captive and occupied nations, (c) the institution of a freedom academy, and (d) the adoption of a policy of emancipation and independence. We call for a 16-year freedom plan, commencing with this anniversary Lincolnian year of the Great Emancipator and earning the honor of our being as the nation of world freedom by 1976, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

In the year of one of Khrushchev's favorite predecessors, Marx wrote: "They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." We're not imbecile or timid, but some are deluded and we have yet to take the fearless way.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,

*Chairman, National Captive Nations
Week Committee and Author of
Captive Nations Week Resolution.*

NATIONWIDE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
OBSERVANCE

Mr. Speaker, due to the tireless efforts of the National Captive Nations Committee and those of the many local committees, millions of Americans participated in the 1960 observance of Captive Nations Week. At my request, the committee has furnished me hundreds of newspaper clippings reporting the activities of this nationwide observance. Every section of the country is represented. Editorials and reports appeared in the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, the Philadelphia Inquirer, the Daily Times of Maine, the Saturday Democrat of Massachusetts, the Sentinel of South Carolina,

the Eastern Colorado Plainsmen, the Sacramento Union of California, and many others, large and small, from almost every State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, to show the range and types of these reports on the observance activities throughout the Nation, I present the following selected items which I include as part of my remarks:

[From the Washington Star, July 24, 1960]
SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—LET MY PEOPLE GO
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The test of America's boasted freedom is how much her freemen care for those who have lost their liberty. To revel only in one's freedom, and to forget the fetters of others, is a base betrayal of our own heritage. Such forgetfulness is an ominous prophecy that those who do not fight for liberty everywhere will finally lose their own. There is absolutely no question more vital in this day of besieging problems than the attitude of the free nations toward the lands Soviet Russia has bound with the shackles of serfdom.

There is nothing on which the conspirators of the Kremlin are more adamant than their insistence that their imperialistic robberies be recognized and the status of satellite nations be accepted as final. That assumption is a definite part of their strategy to communalize the whole earth. They have the effrontery to suggest to the free world that they agree to coexistence with those who are using every foul force to stamp out the fire of freedom in lands once free but now under the Soviet's savage sway.

The greatest imperialists of the age so discount the intelligence of the human race and so distort the facts that they now charge the very Republic which gave Cuba its freedom with plotting its enslavement. The system with millions of slaves in its iron hold threatens to "free" Cuba. Could the big lie be stretched to bigger proportions?

It is an appeal to the best instincts of America which sounds in the call of Congress and of the President for a specific week of remembering the captive nations whose anguished cry, "How long, O Lord, how long?" must never be drowned by the glorification of our own freedom. Nothing which he heard in our free land aroused the ire of the crude and cruel peasant who stands at the top of the Soviet pyramid of brute strength as much as any reference to Hungary, and the other captive nations.

No wonder, for it is the one heinous blot that gives the lie to all the fair promises of this vast principality of evil which has invented its own inverted and perverted dictionary in which the holy word "peace" means simply the victory of their tyranny.

Captive Nations Week serves notice on the Kremlin that no rocket-rattling will ever make America forget her vow to keep alive the knowledge of atrocities perpetrated, until the submerged nations are rescued from the invader and their soil no longer defiled by this abomination.

Our Congress has called the roll of those now under the Soviet yoke: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Korea, Albania, Tibet, and others. To make sure that the idea of Captive Nations Week does not prove to be simply an ephemeral sop to the American conscience, Congress specifically declares that "the President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." With wholehearted approval President Eisenhower sounds a trumpet which must never know retreat in his ring-

ing words, "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of the status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and repression of human beings on a gigantic scale."

And what does all this have to do with "Spires?" Everything. It is under the church spires of America that there thunders the emancipating words of the Father God, to whom all souls belong and to whom all souls are dear, "Let My people go."

Every remembrance of the captive nations is a prayer. Their plight ought to be the subject of prayer in every temple of worship on the Sunday of the annual Captive Nations Week.

We can imagine no more moving scene in any church in America than the service at 11 a.m. on the dear Lord's blessed day of that week observed at St. Patrick's Catholic Church in the Capital of free America. Present were many whose ancestral roots are in the nations now enslaved. Many of them had fled from the present tyranny. From the high white pulpit of that lovely sanctuary Bishop Philip M. Hannan proclaimed the unvarnished truth in sermon and in prayer. His was indeed the voice of America, and the voice of the Universal Church as to the altar of the Most High the shackled millions were lifted in the arms of Christian sympathy and intercession.

In such an hour of worship in any church we are reminded of the final judgment test of the Master who came preaching release for the captives as He asks the piercing question, "When I was in prison did you come unto Me?"

In the spirit of that moving service in St. Patrick's, let us pray—Our Father God, author of liberty, without ceasing we would remember the captive nations in their cruel bondage—proud peoples with their precious traditions stamped into the dust while alien Caesars exercise their ruthless sway over them. Above all the tumult and shouting of these volcanic days we hear Thy summons, even as in centuries past, "Let My people go." Give us to see that to acquiesce in the crucifixion of freedom anywhere is ultimately to nail our liberty on the same cross, knowing that with what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again. We ask it in the Name of the Redeemer who came to proclaim liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. Amen.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 7, 1960]

COMMENDS DR. HARRIS

For some time now both my wife and I have been consistent readers of the "Spires of the Spirit" column written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris in the Sunday Star. To us it has come to be a weekly must. And on the basis of my various associations I know that this expressed admiration for the column also reflects the thoughts and feelings of countless other readers.

I sincerely congratulate the Star for making the writings of the Chaplain of the U.S. Senate accessible to us. In his own right Dr. Harris is widely respected in many quarters of the globe for his remarkable capacity to interpret the temporal and ephemeral in terms of the eternal and universally necessary. His lucidly written column furnishes us with perspectives and insights which are not readily obtainable elsewhere. The manner in which he invariably weds principle and act, the moral idea and the experiential empiric, illuminates the meaning and significance of every current development he treats.

His recent article "Let My People Go" clearly substantiates these points. In behalf of all our citizens who observed Captive Nations Week, I wish to express publicly our gratitude and esteem for this superb literary rendition which will be widely distributed next year. Indeed, Dr. Harris presented the

facts about the 22 captive nations with impressive accuracy. His column is a source of powerful spiritual sustenance for all its readers.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, National Committee on
Captive Nations Week.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 17, 1960]
WHY YOU PRAY TODAY FOR 22 CAPTIVES—DR. DOBRIANSKY HAS AROUSED WORLD TO FLIGHT OF ENSLAVED

(By William Gill)

Because of the perseverance of one man, thousands of people here and in the rest of the United States will kneel today in prayer for the liberation of 22 nations held captive by the Kremlin.

He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, 41, a balding, scholarly professor of Soviet Economics at Georgetown University in Washington.

A lieutenant-colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve, Dr. Dobriansky was teaching at the National War College when he conceived the idea for Captive Nations Week which starts today.

The year was 1958 and the United States, having failed to act in the Hungarian Revolt 2 years earlier, had all but buried its avowed policy of liberation of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia.

"Then, as now, I was increasingly concerned over the growing indifference in many American circles toward not only the status but also the strategic value of the captive nations," Dr. Dobriansky says.

New York-born, Dr. Dobriansky graduated magna cum laude from New York University, studied philosophy 7 years at Fordham and returned to New York University to earn his Ph. D. in political science in 1950. He is of Ukrainian heritage and is chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Dr. Dobriansky views Nikita Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence as a sinister drive to break the wills of the captive nations by convincing the United States it is hopeless to encourage the spirit of freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

This, he claims, would amount to an American guarantee of the territorial integrity of the Russian Empire. Secure in this knowledge, the Kremlin could then step up its cold-war operations far beyond their present scope.

Washington had all but officially granted this guarantee when Dr. Dobriansky saw his opportunity to head it off in June 1958.

The executions in Hungary of ex-Premier Imre Nagy and Gen. Pal Maleter spurred widespread anti-Communist demonstrations in the United States and Europe.

At this point Dr. Dobriansky got a resolution introduced in Congress calling for observance of a Captive Nations Year. The House Judiciary Committee killed it, largely because a majority felt a year was too long for such an observance.

Dr. Dobriansky had to wait another year before another event gave him a second chance. The event was Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's visit to Moscow last July. Many saw in this a first step toward granting the guarantee the Kremlin wants.

To allay these fears, Dr. Dobriansky again introduced his resolution, this time pruning the observance from a year down to 1 week—Captive Nations Week.

Cosponsored in the Senate by PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, and JACOB JAVITS, New York Republican, the resolution was unanimously passed by voice vote on July 6. Massachusetts' Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, House majority leader, hustled it through the lower Chamber.

The resolution did not mince words. It said that the "enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence."

