

out with his left arm and pull a D-shaped handle, opening a storage bay and exposing the lens of a black-and-white TV camera.

In 1.3 seconds, the time it takes light to reach the earth, we will see Armstrong's legs carefully moving down the ladder.

A moment later, men on earth will see man walking on the moon.

For the first half hour, Armstrong will test his mobility on the surface, collect a two-pound "grab bag" rock sample, which is a contingency sample in case the walk has to be cut short, and receive equipment and a camera via a conveyor belt from Aldrin.

At this point, Aldrin makes his appearance on the moon.

For the next two hours, the astronauts collect rocks and soil with a scoop on a three-foot-long handle, filling two containers.

Two hours and 40 minutes after Armstrong opens the hatch, both crewmen should be back aboard Eagle.

And at 1:55 p.m.—after a total of 21 hours and 26 minutes on the surface—Eagle will blastoff to rejoin Columbia.

OUR FLAG IN AN AIRLESS VOID

Ever since the Age of Exploration, man has yearned to plant his banners on remote and distant shores. When Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin make it to the lunar surface, the Stars and Stripes will fly on the farthest shore of all.

Plans call for Armstrong and Aldrin to jointly implant a three- by five-foot nylon American flag about an hour after they step onto the moon.

It will be erected on an eight-foot-tall aluminum staff, tubing along the top edge of the flag keeping it unfurled in the airless lunar environment.

Raising of the American flag—and only the American flag—was mandated recently by Congress. Space agency senior officials had

avored raising both the American and United Nations standards.

"The planting of the flag is symbolic of the first time man has landed on another celestial body and does not constitute a territorial claim by the United States," the space agency said in a terse statement.

More enthusiastically publicized by Nasa is a plaque which the astronauts will unveil and leave on the moon, bearing images of the earth's two hemispheres, signatures of the three Apollo 11 astronauts and President Nixon, and carrying the inscription:

"Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon July 1969, A.D. We came in peace for all mankind."

Also to be left on the moon is a silicon disk about the size of a half dollar bearing messages from more than 100 world leaders. To fit them all on the disk, the messages have been reduced to about 1/200th of their original size.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 16, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—Isaiah 40: 3.

O God and Father of us all at this high moment in our national life we bow at the altar of prayer invoking Thy blessing upon us and upon our noble endeavors. Shine Thou upon our Nation as we launch out into a new day. Bless our astronauts as they wend their way to the moon, as they land on its surface, and as they find their way back. Grant them safety all the way and may they return with their mission accomplished and their aims achieved.

We thank Thee with glowing hearts that we live in an hour like this. May we play our part as participants in this crowning hour of our Nation's history.

In the spirit of the Pioneer of Life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GODSPEED TO OUR ASTRONAUTS AND SUCCESS TO OUR SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful day this is for America and for the world. America, in the name of peaceful exploration, has launched into orbit three brave men—Neil Armstrong, "Buz" Aldrin, and Mike Collins, who are to conduct the first landing on the moon.

No matter how many times a launch has been done before, the potentials for danger are so great that the whole community of mankind pauses as Saturn V lights for the takeoff.

Our country has conducted with great credit as well as success its open program of peaceful exploration of space. The National Aeronautics and Space Act was proposed by President Eisenhower, and was forged and perfected in committees of the Congress of which I was the chairman in the House. We then pledged our program to peaceful goals in the interest of all mankind. I think

history is supporting the wisdom of those decisions of 1958.

We welcome the sense of sharing which other nations have had in this endeavor. Their flags are being carried to the moon and statements of many of their national leaders will be left as a memorial on the moon to this epic event in the history of our race.

Today, at Cape Kennedy, Ambassadors of most of the nations have been present to see the launch. In one way they are our guests because of the investment the American people have made financially to bring about this mission. In another way, they have a right to be there as participants, not merely guests. Our space program has been built upon a common heritage of knowledge with the cooperation of many nations over many generations. Also, the conduct of this mission has depended upon cooperative tracking stations in many nations, and our flights are conducted under a regime of peaceful acts of space established by international treaty.

Our men go to the moon not to seize it in the name of ownership but as ambassadors for all men of good will. The mission, the men, the hopes of the world, all represent to the highest aspirations of mankind for peace, for progress, and partnership.