It named the 22 nations Communist Russia holds in bondage, some of them nations Americans never thought of as independent entities because they had been conquered by the czars.

It sidestepped the promise of any direct U.S. action to set these nations free but it tied their continued resistance to America's own national security.

Finally, it urged the President to issue a proclamation setting aside Captive Nations Week to encourage this resistance.

Dr. Dobriansky claims the State Department is responsible for watering down the version signed by President Eisenhower last year. But this was barely noticed in the fireworks that followed.

Nikita Khrushchev squealed like a stuck pig. On the eve of Mr. Nixon's arrival in Moscow, he let loose a series of blasts at President Eisenhower for having the temerity to set aside a week of prayer for the captive nations.

Mr. Eisenhower returned the fire and he was backed up by leaders of both parties and most notably by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Meany called Khrushchev's outbursts "only a demonstration of the inherent weakness of his sprawling slave empire."

In Moscow, Khrushchev got into a heated argument over the proclamation with Vice President Nixon as they toured the American exhibit.

Khrushchev's tirades did not deter Congress from passing the resolution again this year.

DOBRIANSKY ON RADIO THIS WEEK

Pittsburgh will have a chance to hear Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky on two local radio stations this week.

Today at 5:30 p.m. on WPIT Dr. Dobriansky will take part in a Georgetown University Forum session titled "Moscow's Reaction to Captive Nations Week."

Tuesday at 9:05 p.m. on KDKA radio, Dr. Dobriansky will discuss the significance of the observance.

Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the State supreme court, heads the Captive Nations Week observance in Pittsburgh and will speak tomorrow at a luncheon rally in the Roosevelt Hotel.

Other Pittsburghers on the national Captive Nations Committees include Bishop Nicholas T. Elkko; Michael Komichak of the Ukrainian Congress Committee; Michael J. Vargovich of the Catholic Slovak Union, and Bozidar Vuckovic of the Croatian Fraternal Union.

[From the Lincoln (Ark.) Leader]

A TIME TO TAKE STOCK

As a result of long fumbling of our diplomacy, military intelligence, and economic relations around the globe, the United States is today a deadly peril of joining the captive nations. If we should collapse under the pressures our stop-happy policies have generated against us, we could no longer be of assistance—morally, spiritually, or financially—to any nation. And if we should collapse, the other presently free nations would go into Communist bondage along with us. The lamp of freedom would finally have been extinguished on this earth. And if Khrushchev should drink himself to death celebrating, it would be no help to us.

We might, therefore, in our Captive Nations Week observances find a place for emphasis on how not to become a captive nation—a review of our global blunders, say from Tehran to the U-2 and some suggestions for reform at this 11th hour. They may readily be found in BARRY GOLDWATER'S "Conscience of a Conservative."

Such emphasis might be of practical value in stiffening some political spines—in and out of Congress—especially as the week is

more or less concurrent with the rising of the presidential campaign curtain in the drama (or tragedy) of the political titans searching for lollypop issues and policies that they hope we will all grab at.

[From the Arkansas Herald, July 18, 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS

We Americans, luxuriating in the lap of freedom, are now preoccupied with the business of choosing our national leaders. We nominate and vote for whomever we choose.

Whoever we elect will not control our lives. Our leaders are restricted to administering laws enacted under representative government.

Some 225 million people behind the Iron Curtain are not so fortunate. They are captives of a Communist hierarchy that has absolute power, enforced by police, to prescribe their every freedom.

To help these hapless fellow beings is the purpose of Captive Nations Week which began Sunday by joint resolution of the U.S. House and Senate.

By whatever means we can, each of us should do our bit to let these submerged nations know we are pulling for them. This is not only our moral obligation, but it serves our national interest.

Dissatisfaction of captive peoples constitutes a ball and chain on the Red masters. They are not free to do as they choose so long as a spark of revolt burns. Keeping the Communist leaders preoccupied with internal difficulties is one of the strongest deterrents to war.

At very least, each of us can pray this week for the well-being and ultimate delivery of our silent allies for freedom who are suffering at the hands of tyrants.

[From the Dallas News, July 17, 1960]

DALLAS MAYOR SETS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
Captive Nations Week in Dallas will be observed starting July 17, Mayor R. L. Thornton proclaimed Friday.

The week, commemorating the struggle for freedom by nations under Soviet domination, was approved by Congress on July 17, 1959.

"The third week in July will be designated with a similar proclamation until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world," said Mayor Thornton.

The proclamation pledges the "support of the Government and people of the United States for the many nations throughout the world made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism."

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Wanderer, July 28, 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

When, in accordance with a law enacted by Congress, President Eisenhower last year proclaimed a Captive Nations Week, his action provoked a storm of Soviet denunciation. What? Captive nations? Ridiculous. Nowhere, the world was told by Moscow, do the bells of freedom peal more loudly than in happy Hungary, the joyously self-governing Baltic States, lighthearted Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania—all, of course, with a little friendly watchfulness on the part of the actual, or potential, presence of the Soviet Army.

President Eisenhower has again proclaimed a Captive Nations Week, again in accordance with a law of Congress and again inviting a torrent of abuse from Moscow.

Speeches and editorials attacking President Eisenhower were published simultaneously with glowing accounts of how the people of the Soviet Baltic Republics were celebrating in festive mood the 20th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power.

The official newspapers of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government published greetings from the Kremlin leaders to the Communists chiefs in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

All through the past week huge rallies have been organized to "voice the joy over the liberation of these people from the bourgeois Fascist boot" so that they are now "free to march forward in the building of communism," it was declared.

The scathing sarcasm in which public utterances on the subject of the proclamation of Captive Nations Week was expressed was a clear sign of the indignation with which the Soviet leaders view such action.

The most vehement denunciation was an editorial in the Communist Party paper Pravda. It termed the action "just another insolent and stupid international provocation, spiced, moreover, with unpardonable lies."

Despite the Red anger, it is appropriate, and essential, that the West continues to assure these imprisoned people behind the Iron Curtain that they have not been forgotten. It is not its purpose to employ force to reestablish their independence. If independence is ever to be achieved it must be achieved by peaceful means. But we do not intend to forget the wrongs done to these small nations by an overpowering neighbor nor to abandon hope that the day will come when they will once more live in freedom.

[From the Catholic News, July 23, 1960]

MASS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS OFFERED AT ST. PATRICK'S—HIS EMINENCE MEETS REPRESENTATIVES OF 23 COMMUNIST-DOMINATED COUNTRIES AFTER MASS

Representatives of 23 Communist-dominated European and Asian countries, many in colorful national costumes, attended mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral on Sunday, July 17, to mark the opening of Captive Nations Week. Over 2,500 persons were in the congregation to mark the second year of such an observance, many recalling the resentment voiced over the institution of such a week by Premier Khrushchev last year when he complained bitterly to Vice President Nixon over the publicity given the inaugural meeting.

His eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman presided at the mass. The assistant priest to his eminence was the Right Reverend Monsignor Bela Varga, noted leader of the Hungarians in exile and last president of the free Hungarian Parliament. Deacons of honor to his eminence were the Very Reverend Monsignor Jonas Baikunas, chairman of the Conference of Americans of Central-East European Descent and pastor of Transfiguration Church, Maspeth, and the Right Reverend Monsignor Stephen E. Krasula, pastor of St. John Nepomucene in Manhattan. The Right Reverend Monsignor Terence J. Cooke, vice chancellor of the archdiocese, was master of ceremonies to his eminence. The celebrant of the mass was the Very Reverend John A. Flynn, C.M., president of St. John's University.

The preacher of the occasion was the Right Reverend Monsignor John J. Dougherty, president of Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. The text of Monsignor Dougherty's sermon was as follows:

"We have come together in this sacred place for a very serious purpose. We have come to this great cathedral not to be injected with 'the opium of the masses,' but to be inspired and strengthened by the mystery of the Mass. We have come to kneel in the majestic silence of this House of God to look with compassion on the suffering of our fellow man. Who are we? We are little men and women confronting history's largest and darkest hour. You are sons and daughters of many nations. Once free, now enslaved. We,

16458

who are Americans, join you, lest we forget the monstrous tyranny that has devoured your countries like a rampant bear. We have come to remember those that are enslaved, the captive nations, who sit 'in darkness and the shadow of death.' We have come to call upon God to remember them. We are here to pray in Christ's name and through His holy Mass, recalling His words of hope, 'You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.' We are here to examine our souls, to call to mind the responsibilities of free men, to weigh the cost of liberty.