The inspiration of our moon flight is that we can join forces to solve the major problems on earth just as well as we continue to do so in space, and to continue space explorations will have its applications and spinoffs which will pay for the progress of our fellow men here on earth.

This mission has only begun, and many difficult tasks are yet to be performed. We have high confidence in the work and in the equipment but if the mission is not completed, these men would not want us to turn our backs on what they have strived for so hard to accomplish.

Nor would America want us to quit. We, of course, hope and expect that within about 8 days this mission can be a part of history, a wonderful success and a tribute to the astronauts, the engineers and the scientists and the workers, the citizens and the Government which made it possible.

We ask God's blessings on this great adventure of the human spirit.

THEY ALSO SERVE WHO STAND AND WAIT

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish my presence today in this Chamber with a corporal's guard of House membership, while our colleagues enjoy this morning's historic spectacle of the lift-off in Cape Kennedy, to connote lack of support for, indeed enthusiasm for, the enormous achievement of man's flight to the moon.

I join my colleagues in proudly paying tribute to our space team. I wish them a safe trip and every success, and while our astronauts are on the moon, I hope they will pick up and bring back some of that surface because, Mr. Speaker, being from Wisconsin, America's dairyland, where our farmers are burdened by foreign dairy imports, I want Wisconsin dairy producers to be reassured that the moon's surface is not made of potentially competitive green cheese.

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman for the statement he has just made about the spirit and attitude which prevails throughout all of the membership of this body. Those of us who are here today are certainly with our astronauts in spirit and share in the very high hopes of all of us for a successful achievement down there at Cape Kennedy and also share in the great pride at what has already been accomplished.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF MILITARY SPENDING

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, delivered a speech before the 16th annual Institute on Government Contracts on Thursday, May 8, of this year. His subject was the responsibility of Congress to exercise control over military expenditures. I think the speech is extraordinary in its insight and I recommend its reading to the Members of this House:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

Ladies and gentlemen, over the last 6 weeks I have been participating in hearings on the Subcommittee on Military Operations and have heard a key phrase repeated over and over again—maintain capability—as the rationalization for the incestuous relationship between the Department of Defense and our defense contractors. It brings to mind the symbolic but appropriate picture of a million pound dinosaur living in a man's backyard and constantly demanding to be fed—his rationale to the homeowner is what would you do with a dead dinosaur in your backyard?

I come before you today to discuss a dire and dangerous condition in the United States of America. I am referring to our self-perpetuating military budget and the sincere but vain attempts which have been made to bridle this beast.

You might ask me why after serving ten years in the House of Representatives I now bring to your attention that military spending has no governor.

As I look back on my decade in Congress, I would say, indulging in a bit of hindsight, that the \$80 billion military budget has been out of control or nearly so for all of those 10 years.

In my first two years in Congress, General Eisenhower was President, and with his great prestige as a General he was able to impose a ceiling of sorts on the military budget. This was not a rational ceiling, however. It was one that, I suspect, contained more spending for officers clubs and less on defense capabilities than the American people wanted.

In 1961, John F. Kennedy became the President of the United States and named the brilliant and budget-minded Robert S. McNamara to be Secretary of Defense.

Even a Defense Secretary, as strong-willed and determined as Robert S. McNamara, faced the threat of the Joint Chiefs' reprisals for his efforts to rationalize the budgetary process. In order to protect himself from these assaults, McNamara insisted that the Joint Chiefs sign off on all Defense budgetary matters thus obviating the possibility that the Joint Chiefs would criticize him for not putting enough money in specific weapons systems and thereby endangering the national security.

If he did not achieve the reality, Robert S. McNamara certainly achieved the illusion that there was a strong civilian control over the military. At any rate, those of us in Congress who were interested primarily in the domestic and civilian programs of the United States were satisfied that the military budget was under control.

Our problem in Congress in those days were conceptual rather than financial.

We were trying to get the Congress to accept dramatic new ideas—Medicare, federal aid to education, the war on poverty, federal support for the arts and humanities, and a few dozen more.

In 1965, in the 89th Congress, we were successful, and most of these new ideas were enacted into law.

But also in 1965 the battle between guns and butter began and inflationary pressures started to build. They rose in intensity in proportion to our growing involvement in the Vietnam morass.