'We begin today the observance of Captive Nations Week. This solemn religious service demonstrates the church's compassion for the enslaved peoples of the world, and manifests her longing that they be free. The church marshals the ranks of her children, arms them with the moral weapon of her most precious and powerful prayer, the holy Mass, and at the head of her spiritual forces pleads with God and men for the liberation of the captive nations. By this solemn service, and others like it, she proclaims to the world that she is the champion of the enslaved peoples and the eternal foe of the Communist ideology of their tyrannical masters. The church is confident that this unnatural ideology, so opposed to the nature of man and the God of nature, cannot endure. Her essential mission is to bring to man the blessings of personal spiritual and moral freedom through God's grace. She recognizes, however, man's elemental need for political, economic, civil, and religious freedom. She puts the weight of her spiritual authority and venerable dignity behind man's struggle for these freedoms.

'In this cathedral on this morning, her cry is once more hurled against the tyrant, 'let my people go.' The church has extended centuries of sympathy to the oppressed, since the day that her founder, standing in the synagogue at Nazareth, described His mission in the lines of the prophet Isaiah; among them were these words: 'To proclaim to the captives release.' The faith of the church is the hope of the captives, and the hope of the church is that their faith will support them till their freedoms come. Faith's freedom is a life that no tyrant can destroy, no secret police can root out, no concentration camp can starve out. By such freedom must captives live until their other freedoms are restored, and God will in His good time see to that.

'Captive Nation's Week is the challenge of this Nation hung at the tyrant's feet. The resolution inaugurating it was passed by the Congress of the United States on July 9, 1959, and is now public law. It is a cry of protest against Communist tyranny that shall not be silenced 'until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved by all the captive nations of the world.' Since 1918 Russian communism has subjugated by direct and indirect aggression about 1 billion people, has deprived of national independence Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, the mainland of China, Armenia, North Korea, Albania, North Vietnam, Tibet, and other nations. It has founded its empire upon atheism, genocide, torture, slave labor, and Communist terror.

'That is why there is a Captive Nations Week.

'There is a Captive Nations Week because in the words of President Eisenhower's proclamation, 'Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties.' Because 'it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations of freedom and na-

tional independence,' because 'the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent.' There is a Captive Nations Week because in the words of the resolution of the Congress of the United States, 'the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples.'

'This undying cry of protest will reach the ears of the captive nations and kindle the ashes of their hope. It will reach the ears of the Kremlin masters and fill them with fury. Men who live by the lie are infuriated by the truth. But the cry must go on, until it becomes the shout heard around the world. Too long have we been silent, too long have we spoken with a soft voice. The captive nations are a fearful reminder that the alternative to nuclear war is not coexistence, but slavery.

'We are the hope of the captive nations, they look to us as the citadel of freedom. This is the destiny committed to us by history, and we must be worthy of it. This is our birthright and our glorious heritage. In the words of Woodrow Wilson:

'We in America have stood from the day of our birth for the emancipation of people throughout the world who were living unwillingly under governments which were not of their choice. The thing which we have held more sacred than any other is that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed.'

'It was this philosophy that begot the Revolution of 1776, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

'It is not the philosophy that perpetrated the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. Today, we sons and heirs of the American Revolution, sons of Washington and Jefferson, confront the heirs of the Communist Revolution, the sons of Marx and Lenin, the Children of Cain. These two powers face each other like colossi that bestride the globe, two irreconcilable philosophies, the ideology of freedom and the ideology of slavery.

'Behind the Iron Curtain of one camp, the captive nations sit and wait. Weapons they have none save the explosive force of ideas, the concept of human rights and social justice, the ideas for which our forefathers fought at Concord and Valley Forge, ideas which many of their children have forgotten or ignored. This is the force that Communist imperialism fears, love of freedom, love of country, love of God. As long as these survive in the hearts of men, she cannot conquer all. This is the resistance that she fears; it is for her the shadow of death. It is this spirit, this resistance, that we must help keep alive by our moral and spiritual weapons, by the unceasing cry of protest, the anger of free men beholding tyranny. More than this is needed. Our Government should add strong political and diplomatic measures to supplement the cry.

'If the plight of the captive nations is not powerful enough to motivate us to action, our own plight should do so, for the inescapable fact is that the free world has come to the pass where it must now defend its own self-determination and independence. Will it or not, our fate is tied up with the fate of the captive nations, our freedom is bound up with theirs. As Lincoln said: 'The house of humanity divided against itself cannot endure permanently half slave and half free.' We know our course. We choose freedom for ourselves and all mankind with all the risks this choice demands, because for men who believe in God no other choice is possible. And may the Lord, God of Hosts defend us.'

[From the Washington Star, July 17, 1960]

Mr. K.'s CAPTIVES

Today begins what is known as Captive Nations Week. It is a week designed to keep us and the rest of the world from forgetting one of the ugliest and most tragic stories in modern history of mankind. The story is that of pitiless Soviet imperialism and what it has done to freedom in nearly a dozen once-independent lands.

These lands, in alphabetical order, are Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. The list, which included Yugoslavia until Marshal Tito declared his independence of the Kremlin some years ago, could be justifiably broadened to embrace such other countries as the Ukraine, which has long since been absorbed by the U.S.S.R. But the prime purpose of Captive Nations Week is to focus attention on the imperialistic crimes committed by the Kremlin since the beginning of the Second World War.

The Baltic countries—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—have been gobbled up completely. As for the other victims, they are permitted, under puppet Communist regimes rigidly controlled by Moscow, to maintain some semblance of separateness from the Soviet Union. But this separateness is cruelly limited, and woe betide those who would dare attempt to expand it into genuine independence. The most frightful case in point is what happened to the Hungarian people in 1956 when they staged their heroic uprising for freedom and when Nikita Khrushchev and his colleagues answered them with naked armed force and a literal butchery of all their hopes and dreams.

This is one of the grim facts that will be stressed this week, as it ought to be stressed, by all friends of the once-free peoples now held in captivity behind the Iron Curtain. Certainly, as Ambassador Lodge once put it to the United Nations, "So long as independence remains unachieved, so long as the Soviet Union continues to intervene in the affairs of these countries, we cannot and we will not remain silent and unprotesting." On the contrary, "We will do what we can * * * to show these hapless victims that they are not forgotten, that they are not lost," and we "will continue to supply these people with the truth about our world and the truth about their world. At every opportunity we will assure them that * * * the old ties of kinship and friendship have not been broken."

These words constitute a good text for Captive Nations Week. Free men everywhere, together with their governments, ought to give the most sober thought to the terrible nature of the crimes committed against the victimized lands. And those crimes, in turn, should serve as a measure of the stunning mendacity and monumental hypocrisy of Nikita Khrushchev's current propaganda assault on the West's American-led "imperialists" and "aggressors." What we face here is something that is at once as dangerous as it is contemptible.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 18, 1960]

RUSSIA TOLD SLAVES WILL REBEL IN WAR

Russia was warned here today that if it ever started a war against the free world it would be quickly overrun and overwhelmed by rebellion within its own slave empire.

Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the State supreme court, told a Captive Nations Week rally at the Roosevelt Hotel that it is a big mistake to regard Russia as an invincible giant.

"Russia itself contains a population of only 96 million people," he said. "The non-Russians within the Soviet Union number 114 million * * * (in) 15 so-called Soviet

Socialist Republics which at one time were free and independent nations."

"Along with the puppet nations of Eastern Europe, these republics constitute an ever-present threat to the power of the Kremlin," Justice Musmanno said.

"These nations are moral and spiritual allies of the Western World and should receive our friendship and encouragement," he declared.

The justice said Khrushchev forces the United States to look to our security through never-relaxing vigilance and never-decreasing defensive strength.

"One of the most vital weapons in that defensive strength is the friendship and respect of the captive nations now languishing in chains behind the Iron Curtain," he said.

Col. J. J. Sustar, TV newscaster and former Czechoslovak war hero and diplomat, also spoke at the luncheon rally. William J. Tepsic acted as master of ceremonies and Michael Komichak was chairman of the event.

[From the Clarion, Catholic Parish of Glenview, Ill., July 10, 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17 TO 23

Lev E. Dobriansky, one of the originators and authors of the resolution which became Public Law 80-90 to establish this national observance, has now formed the National Committee on Captive Nations Week Observance. This national committee must have support. Contribute whatever you can for the work of promoting this observance on a huge scale. In this way let its voice be heard even in the Kremlin. Contributions to Captive Nations Week Observance, in care of Georgetown University, Washington 7, D.C.

Last year when Captive Nations Week became an official observance in this country, it so touched the nerve center of communism that Khrushchev was obviously shaken. The danger now is that some of our leaders may be happy to let the first anniversary slip by with less ceremony than National Pretzel Week.

The sufferings of the captive nations are beyond belief. Albania, Azerbaijan, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Caucasus, China, Cossackia, Croatia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkistan, and White Ruthenia are the peoples being ground under the iron heel of the Reds. It is not just, it is not Christian, it is not human to negotiate on other matters without first insisting on freedom and free elections for these enslaved, for whose enslavement some of our most respected American leaders are directly to blame before God. In conscience we cannot write off millions who look to us for help. By negotiating we invite further Red aggression and become slowly reconciled to surrender by default.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, the Evening News, July 20, 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAIMED

Mayor Frank P. Slattery has proclaimed the current week, July 17-23, as Captive Nations Week in Wilkes-Barre. The local observance is in conjunction with national Captive Nations Week which was approved by a resolution of Congress and proclaimed by President Eisenhower in recognition of the nations which are still under Communist domination.

Attorney Peter Paul Olszewski, city solicitor, and Stephen J. Tkach, president of Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, are the local members of the national Captive Nations Committee. Congressman DANIEL J. F. Flood was one of the cosponsors of the House of Representatives resolution setting aside this week for the observance.

Some 22 nations with a total population of 800 million people are still under the heel of international communism, both Soviet and Chinese varieties, the Captive Nations Committee reports.

Rev. Andrew P. Maloney, administrator of St. Mary's Church, 533 North Main Street, Pittston, is also a member of the national committee and Congressman Flood is an honorary member of the body.

[From the Scranton Tribune, July 21, 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

President Eisenhower's proclamation setting aside this week for the observance of Captive Nations Week has particular significance here in Scranton and northeastern Pennsylvania.

For here we have family bonds with most of the nations subdued and tyrannized by the Communist captors who have deprived millions of people of their liberties, their freedoms, and the right to govern themselves.

From before the turn of the century and up to fairly recent times our population in this area has been enhanced by men and women from European nations which have since been overrun by the ruthless Soviet despots. And most of these people have relatives and friends still held captive behind the Kremlin-erected Iron Curtain.

So it is particularly significant to us to "manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their aspirations for freedom and national independence," as urged by the President in his proclamation.

And we are in full accord, too, with the desire expressed by Mr. Eisenhower that U.S. Presidents continue to issue proclamations each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1960]

TWO FAITHS SUPPORT CAPTIVE NATIONS—HEEDING OF THEIR CAUSE IS STRESSED AT ST. PATRICK'S AND ST. JOHN THE DIVINE

Special services were held yesterday in St. Patrick's Cathedral and the Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine to mark the opening of Captive Nations Week.

Twenty-three nations under Communist domination were represented at St. Patrick's by expatriates in native costume.

Cardinal Spellman presided at the 10 a.m. solemn mass. The Very Reverend John A. Flynn, president of St. John's University, was the celebrant, and Msgr. John J. Dougherty, president of Seton Hall University, preached the sermon.

USE OF SPIRITUAL FORCES

In the sermon Monsignor Dougherty called prayer and the mass the most powerful weapons of the Roman Catholic Church in its efforts to lift the yoke of Communist tyranny from the enslaved peoples of the world.

"The spiritual authority and dignity of the church are forces behind man's struggle for political, economic, civil, and religious freedom," he said.

"The United States is the hope of the captive nations because they look upon us as the citadel of freedom. This is the destiny committed to us by history, and we must be worthy of it."

Asserting that the Communist ideology "is so opposed to the nature of man and the God of nature that it cannot endure," he added:

"Captive Nations Week is a cry of protest against Communist tyranny that shall not be silenced until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved."

At the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Church of St. John the Divine the Reverend Canon John W. Pyle asked Christians "to

strike a blow for Christ" by supporting the oppressed countries behind the Iron Curtain.

"We must make commitments, even though the risk is great," he said. "Unless we take chances, we can never know the true Christian ideal."

"It is entirely right for us to launch out against oppression. As Christians we ought to have identification with those who run a great risk to exercise their faith. The very essence of a belief in the right thing involves risk.

"The most dangerous thing we could do now would be to seek security and safety and forget about those in need."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, July 20, 1960]

ESSAY WRITERS WIN PRIZES—CAPTIVE NATIONS THEME OF PROJECT

Gold and silver medallions were presented to the winners of the American Education Association's essay contest at ceremonies held yesterday in city hall in observance of Captive Nations Week.

The three winners—two New York City high school students and a Hunter College graduate student—were presented with the awards by City Council President Abe Stark. The theme of the essays was "Captive Nations' Contributions to American Society."

The contest was supervised by Mrs. Kathryn L. K. Dorney, editor of the AEA magazine, the Educational Signpost.

The winning students are:

Doris Lynne Garter, a junior at Martin Van Buren High School, gold medallion.

Kevin O'Brien, senior at Archbishop Molloy High School, silver medallion.

Pvt. Paul Benischek, graduate student at Hunter College, now on a 6-month tour of duty with the Army at Fort Dix, N.J., gold medallion.

The contest winners will appear at a mass rally sponsored by the New York State Committee for Captive Nations Sunday at 2 p.m. in Manhattan Center.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, July 19, 1960]

WEEK OF SOLICITUDE FOR WORLD'S OPPRESSED

The significance of Captive Nations Week, proclaimed by President Eisenhower for countrywide observance, is that—in an undetermined number of years hence—captive nations could refer to all nations if Soviet plans for world conquest are permitted to materialize. At present it refers to Asian and European lands which communism already has brought to heel, and all too soon could refer to lands in the Western Hemisphere which it menaces with its standard plan of action: Infiltration, subversion, and domination.

America would not be America—a sanctuary for seekers of freedom from many lands—if it forgot its traditional ties with nations now held in the grasp of Red enslavement. These humbled people are in many ways the same as we Americans who cherish a way of life we have chosen for ourselves, but of which they—who once tasted freedom—only can dream despondently while they languish under Red tyranny. We would be strange Americans indeed if we felt no sympathy for them who have suffered every human indignity and outrage at the hands of their conquerors, and yet must endure ruthless subjugation that cries to heaven for vengeance.

They are our friends, believing in us and trusting us not to let them down with a cynical regard of their plight. We owe them the moral support of encouraging them in their hope of divinely vouchsafed deliverance and restoration to a free human estate. We need to grid them to ourselves, as it were with hoops of steel, for even now they are allied with us in spirit and fellow believers

in freedom's cause, if not potential recruits in a showdown with aggressive dictatorship. This week, in our commemoration of the tragic wrongs inflicted upon them, in our responsibility as free men to challenge and condemn their enslavement and in our prayers for their eventual liberation, we shall bring to captive nations comfort, solace and cheer, renewing their faith in things for which to live and in their ultimate realization.

[From the Park Cities North Dallas News, July 14, 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVED JULY 18-23
It is fitting that during July, the month of freedom, we observe Captive Nations Week, scheduled this year for the week of July 17-23.

By special programs, sermons on freedom, display of the American flag, civic organization luncheon talks, radio and newspaper coverage, film presentations, and essay contest award announcements, it is hoped that the free peoples of the world may continue to be informed and concerned about the captive nations, and offer hope to enslaved millions.

The Presidential proclamation about captive nations stated that "such proclamation should be made each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." His statement brings to mind the serious dilemma confronting the free world: Shall the captive nations enslaved by communism be written off to the Communists, or shall the free world take an active interest in them, and what is to be gained or lost through such action.

Khrushchev and his clique, realizing that brute force cannot suppress indefinitely the drive for freedom and independence, has refined his methods with his policy of co-existence. This is the permissible philosophy of one step back under communism, until the propitious moment comes to shoot two steps forward.

It should be called to mind that when Mr. Khrushchev speaks of peaceful coexistence, he means nothing less than American acquiescence to the permanent security of his empire. His purpose is to gain time for the consolidation of his imperialistic empire which would come easy with the broken wills and hopes of the captive nations.

Sometimes reticent in taking a positive step, the free world should now make its position determinately clear to the Communists regarding the captive nations of any nation seeking freedom or self-determination. In a world in which the constant struggle for independence is on the daily newspaper, it would certainly lessen the moral standard of the United States to refuse recognition to these facts. Many of today's nationalist movements found their inspiration in American history. It would be ironic, if the United States should ever find itself cast in the role of opposing independence movements seeking recognition of the kind of principles which established our own country.

Over 225 million people held captive by the Communists (besides the 700 million Chinese) represent a potent force who can become the free world's most reliable allies. It is also important to note that the stronger the hope and urge of the captives for their freedom and independence, the weaker the threatening position of the Soviets and, consequently the more secure is the status of the free world.

Our course of conduct in foreign relations should be tested by the standards we have pursued in our past. If it advances the cause of freedom, let us pursue it; if it injures the cause of freedom, let us reject it most vehemently. Only then can we hope to maintain our security and peace and at

the same time, help others secure their God-given principles of freedom and self-determination. Our ultimate weapon is the inherent desire of all peoples for freedom. This is the peaceful policy of liberation in action. We must be alert to any cracks in the Soviet empire, and encourage and exploit any weakening bonds that tie the satellites to Moscow. In this meaning the idea behind the Captive Nations Week observance had a true and worthy purpose, and should find acceptance among all the free peoples of the world.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1960]
ARTISTS STAGE PROTEST—CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MARKED BY DANCES AND MUSIC HERE

Artists representing captive nations staged a colorful demonstration of the spirited music, song, and dance of their homelands before 750 at the Manhattan Center on 34th Street yesterday.