Those of us in the Congress who had fought for new and increased programs in health and housing, for education and for the war on poverty, began to realize that unless we could bring the military budget, and procurement in particular, under control, these vital social programs would die from the malnutrition of underfunding.

The picture was made more discouraging by statements from the military and its supporters. These elements said that when the war in Vietnam ended, the bulk of the resulting savings would still be required by the military to carry out procurement for weapons systems deferred because of Vietnam.

This situation has remained the same—ominous—for the last four years.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff this year requested more than \$100 billion to maintain the military strength of the Pentagon. Right now there are 13 major weapons systems—ranging from new fighter planes to missiles and aircraft carriers—whose production has been approved but backed up because of the Vietnam war.

For example, this so called "fiscal dividend" was originally projected at \$19 billion after the cessation of Vietnam hostilities. However, Defense Secretary Laird in a recent statement staked the Pentagon's claim for \$12 billion of this dividend—so once again the lion's share goes to the military at the expense of our domestic programs.

Last year, I decided to promote for public and congressional sake, what I would call a healthy skepticism about the size of the military budget.

This feeling was brought about in part by the election of a presidential candidate who spoke of increasing our military budget to achieve a clear "superiority" over the Soviets. I shuddered at the implications of the statement. More and more expensive weapons programs—leading to a reaction in kind by the Russians—which would further drive us to still greater heights of arms acquisitions.

I was also impressed by certain testimony delivered before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve. This testimony showed how insidious the military industrial complex had become and the fact that the military budget and procurement had become self-contained entities, successfully denying outside control.

Building on the findings of the Joint Economic Committee information about the DOD budget in procurement practices and the results gleaned from another set of hearings—the House Military Operations Subcommittee—I came to the shocking conclusion that, outside of the Pentagon, there is almost no control over the military budget.

My research into the budget interplay between the Defense Department and the Bureau of the Budget left me disturbed by what appears to be the inability of the Bureau of the Budget to scrutinize the Defense Department to the same extent that it reviews non-Defense spending.

This is the result of both inadequate manpower and the nature of the Defense budget process itself.

For example, there was one BOB examiner assigned to the Head Start Program, and one examiner assigned to the Anti-Ballistic Missile System.

There is something basically wrong when a government gives equal Budget Bureau attention to an ABM system, with projected expenditures of anywhere from \$6 billion to \$50 billion and the Head Start Program which has an estimated expenditure of \$338 million in fiscal 1970.

Of course, I am not advocating that there be a one to one personnel ratio dollar-wise, but pointing up the fact that there presently seems to be a severe imbalance with only 10% of the Bureau professional staff examining nearly half the budget.

Furthermore, domestic agency budgets are given different and more intense scrutiny

than the defense budget. In all departments of government, except for the Defense Department, budget examiners conduct an independent analysis and review which is submitted to the Director of the Budget. In Defense, budget examiners work not independently, but with their Defense counterparts, and the analysis and review are submitted first to the Secretary of Defense rather than to the Budget Director. Only after the Secretary has approved it, is the review submitted to the Budget Director. The result of this procedure is that whereas other Secretaries must go to the President to have him overrule the Budget Director, in the case of Defense, the Budget Director must go to the President to overrule the Secretary of Defense.

This process, of course, shifts the whole budget process power structure and renders the Bureau almost impotent as a force for independent analysis of military procurement programs.

The Bureau of the Budget will not admit that what I've just told you is the truth. But in hearings before the Military Operations Subcommittee, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said the "climate" was different in the examination of defense requests.

Referring to the "power relationships" in Washington, Mr. Hughes, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget conceded that the Defense Department has both political power and muscle. And that "in this power-oriented town," these two attributes give it extra advantage in dealing with the Budget Bureau.

Defense Secretary McNamara in his inimical way made his opinion of the Budget Bureau's role in defense budget-making very clear when he told the Congress:

"I will be quite frank with you, I can't remember a single instance in which the Bureau of the Budget and I differed on a recommendation in which the President accepted the Bureau of the Budget view. There may have been one in 4 years, but I can't remember a single one."

Given the fact of the lack of effective scrutiny of the military budget by any executive agency outside of the Pentagon—what control, then, does the Congress exert over this budget?