White Russians, Tartars, Cossacks, Latvians, Ukrainians, Hungarians, and Slovaks, all in bright-colored native costumes, performed during the 2-hour program in observance of Captive Nations Week.

Jay Lovestone, assistant head of the international division of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, said more and more Americans saw the fraud of Moscow's coexistence propaganda line. The AFL-CIO supports self-determination everywhere, he said.

[From the Washington Star, July 23, 1960]
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

*While in Austria, Khrushchev announced that he hoped to see in his lifetime the symbol of communism—their red flag—flying over the whole world. This has been said before by every other Communist leader. Unfortunately, people seem to ignore it. During the Captive Nations Week we should try to impress upon everyone that Communists are Communists, and not comparable to any well-meaning people, and that they even dare to openly declare their goals. We should understand that they use the word "peace" just to reach their goals, and the greatest "piece" they want to get is the United States of America, and they are deterred right now only by the fear of an upheaval of the captive nations, the spirit of which they are trying to break.

To destroy Khrushchev's plan we should start in the Captive Nations Week a concrete action: we should declare that we want to reach in our lifetime a situation where the symbol of slavery—the red flag—be obliterated and that communism would remain in people's minds only as a nightmare, and that everywhere there would be government of the people, by the people, for the people.
ALFRED S. BERG.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 17, 1960]
THE AGE OF SLAVERY

Captive Nations Week begins today on a grim note: Never in all the world's history have so many millions of people lived under oppression and tyranny. For this is not only the dawning space age—it is the age of slavery for 900 million human beings.

Captive Nations Week will not be celebrated—it is being observed solemnly. Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, who is chairman of the observance in the Pittsburgh district, has urged all "who are attached by family ties to any of the 22 enslaved nations" to display all week the American flag and "the flag of the country of their forebearers."

"I respectfully ask that the people of this area offer up prayers for the liberation of the 900 million people held in cruel Soviet bondage," Justice Musmanno declared. "We must not let them lose hope for their ulti-

mate liberation. Let them know that the American people, who are the amalgamation of all the peoples of the world, believe in their just aspirations."

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of this age, however, is that many millions of these people do not even have such aspirations. Like creatures born in captivity, they have never known freedom and do not resist the stifling regimentation which robs them of their humanity.

THE WEEK AND THE RESOLUTION FOR A HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

These reports are only a sample of the coverages given the observance of Captive Nations Week. In every major State and city the activities of the local committees were reported almost daily. In each of these areas and in numerous towns throughout the country, authorities issued their proclamations and resolutions on the Week. As an example, I include here the Resolution issued in the city of Philadelphia:

RESOLUTION 65

Resolution requesting the mayor to proclaim Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, 1960, and calling for public observance of this occasion

Whereas the Senate of the United States of America and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 17-23, 1960, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas the President of the United States has by such proclamation invited the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

Whereas many people have been made captive by the tyrannous policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas there are many good citizens of Philadelphia, whose national origins are associated with the victims of Communistic oppression: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That his honor, the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, be requested to proclaim Captive Nations Week, July 17-23, 1960; and

Resolved, That the citizens of Philadelphia, in accordance with such proclamation, be requested to cooperate in observance of this celebration, in churches, synagogues, civic and patriotic clubs, educational institutions, and wherever such observance should be appropriate.

By the request of the National Captive Nations Committee, the President issued from the summer White House in Newport, R.I., his proclamation of the 1960 Captive Nations Week. The contents of this proclamation are important to my proposal for a House Committee on the Captive Nations. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 185th.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that as in the case of last year's proclamation—in fact, more so—the Red totalitarians in Moscow reacted sharply and vehemently denounced this recent proclamation by the President and also the observance of the week by our private citizens. On this, the New York Times report on a brief analysis of the 1960 results of Captive Nations Week, as it appears in the August issue of Freedom's Facts, suffice to give us an appreciation of the deep-rooted fear Moscow has of the Captive Nations Week resolution. I incorporate here both the report and the analysis: [From the New York Times, July 23, 1960]

RUSSIANS DENOUNCE EISENHOWER FOR U.S. CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—LEADERS AND PAPERS REACT WITH ANGER—DECLARE THAT BALTIC PEOPLES REJOICE ON ANNIVERSARY OF "LIBERATION"

(By Osgood Caruthers)

Moscow, July 22.—Soviet leaders and newspapers reacted angrily today to the proclamation in the United States of Captive Nations Week.

Speeches and editorials attacking President Eisenhower (who last Monday proclaimed the second annual observance of the week) were published simultaneously with glowing accounts of how the people of the Soviet Baltic republics were celebrating "in festive mood" the 20th anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power.

The official newspapers of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government published greetings from the Kremlin leaders to the Communist chiefs in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

HUGE RALLIES ORGANIZED

All through this week huge rallies have been organized to "voice the joy over the liberation of these people from the bourgeois Fascist boot" so that they are now "free to march forward in the building of communism," it was declared.

The scathing sarcasm in which public utterances on the subject of the proclamation

of Captive Nations Week was expressed was a clear sign of the indignation with which the Soviet leaders view such action.

They protest with extraordinary vigor that the people of the Baltic States were never before as well off as they are now under Soviet rule.

Setting the keynote on this theme was Mikhail A. Suslov, the Soviet Union's chief Communist theoretician and right-hand man to Premier Khrushchev.

Mr. Suslov attended anniversary festivities in Vilna, the capital of Lithuania, and spoke there last night of how "the American imperialists and their servants are displaying silly efforts to spoil the relations of the peoples of our countries."

"They hope that the remnants of bourgeois nationalism in the Soviet Baltic Republics will survive," he declared, "but all of these hostile machinations are doomed to failure.

"One must lose his senses to propose that the really free peoples of the Soviet take on the chains of imperialist slavery."

NIXON'S VISIT RECALLED

It was recalled here that exactly a year ago today Vice President Nixon arrived in Moscow and was almost instantly confronted by Mr. Khrushchev with an angry denunciation of Washington's endorsement of the congressional proclamation of Captive Nations Week. The subject was raised incessantly by Mr. Khrushchev during Mr. Nixon's visit.

The most vehement denunciation of this year's renewal of the proclamation by the White House was an editorial writer in the Communist Party paper Pravda.

He termed the action "just another insolent and stupid international provocation, spiced, moreover, with unpardonable lies."

"If the U.S. President was indeed concerned for the lot of captive nations, he need not have to go far," the writer continued. "Suffice it for him to take a look at what is going on right in his own house to find out whether many are free in America itself. * * *

Similarly, these were expounded by Kremlin leaders in the Baltic capitals during the current celebration.

In Tallinn, the capital of Estonia, Otto V. Kuusinen, Finnish-born member of the ruling Presidium of the Soviet Communist Party, told the inhabitants that Soviet power had brought them benefits. In the Latvian capital of Riga the speaker was Nikolai M. Shvernik, former titular chief of state and also a Presidium member.

[From Freedom Facts, August 1960]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK—1960 RESULTS

Millions of Americans took part in Captive Nations Week observances on July 17 to 23. There were special services in synagogues and churches. There were hundreds of special meetings, observances and rallies.

Through all of these events in many key cities Americans expressed their support for the hopes of captive peoples for freedom and national independence. They pledged themselves to struggle by every peaceful means to obtain self-determination and freedom for all captive peoples.

At the rally in Washington, D.C., the Honorable George W. Abbott, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, declared that "as long as any nation is unfree, no nation can be completely free." A former Cuban businessman and lay religious leader, Miguel Kohly, said 90 percent of his countrymen were dedicated to freedom, but the remaining 10 percent were leading the "boldest piracy in history." His Excellency Il Kwon Chung, Ambassador of Korea, declared that there is no place for compromise or neutrality in the fight against communism, and added that freedom has never burned brighter in the bosoms of Koreans.

A HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER SPEAKS

At the same rally an anonymous Hungarian freedom fighter made an eloquent plea. Speaking for peoples of the captive nations he declared, "We, members of the captive East European nations, turn to you, representatives of the free countries. We turn to you from the worst kind of slavery, pleading with you to deliver us from this hell on earth. We plead with you first of all in the name of the Creator, who blessed you with all the beauties, wealth and liberty, leaving us the sorrow, suffering and captivity. Sorrow and suffering are easier to bear, but it is captivity against which we rebel and beg you to aid us in casting off our yoke.

"If things go on the way they have during the immediate past, the tactics of the Communists will conquer every country, one by one. If you, the strongest, are afraid, what can you expect of the really weak? With determination and courage you could save the oppressed and, automatically, save yourselves. The price of your freedom is our freedom."

Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, New York, in a statement on the occasion of Captive Nations Week declared, "Their cause is our cause, their sorrow must be our sorrow, for freedom is a brotherhood or it is nothing. God made us to be free, and under God we must pledge to one another, across the oceans, across the curtains of iron, that freedom is not a separate destiny, but a common destiny * * * no free man can have ease of mind while his neighbors are shackled by the brutal chains of the sworn enemy of freedom."

THE IMPACT ON COMMUNISTS

What impact did statements like these have upon the Communists in Moscow and in other Communist-ruled capitals? Radio Moscow attacked Captive Nations Week even more bitterly this year than last. Claimed Commentator Orlov on July 19, the Americans cannot "stomach the fraternal relations of equal cooperation and mutual assistance within the Socialist system, for all this is in sharp contrast to their own relations with smaller or weaker countries, a clearcut instance of which are the recent imperialist intrigues, conspiracies, and interventions against Cuba and the Republic of Congo."

Communist propagandists in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Estonia, Albania, and other nations attacked Captive Nations Week as "a lying campaign," as a "slandering campaign," and as "a provocative act," which could only "make the world public laugh."

The widespread and bitter Communist attack against Captive Nations Week by itself indicates that the truths proclaimed by the week's activities have hit a sensitive spot in the Communist armor. The Communist-propagated fiction that captive nations are free and equal partners in the Communist bloc is exploded by the groveling subservience of Communist rulers of the captive nations to every order and whim of the top Russian Communist.

PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

Captive peoples are not free to select their own government, make their own laws, run their economy, or decide for themselves the kind of lives they want to lead. All decisions are made by the state and the party and both are run from Moscow.

Captive Nations Week exposed the truth of Communist tyranny to the world, and Communists were hurt. They admit the truth of the charge when they deny the captive people the right to self-determination by a free and secret vote. They know that if captive peoples have the chance, they will throw the Russian Communists and their minions out of power.

By voicing this truth with strength and with conviction, Captive Nations Week puts the Communist masters on the defensive before their own people and before the world. The effectiveness of Captive Nations Week suggests that the struggle needs to be increased through participation of more millions of peoples of the free world. The struggle must continue until all captive peoples can say to the Reds: "Stop running our country and our lives. Go home. We don't want you here."

DR. DOBRIANSKY'S TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT
EISENHOWER

The President's reply to this new and harsher denunciation took the form of a challenge to Moscow to accept under U.N. auspices the conduct of free elections in all the captive nations and elsewhere in the world. The importance of such challenges and their follow-up should not be underestimated in the prime area of creational conflict and skillful propaganda they can have lasting results of benefit to the cause of world freedom. This is what the chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee had in mind when he dispatched a telegram to the President, congratulating him for this challenge. As reported in the Chicago Tribune and other national papers, the telegram was as follows:

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Chicago, Ill.

We strongly congratulate you and heartily applaud the challenge of free elections you offered Khrushchev last night in your stirring address at the Republican National Convention.

We and countless Americans urge that you and our United Nations Ambassador press this challenge by every means in the forums of world opinion.

I am particularly happy over this development because in a letter addressed to you on September 12, 1959, and in subsequent communications I urged that this kind of challenge be made to Khrushchev in connection with his statements on Captive Nations Week in his foreign affairs article released last August.

Americans throughout the land cannot thank you enough for your Captive Nations Week proclamation last week. Once again Moscow has been rocked by this. It demonstrates again their fear of our Captive Nations Week resolution. We earnestly hope and urge that you will implement the resolution by honoring our proposal to create a Government Agency on Self-Determination of Captive and Occupied Nations which would place Moscow on a perpetual defensive in the cold war. This can be a further and very practical challenge.

Sincerely,

DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, National Committee on
Captive Nations Week Observance.

In deriding this challenge Radio Moscow lied in this way:

The tendency of this process is quite evident. Almost half of all mankind has voted in favor of socialism (July 28).

In reply to this lie, we should have recited again and again for all the world to hear, the dates of Russian Communist conquest of all the captive nations listed in the Captive Nations Week resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of our failure to follow up such opportunities as

presented to us that I propose the necessary establishment of a House Committee on the Captive Nations. But this is only one reason justifying the creation of this committee. If the Members would read carefully the clauses preceding my resolution, they would recognize immediately the many pressing reasons for such desirable action.

For one, the two Presidential proclamations on Captive Nations Week—last year's and the recent one—call upon the American people to study these nations. A committee of this type would insure continuous studies and inquiries into all the captive nations. It would prove to be a constant source of knowledge and information about the captive nations. Its very existence would serve the purposes set forth and stressed in the Presidential proclamation.

Second, an active committee of this nature would by its studies, inquiries, and investigation, open for us new vistas of conception and understanding about the Soviet Union and the entire Red totalitarian empire. These new dimensions of thought would in turn contribute to the development of new, imaginative, and dynamic ideas and approaches by which we could successfully throw the ideological aggressors upon a perpetual defensive and into eventual defeat in the cold war. With the Powers' trial in Moscow, it would do well for us to bear in mind that almost the entire territory flown over by the U-2 plane is captive non-Russian country. A knowledgeable use of this basic fact at the time of the summit would have kept the Moscow totalitarians talking and thinking about this to present date.

The third additional reason for a House Committee on the Captive Nations is that the products of its systematic and continuous and concentrated work would go a long way to offset and negate Moscow's propaganda and infiltrative efforts in free Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. For example the focus of our serious attention upon the 35 million Moslems subjugated within the Soviet Union could not have the most salutary effects upon the entire Moslem world. Moreover, the contributions of the committee would bolster and vastly improve our posture and position in the paramount arena of contesting ideas and argument in the cold war.

Fourth, the Congress could display in no better way the pride it has in having legislated the Captive Nations Week resolution than by beginning to implement it with the formation of a permanent committee on the captive nations. As the data I provided here will show, the American people responded vigorously to the resolution in their observance of Captive Nations Week. Responding also to the President's call for the study of these nations, they have articulated the need for such a committee in their recent observances. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I am proposing here is a response to this popular demand, and I feel sure that every Member, after having read the samples of evidence given here, will share this feeling.

It is not enough to express from time to time our sympathy with the captive nations in Europe and Asia. The time has come for us to understand the basic ideology of all the captive nations. Reason, not sentiment is determinative here. The captive nations in the aggregate are perhaps even more important to our national security and that of the nontotalitarian free world than space conquests, missile superiority, and a host of other things. They are our great and formidable deterrent against the outbreak of a hot global war. So long as colonial and imperialist Moscow remains permanently insecure with regard to its captive masses, it will certainly venture into no hot war. Quite emphatically, it could scarcely afford one, for the captive nationals within the armed forces of the Soviet Union itself would be a constant threat and then an eruptive force in the empire. The captive nations in the aggregate are both an insurance for continued peace and a weapon for the advance of world freedom. They represent a tremendous strategic value for the forces of freedom.

This strategic value more than justifies the need for establishing a House Committee on the Captive Nations. Because of this value to our national security, we have rightly and appropriately formed specialized committees in the areas of space, atomic energy, and economics. The strategic value of all the captive nations, which means also those in the Soviet Union, is in itself a compelling and urgent reason for us to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this fundamental reason and all that it implies that I offer and submit for action in this session the following resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations:

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations; and

Whereas the nationwide observance in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas, following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography the now famous

1960

U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of 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, Turkistan, North Vietnam, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of noninterference in the internal affairs of states and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the two Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and of whom five shall be members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which include those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them; facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1962.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. Speaker, the heart of the matter is that we are helping ourselves when we look to the interests of the captive nations. They are a strong factor in deterring the Kremlin from outright aggression that would provoke a nuclear war. Khrushchev knows he presides over a very uneasy empire. He realizes full well that the so-called Soviet Union is largely a political fiction, a forced alliance of peoples with past histories of independence, glorious cultures, and their own folkways. The Soviet rulers know better than anyone else the repressive measures they are required to use to keep the peoples of the captive nations prisoners. And, above all, the Soviet ruling clique is totally aware that the nations held in captivity dream of freedom and independence and a return to their once proud sovereignty. In such a situation, a strong third force would be on the side of the free world in the event of hostilities. Imagine the havoc such a force could inflict on Communist military installations, transportation, food supplies. Yes; the captive nations are a deterrent to war, and are at the same time strong, natural allies of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, history informs us that tyranny bears the seeds of its own ruin. Down through the ages it has been thus, one tyrant after another met his ruin in the blood baths of his own instigation. Many of us here today remember Hitler boasting that the Reich of his own violent creation would continue in glory down for a thousand years. We all remember, too, how this madman perished by his own plan of destruction, cornered literally like a rat, in a Berlin bunker—this bloodstained edifice pulled down round his own villainous head.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we serve our Republic and the free world well when we look to cause of freedom for all mankind. Freedom is America's business—it has

always been so and, pray-God, it will always be so.

Let us now send out word and keep sending it out to the peoples of the captive nations that they are not forgotten in America—that their plight is our concern, that we shall never be reconciled to their sorry condition, that we shall continue to use every peaceful means at our command to bring about their release, their restoration to freedom.

What I propose here today is the development of another effective instrument to bring about that happy day of independence for these millions gripped in the vise of Red tyranny.

In all solemnity, Mr. Speaker, I say: Let us tend the lamps of freedom—the hour is late and the night is dark—but the dawn will be ours when all men may walk upright in freedom, and Red tyranny has been crushed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], for the excellent presentation he is making here today. I know few men who are as fully qualified to know the real meaning of the threat of communism as does Mr. Flood. In 1952, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a member of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives that investigated the Katyn Forest massacre, and the gentleman, indeed, played one of the key roles in writing the indictment—the first indictment against the Soviet Union for committing this monstrous atrocity against some 15,000 Polish Army officers who were our gallant allies in World War II. I think the gentleman's analysis of the importance of this captive nation's resolution which the Congress adopted last year is, indeed, very penetrating and the gentleman would be happy to know that only this year in the city of Chicago in pursuance of the captive nations' resolution, we held a great service and ceremony on Captive Nations Day. Some 5,000 people attended. I would like to stress the importance of this point that the gentleman has brought up. This ceremony was arranged by Mayor Daly. It was a magnificent sight to see the representatives of the 14 captive nations, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania just mentioned, standing there with their national banners and flags raised high and their voices and their hopes high that some day these captive nations would join the family of free nations of the world. I congratulate the gentleman for the outstanding presentation he is making today.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois. He is very kind. I am especially glad to see him here because he very graciously referred, Mr. Speaker, to my connection with the famous Katyn massacre investigation.

That massacre investigation would not have got anyplace at all if it had not been for the fact that this brilliant young man, now a Member of this distinguished body, was at that time my chief clerk and my chief interpreter. He was my right arm all through the months of this investigation. Since that time, I think largely because of his great service, the people of his great district in rural Illinois saw fit to send him here to join us so we could have the benefit of his experience as a colleague.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], for continuing to bring to the attention of this body and the country the grave danger we are in. I think the gentleman's plan could put the Soviet Union on the defensive in 5 minutes if we would adopt this plan and appeal to the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, as well as outside of the Iron Curtain.

For years we have been on the defensive. This plan could put the Soviet Union on the defensive instantly. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad my friend from South Carolina has taken this time. He has been with me for 10 years here when we both have been making this kind of speech, and I am glad to have his South Carolina dignity and accent added to this. Our southern colleagues are renowned for their patriotism and their opposition to communism and all it stands for. He speaks well for the South. I was born and raised in the South. I am not a "damyankee." I am just a "Yankee." I am glad he is here today to say those words.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for his introduction of this resolution to create a House Committee on Captive Nations. I would like to associate myself with his remarks, Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that the subject of captive nations should be included at the summit conference.

I am particularly pleased to support this measure. It is especially significant, Mr. Speaker, at this time, in view of the tragic scuttling of the summit conference by the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent to include my remarks on this subject at the conclusion of the speech by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, one of the most valiant fighters against communism in the entire country. I compliment him for his splendid remarks on the subject of captive nations. I have a great number of people in my district who have relatives in these captive nations, Polish, Hungarian, Rumanian. I believe the people in these countries eventually will gain their freedom.

I wish to associate myself with every sentiment the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expressed.

Mr. FLOOD. I am very pleased with these expressions of support. I know the great city my friend comes from. Upon occasion I feel called upon to recognize him not as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but the gentleman from Philadelphia.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I also wish to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his remarks and would just like to point out that at the time this Katyn Massacre Committee was appointed there was a great deal of doubt in the minds of some Members of Congress as to whether or not it could serve any useful purpose. However, history has told us that that Committee has served a tremendously useful purpose. It has been my privilege to have been back of the Iron Curtain twice since then.

I know that everyone behind the Iron Curtain knows the great work done by that committee, and I think the committee proposed now can do a great service for our Nation and for the cause of freedom everywhere.

One of the weaknesses of our policy is that we have frequently indicated our sympathy with people behind the Iron Curtain, but we have never yet developed the right kind of policy with regard to those people. A committee of the kind the gentleman is suggesting could do a great service for this Nation and for the cause of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, he served with me invaluable upon the committee making the Katyn massacre investigation, and may I remind you, Mr. Speaker, his name is MACHROWICZ. He has the honor and served bravely and nobly with the Polish armed forces before our country was in the war, and fought communism with his blood and his strong right arm with the armed forces of the motherland from which his people came. So he yields to no one in his awareness of the dangers and evils of atheistic communism and in patriotism and love of our country.

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Congressman from Pennsylvania in sponsoring a resolution to establish a House Committee on Captive Nations.

As cosponsor of the recent captive nations resolution which was approved by the House last spring, I believe that this is a most appropriate followup to demonstrate to the Soviet Union and to the world our continuing and persistent concern with the fate of the captive peoples.

The captive nations, as has been pointed out on the floor today, constitute a powerful and effective third force in our fight against Communist tyranny.

The establishment of a House committee to deal exclusively with the problems of the captive nations will give new heart and courage to these oppressed peoples and will reassure them that we shall continue to use every peaceful means to restore them to independence and freedom.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] on his introduction of the resolution to create a House Committee on Captive Nations, and I would like to associate myself with his remarks. As a cosponsor of the resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the subject of the captive nations be discussed at the summit conference, I am particularly pleased to support this measure. It is especially significant at this time in view of the tragic scuttling of the summit conference by the Communists.

Among the most glaring contradictions to the claims of the Communists that theirs is the flower-strewn road to the future is the existence of the captive nations which adorn the periphery of the Soviet State. In not one of these countries did communism assume control of the government with the consent of the majority. In not one of these countries was the path to power of the Communists marked by anything but human misery, privation, and death. The very existence of the captive nations gives the lie to the pretensions of the Communists about the benefits of their brutal system. Stripped of their treasure and forced to bow to military and economic tyranny, the captive nations present a tragic exhibit of what the rest of the world can expect from Communist domination.

Their story is a grim warning to the free nations but it is also a challenge. We cannot let others become captives of the Communists and we must offer every hope to the already enslaved to encourage their adherence to freedom, that they will eventually regain their independence. Just as we undertake to plan strategy to counter Communist efforts here at home and to prevent its expansion abroad, so must we likewise consider how we can best assist the captive nations in their deep-seated desire to reachieve their freedom. The investigation and study that the proposed committee can make in this field can be of immeasurable benefit to future policy formulation. In addition, its activities

1960

can provide all of us with a deeper knowledge of the problems and conditions with which the peoples of these nations must cope.

Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse the proposal by our colleague and I hope that the House will see fit to adopt his resolution in the time that yet remains before we adjourn.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit this afternoon during special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT OF PETER J. CAHILL, SECRETARY-TREASURER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

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

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able leaders of Federal employee groups, and one who has honored me with his friendship, has reached the mandatory retirement age of 65. This week, at the Cincinnati convention of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Secretary-Treasurer Peter J. Cahill will round out a career that began 47 years ago when he went to work for the Post Office Department in Boston.

From personal experience he learned that the lot of a letter carrier was not an easy one, and he determined to do something about it. He joined the NALC where his intelligence, his initiative, and his courage singled him out as a natural representative for his fellow workers.

He gave his heart and soul to the unrelenting efforts of improving the working conditions and wages of the letter carriers. This loyalty and devotion to their best interests won increasing recognition, finally resulting in his election as national secretary. It is significant that, in 1956, when the offices of secretary and treasurer were consolidated, Peter Cahill was the first man chosen to shoulder that dual responsibility.

It is no mere coincidence that the NALC has made such progress, both in its organizational growth, and in the promotion of its programs during the time that he was a national officer. For he never spared himself. His energy and his sincerity impressed everyone he met, and lifted the esprit de corps of the NALC to an alltime high.

I was a frequent companion of his on many plane trips between Boston and Washington, and so I came to know his personal interest in the letter carriers who were his second family, and of his earnest desire to help them in every possible way.

The greatest satisfaction that he takes with him into retirement is that he suc-

ceeded far beyond his, and their, expectations.

For he fought the good fight that not only benefited the letter carriers, but provided the leadership that indirectly strengthened the prestige and raised the living standards of every Federal employee.

We congratulate Pete Cahill on his long and constructive career and his many accomplishments in behalf of every letter carrier in the Nation.

We know that the many years of retirement that stretch ahead will be blessed with every happiness and fulfillment for Peter Cahill, in return for his faith and pride in his fellow human beings.