I must inform you that the military-industrial complex, against which President Eisenhower warned us in his closing address to Congress, has now become the military-industrial-congressional complex. Just as Members of farm areas seek assignment to the Agriculture Committee, so do Members with large military installations in their districts desire seats on the Armed Services Committee or the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

This constituent concern can't help but color their judgment. I know that constituent concern affects me. Furthermore, service on these Committees brings the Members into continuous contact with the uniformed military. This continuous contact with dedicated men, whose primary concern is the external threat to the security of the United States, has an imbalancing effect.

In the case of agriculture or education, for example, those of us who are not on the relevant committees can make an independent judgment because the issues and the programs are not shrouded in secrecy and wrapped in the flag. When the military matters come before Congress we are told they are too complex to be properly understood by the Congress generally and the American public.

However, I charge that there is no issue as complex as determining how a disadvantaged child should be provided with an education relevant to his background and needs. However, there are 535 education experts in the Congress, each demanding that his ideas be recognized.

I would conclude, therefore, that the Congress, at least as presently structured, cannot control the military budget.

Therefore I would propose that the House and the Senate should consider the creation of a joint committee, without legislative jurisdiction, similar to the Joint Economic Committee, which would review annually the foreign and military posture of the United States and the size and shape of the military budget.

I would propose further that no member of the Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, or Appropriations Committees be eligible for service on this Joint Committee and that service on this Committee be limited to a term of say 4 or 6 years.

With such restructuring, I believe that the Congress could recapture control of the military budget.

Now then, if the Congress can't control the military budget, what about the office of the Secretary of Defense. Regrettably, I suggest today that the Secretary and the Undersecretary, both men of the highest integrity, come from the military-industrial-congressional complex. The Secretary served for many years on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. The Undersecretary was the head of the Hewlett-Packard Corporation, the majority of whose business was with the Defense Department.

As evidence of their attitude, I would point to their decision, long resisted by Secretary McNamara, to proceed with the procurement of a manned bomber, the so-called AMSA or Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft. The manned bomber today is the same object of sentimental attachment and the same military usefulness as the horse was to the cavalryman before World War II.

I think the sentimentality pitch, when applied to today's bomber situation, doesn't hold sway—mainly because the price of sentimentality has gone up.

Yet the logic behind present-day cash outflows for manned bombers seems similar to those reasons set forth back in 1941 for the maintenance of the cavalry.

As a report of the controversy stated, "The U.S. had some tens of millions of horses, and government spending in this direction . . . was a chief source of revenue to all the many horse breeders, hay growers and saddle-makers."

Listen to this testimony given before the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the House Committee on Appropriations on March 11, 1940 by the Chief of Cavalry; see if you don't think this testimony has a modern ring to it.

"Each arm has powers and limitations. The proper combination is that which arranges the whole so that the powers of each offset the limitations of the others. . . . Mechanized cavalry is valuable and an important adjunct but is not the main part of the cavalry and cannot be. Our cavalry is not the medieval cavalry of popular imagination but is cavalry which is modernized and keeping pace with all developments."

Is the Defense Department through its insistence on a new squadron of manned bombers merely repeating the history of the horse cavalry?

There is in existence today one source for control over the military budget and that is an informed and aroused public.

If the public becomes aroused, the Congress and the President will respond.

If the Congress and the President respond, the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the General Accounting Office will also respond.

You may have noticed that in recent days, I have been highly critical of certain of our procurement practices, particularly with respect to concealment of cost overruns from the public and the Congress.

I have done this, not with any intention of getting any one individual but merely to

alert the public and Congress to the dangers of the system.

Of course procurement which consumes over 50% of the military budget, is an area of vital importance.

However, to limit scrutiny of the defense budget to procurement practice, would be putting the cart before the horse.

We must look at the military budget first in light of our foreign policy commitments; second, the extent of the contingencies we are prepared to face—which, at this moment consist of fighting simultaneously two major wars and one minor war; and third, the force levels which must be achieved to meet the contingencies of our foreign commitments.

Only when we have debated the issues surrounding the first three issues can we intelligently decide on what weapon systems to procure and how to do so economically and efficiently. You gentlemen are the experts in procurement. But part of your difficulty comes from the fact that neither the Congress nor the public get an adequate chance to review, debate or pass opinion on the first three items. Therefore, when we in the Congress and the people who elect us believe that our military budget is out of control we turn to the only visible budget category—the \$44 billion spent on procurement.