BOYD LEEDOM

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, is actively engaging in partisan politics. To my mind his conduct raises grave questions of propriety, which I should like to outline to the House.

As the Members of the House are of course aware, the National Labor Relations Board is an independent agency having important semi-judicial functions. It administers the National Labor Relations Act, that is, the Wagner Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts. That is a highly controversial piece of legislation, and the labor disputes which come before the Board for adjudication are often of such a nature that they arouse intense partisanship. I doubt that anyone will question that the Board should be comprised of fair-minded members who are not themselves partisans of either labor or management.

Indeed the Board itself has always been most insistent on its neutral, judicial role. Successive Chairmen of the Board have, for example, declined on this ground to express to the Congress any views on substantive amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. When Mr. Leedom appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor last year, he started out like this:

As you know from my previous appearances here we are not proponents of any legislation particularly. In fact, we, as quasi-judicial officers, prefer to stay out of the policy area of legislation.

However, Boyd Leedom is not merely Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. He is also general chairman of a Mundt for Senate committee. In this latter capacity he has circulated a letter which I would like to read to the House:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SOUTH DAKOTANS
MUNDT FOR SENATE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1960.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: One of the most important Senate races this year will take place in South Dakota where Congressman McGOVERN, a protege of Senator HUBERT

HUMPHREY and the ADA, is trying to unseat Senator KARL MUNDT.

I know that it is not necessary to list for you the many accomplishments of Senator KARL MUNDT. All of us know of the grand fight which he has made for economy and sanity in Government over the last 12 years in the Senate and for 10 years before that in the House of Representatives. He has become a recognized leader in the battle against the encroachments of socialistic schemes in America. South Dakota and the Nation cannot afford to lose from its Senate ranks this true defender of constitutional government.

Senator Mundt has an especially tough campaign since certain labor leaders have announced that he is on their purge list. These labor leaders are making many thousands of dollars available to his opponent. KARL cannot hope to match these labor dollars with his own and is doing his best with the limited funds he has available to carry on a successful campaign in South Dakota.

We South Dakotans who live in the District and the distinguished Members of the House and the Senate who comprise an honorary committee are sponsoring a recognition luncheon for Senator MUNDT at the Plaza Room of the Continental Hotel at 12:30 noon on June 27, 1960. Your generous assistance to make this testimonial to Senator MUNDT a success is needed.

Please return your contribution of \$50 or more in the enclosed envelope and indicate on the enclosed card whether or not you will be in attendance at the luncheon so that the committee can make the necessary reservations. For each \$50 contribution a luncheon reservation will be made if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD LEEDOM,
General Chairman,
ROWLAND JONES,
Chairman, Men's Division,
VIVIAN ANDERSON,
Chairman, Women's Division.

This activity of Mr. Leedom raises to my mind two important questions.

In the first place it suggests the possibility that the Hatch Act may be in need of clarification as to whether it bars partisan political activity by persons occupying positions such as that held by Mr. Leedom. The Hatch Act provides that—

No officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. * * *

It goes on, however, to exempt from this prohibition four classes of office holders including:

(4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

I do not know whether or not members of quasi-judicial agencies are regarded as coming within this excepted category. The language of the statute looks as if it is only meant to exempt from the Hatch Act presidential appointees having major policyforming roles, rather than members of independent quasi-judicial agencies who carry out policies enacted by the Congress in legislation.

Whatever the proper construction of the present law, it seems to me that it is highly debatable whether members

of independent quasi-judicial agencies should be permitted to engage in partisan political activity. It is my impression that appointees to Federal boards and commissions have in general refrained from such activities. I cannot recall any fund-raising activities comparable to Mr. Leedom's being undertaken by members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or the Federal Trade Commission, or even the Federal Communications Commission. As far as I can learn Mr. Leedom's predecessors on the Labor Board have without exception refrained from actively engaging in politics while members of the Board.

I tend to think that they were well advised. The laws which these agencies administer are themselves products of the political process, and it is difficult to see how a person administering these laws can actively participate in partisan politics without casting doubt on his own impartiality in administering the law.

That brings me to the second issue raised by Chairman Leedom's activities. Mr. Leedom's letter, which I have read to the House, indicates to me that he is antiunion. Mr. Leedom's letter declares that Senator MUNDT is a leader in the battle against "the encroachments of socialistic schemes in America," and it goes on to say that Senator MUNDT has an especially tough campaign "since certain labor leaders have announced that he is on their purge list." Leedom's letter then states, on what authority I do not know, that these unidentified labor leaders are making many thousands of dollars available to Senator MUNDT's opponent.

This is antiunion propaganda, pure and simple. Mr. Leedom has a perfect right to hold antiunion views, and to express them, but is he qualified to head a quasi-judicial agency which adjudicates disputes between unions and employers? If I were a union man I would not want Mr. Leedom as my judge. He has openly proclaimed his antiunion bias.

It is also pertinent to consider the identity of Leedom's associate in this

political fundraising drive. As I stated, Mr. Leedom signed these fund-soliciting letters as "General Chairman of a MUNDT for Senate Committee." They are also signed by Rowland Jones as "Chairman, Men's Division."

Who is this Rowland Jones? I should suppose that there are very few Members of this House who do not know who Mr. Jones is. He is the president of the American Retail Federation. He has been very active for many years as an employer lobbyist on labor legislation. The Landrum-Griffin Act passed last year testifies to his effectiveness.

Just what sort of man is Boyd Leedom that he sees no impropriety in engaging in a political fundraising venture in partnership with a lobbyist for an employer association? Let me ask this: How would employers feel if the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board engaged in fundraising activities on behalf of a Senator notably friendly to unions and in conjunction with a union official? I can tell you: They would scream to the high heaven. I would not blame them.

I frankly cannot understand how anyone can condone or excuse Leedom's conduct in this matter. It seems to me that even Mr. Leedom should have enough discretion and sense of propriety to resign. If he does not do so voluntarily, the President should call for his resignation.

However, it is apparent that discretion is not Leedom's forte, and the Congress, too, has a responsibility in this matter. For that reason I am today introducing a resolution directing and authorizing the House Labor Committee to look into the matter of partisan political activity by the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE CROP PRICE SUPPORT COMMODITY LOANS

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

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many statements made by responsible persons in the Democratic Party over their concern for the small farmer, it is difficult for me to understand why this Congress had deliberately refused to extend a limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation loans for the 1961 crops. The Banking and Currency Committee has refused to even hold hearings on H.R. 9303 and the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee repelled my effort to extend the limitation place on the appropriation bill for fiscal 1960 to the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1961. The end result, of course, will be that the large corporation farmers that are listed below or other borrowers of comparable amounts will again exploit the resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1961 crop and this exploitation will be charged to the Department of Agriculture. There will follow the usual demand next year for further relief for the average size mid-western frontier. Here is one opportunity we have missed.

The failure to take action by the 86th Congress is in direct conflict with the announced aims and objectives of the Democratic Party for agriculture and I think this is an appropriate and effective means to so advise the farmers of America.

Further, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the debate on the floor of the House in 1959 on imposing this \$50,000 limitation, several Members insisted most of these loans were repaid and, therefore, no loss was sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The table below and others on file in my office clearly indicate that the large loans are only rarely, if ever, repaid and thereby a great loss is imposed on the taxpayer and again charged to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, although only the loans in excess of \$50,000 are indicated on the tables below, I have on file in my office and in the Department of Agriculture, a list of loans over \$25,000 and also an indication whether or not they have been repaid.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION
1959 crop corn price support loans made of \$25,000 or more and amount repaid by producer

Producer	Address	Bushels pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Producer	Address	Bushels pledged	Amount loaned	Amount repaid
	CALIFORNIA					MISSOURI			
M. E. & Frank Silva Co.	Isleton	42,858	\$54,001.08		Myers Farms	Brunswick	63,000	\$73,710.00	
	ILLINOIS				Alber Painton Co., Inc.	Painton	49,869	57,848.04	
Cote Farms, Inc., care of L. D. Corkins, president.	St. Anne	161,036	182,987.68			NEBRASKA			
James Youtz	San Jose	53,760	61,286.40		Morrison & Quirk	Harvard	80,000	88,000.00	
	INDIANA				J. R. Brown	Clarks	79,106	84,643.42	
Crelgton Bros.	Warsaw	51,830	58,567.90		Ned Tyson	Herman	71,508	77,228.64	
Overmyer Farms, Inc.	Wolcott	46,100	52,093.00		Bob Hawthorne and Dr. O. A. Kostal	Giltner	47,455	50,776.85	
	MINNESOTA				Ernest and Robert E. Hundahl	Tekamah	46,894	50,176.58	
Harold & Dale Duncanson	Mapleton	60,466	62,884.64						