Despite the importance of the three items, I have, in the last few weeks, been devoting my attention primarily to your area of expertise—procurement.

I have done so for two reasons:

1. to develop a healthy skepticism about the supposed infallibility of the military, so that it may be politically possible for Congress, and the people to debate rationally the military budget this year; and

2. because the process of military procurement is, in and of itself, in need of drastic revision.

A few procurement horror stories should illustrate the need for procurement reform and also help to develop the skepticism about the military budget which is so needed today.

Three recent case studies were revealed before the Military Operations Subcommittee.

The first had to do with the Giant cargo airplane known as the C5-A.

Originally the C5-A was devised as part of a new U.S. world-wide strategic concept which included the development of Fast Deployment Logistic Ships (FDLS).

The ships were to be loaded with heavy military equipment and supplies and kept deployed off explosives areas such as Africa and Asia.

When need for armed intervention arose, the troops and light equipment would be ferried to the area by the Giant C5-A's.

When the Congress determined that the FDLS's would be provocative and hence refused to vote funds for them, one would have thought that there would have been a rethinking of the C5-A because it was based on a strategic assumption which no longer existed.

Not so!

The C5-A which began to manifest cost overruns as early as February 1966 was kept on the books.

Two years later Congress was told there were no expected cost overruns. Yet in April top Air Force officials were told that overruns exceeded more than one-half billion dollars.

Top Air Force officials responded by directing that no reports on the C5-A reveal any cost overruns.

The reason given, for this concealment, privately, of course, was that revelation might hurt the stock market position of the contractor—Lockheed Aircraft.

However, because of an unusual provision of the "trick" contract, Lockheed was in no danger, nor was its stock. Because if Lockheed was sure that the Air Force would agree

to exercise an option to buy an additional run of C5-A's, Lockheed would recoup the losses suffered on the first run.

This placed Lockheed in a difficult legal position.

If Lockheed had not "arranged" with the Air Force to be bailed out of its financial difficulties by the Air Force, it was required under SEC regulations to reveal this potential danger.

If it revealed the fact of protection from the Air Force, it might have revealed the violation of an even more serious breach of law.

What to do? Lockheed, with the co-operation of the Air Force, decided upon concealment.

Only the heroics of a lower ranking civilian officer of the Air Force brought this situation to a head.

The scandal of the jet engines for the F-111-B is another sorry story with a similar hero.

Pratt & Whitney originally estimated the cost of certain jet engines at \$273,910.

The Navy entered into a contract which put a ceiling for these engines at from \$740,000 to \$830,000. Later a private management firm estimated that because of various escalation clauses the engines would cost \$1.4 million apiece.

The procurement officer, Gordon W. Rule, who was sent to find out what the engines should cost reported the trouble as follows:

"What basically needs to be corrected in this country today with respect to the Defense/Industry relationship is the climate that exists today vis-a-vis this relationship. Industry today is smug and perhaps rightly so. They know that no one in DOD is going to take any action they do not like and today they have much justification for this attitude. No matter how poor the quality, how late the product and how high the cost, they know nothing will happen to them. Until or unless this climate is changed, there will be little or no improvement in our procurements.

In the third procurement horror case, this same courageous officer objected to the way the termination of the F-111-B was about to be handled—with a slight slap on the wrist—if that—for a contractor clearly in default.

I have worked to bring before the Congress and the public these cases not in the vain hope of being able to cure the sins that have passed but to try to prevent their commission in the future.

I hope I'm not too late.

When the C5-A overruns were disclosed, the present Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum much more concerned with the public relations aspect than the fundamental problem. The Memo stated, among other things:

"What sorts of actions on DOD's part can be taken to thwart or ameliorate the continuing adverse commentary on program costs and suspect technical effectiveness."

When the new Nixon ABM—the Safeguard program—was announced, the Defense Department said that it would cost \$6.6 billion. Later someone asked what about the cost of the nuclear warhead and DOD said that would be an additional \$1.2 billion.

In courts of law we swear a witness to "tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth."

Within security limitations the American people should expect nothing less from the Defense Department, and, ladies and gentlemen, we aren't getting it!

Not only that but the American people are realizing this. And they are beginning to demand that their elected representatives become less accepting and more critical.

This skepticism in Congress should lead to a thoroughgoing review of our commitments, the threats we face and the force levels we need—from ABM to MIRV to 15 attack aircraft carriers.

However, ultimately we must reach the conclusion that for the foreseeable future there will be a substantial military procurement. And it is your job and mine to see to it that the citizen—the taxpayer—receives the maximum protection for the minimum amount of dollars which, after all, he provides.

One approach to achieve this and one with which almost no one disagrees is for the Congress to pass H.R. 474, the Hollfield bill to create an independent procurement commission.

If we create such a commission, I think there are certainly a few clear areas in procurement which the Commission should study.

First, we should elevate the status and treatment of the negotiators who spend the \$44 billion of defense procurement.

Second, we should have investigative procedures to examine major procurement mistakes to eliminate and document what happened so that we are not condemned in the future to repeat the same mistakes.

In part this is what the Military Operations Subcommittee has been doing, even though its efforts have been handicapped by the attempts of the services to conceal certain facts from the Congress.

Third, the Congress should insist that the Pentagon change the climate of its relationship with industry. Basically, the Government must be fair but firm and insist upon full compliance with the procurement laws and regulations and the terms of the contract entered into with industry.

Fourth, the Congress, and most particularly the Senate in confirming civilian officers of the defense establishment, should insist that they be men who intend to bring this change in climate between defense and industry.

In his testimony before our Subcommittee, Mr. Gordon W. Rule testified as follows:

"I know of one such secretary who will tell you that he believes no defense contractor should be allowed to lose money on a Government contract and whose test of a contractor who has failed to live up to the terms of a contract is 'could any other contractor in that industry have done better?'"

I strongly suggest that no man with such a philosophy should ever be appointed an Assistant Secretary for I&L, because such a person provides the negotiators on the firing line the antithesis of sound procurement leadership."

Fifth, the conflict of interest laws should be modernized. A more meaningful prohibition would be that no officer or civilian can go to work for a company holding defense contracts until all contracts held by that company on the date of the employee's leaving the Government have been completed. This principle should apply whether or not he personally had anything to do with the award of those contracts. To police this situation, the General Accounting Office should keep a personnel inventory of all personnel leaving the Government and going into industry.

Sixth and finally, I believe that the proposed Commission should examine the role of the military in defense contracting.

The basic question here revolves around the average military man's education and training, which may or may not fit him for procurement assignments. These decisions involve dollar and cents business judgments and considerations. And I point out that these important judgments and decisions require considerable patience, consultation and discussion with others because procurement decisions are rarely black or white. Thus the finest officers in the Services at running ships, flying planes, commanding divisions etc. can be—and are—in capable of filling procurement billets when they seek to operate a procurement function by "make it so" order rather than by consultation and discussion.

Additionally, what does the average military man below the rank of Admiral or General want? Quite naturally, he wants to be promoted. Thus, Captains in procurement know that many Admirals with whom they deal on contract matters will sit on their selection boards. The result of this situation becomes rather patent to those exposed to it.

In the Navy there are many very qualified Supply Corps Officers who are knowledgeable in procurement. But organizationally most of these men are under line Admirals who mark the Supply Officers' fitness reports and thus control their future military careers. These Junior Officers have little choice but to say "Aye Aye, Sir" when the Admiral wants something, and this is repugnant to sound procurement.

Both Canada and England do their buying through civilian agencies. And I suggest the time has come in this country to see if our military buying could be improved by an all-civilian purchasing group not accountable to the military.

My remarks thus far may have led you to believe that I believe that the military is all vice and the Congress all virtue.

Nothing is further from my mind.

I believe that the Congress has a constitutional duty to be a check and balance on the military. I'm not sure we are adequately performing that duty today.

I also recognize that even as the military is not all wise—as witness the support for the horse cavalry in 1941—so the Congress is not all wise. And I believe that an above-board, out-and-out discussion by the military with the Congress would be not only constitutional but also healthy.

To preserve the principle of equal time, I will quote from the most eloquent attack from the military community on the political world. From the rhetoric I would suppose that he was a United States cavalryman because General Riley of Missouri managed to get a good many of the ailments of a horse into his description of a politician when he said:

"The people have been fed on buncombe, while a lot of spavined, ringboned, hamstrung, wind-galled, swine-eyed, split hoofed, distempered, poll-eviled, pot-bellied politicians have had their noses in the public crib and there ain't enough fodder left to make gruel for a sick grasshopper."

MORE ON GENERAL HERSHEY

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, I advised my colleagues that because Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, has failed, indeed refused, to advise the local draft boards of the decision of the U.S. court of appeals, that I would notify them of the decision. This recent court action in effect concluded that the earlier Hershey directive to local boards urging immediate reclassification of registrants who participate in illegal demonstrations was illegal and probably unconstitutional.

I sent a letter to the 56 State directors of the Selective Service System, enclosing with my letter a statement of the decision of the court, asking the directors to advise the local boards within their jurisdiction of the court's decision which declared General Hershey's 1967 action to be contrary to the law. In addition, I sent to 17 local boards located in New York City the complete text of the decision.

I have now received a number of re-

sponses from these State directors and I think it would be interesting to the Members of the House to know the contents of those replies. I do this for one main reason—to show that the execution of selective service law is often arbitrary across the country and that if General Hershey will not require compliance with the law, he should be ordered to do so. One need only see the great difference in the attitude of a few State directors to know that, multiplied over 100 times, we would hardly reach the enormous difference in attitudes of the local board members in the country.

Several of the State directors responded affirmatively and thanked me for having sent them the court's decision. In one case, that of the New York City director, he informed me that local boards in his jurisdiction had not reclassified or ordered any registrants to report for induction as a result of Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey's directive of October 26, 1967. The director for the District of Columbia headquarters of the Selective Service System stated his appreciation for my having sent the court's decision and went on to state that he had advised all of the local boards in his jurisdiction of that decision.

I wish I could say that these two letters reflect what has been done in all the jurisdictions I have heard from to date. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Several replies were to advise me that my letter was forwarded to General Hershey and to the General Counsel of the Selective Service System for response. In one letter I was advised that the State director felt he would be remiss in his duty if he were to instruct the local board members how they should classify since they were originally chosen for their judgment and commonsense.

With the thought that such an incredible cross-section of responses might be of interest to my colleagues, I am setting forth the text of some of these letters. It is apparent that only if a directive is issued by General Hershey himself in his capacity as Director of the Selective Service System to each and every local board notifying them of the court's decision can we then be assured that there will be uniform compliance with the intent of the court's declaratory judgment. Would it not be a tragedy if, because the general fails or continues to refuse to notify the boards, one young man was reclassified pursuant to a directive now declared illegal—or worse still, if one young man is now on active duty because of illegal procedure.

The material referred to follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Montgomery, Ala., July 14, 1969.
Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Reference is made to your recent letter.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in the Alabama Selective Service System. This State has always classified registrants in the strictest accordance with the regulations of Selective Service.

We shall continue to classify according to the regulations as we have in the past.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH J. CALDWELL, Jr.,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
St. Augustine, Fla., July 7, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 2, 1969 advising me regarding a recent United States Court of Appeals decision.

I am forwarding your letter to the Director of Selective Service, National Headquarters, Washington, D.C. for whatever action he deems appropriate, since this matter does not apply to just Florida boards.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. WALL,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Atlanta, Ga., July 7, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: Reference is made to your letter of July 2, 1969.

Since the directive you refer to in your letter was issued by Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey, The Director of Selective Service, Washington, D.C., I am forwarding it to him for whatever action he deems appropriate.

Sincerely,

MIKE Y. HENDRIX,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE,
New Orleans, La., July 9, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of July 2nd concerning registrants who participate in illegal demonstrations.

Please be advised that no evidence has been presented to this Headquarters for considering reclassifications because of illegal demonstrations.

However, as soon as a student has been reported as suspended or expelled from attendance, thereby no longer being entitled to the deferment which he was granted or to further consideration along this line, he will most surely be reclassified the same as any other registrant whose reason for deferment ceases to exist.

Sincerely yours,

LEO W. DAVIS,
Acting State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
CONCORD, N.H., July 8, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: Thank you for your letter and the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

As you probably know, the Selective Service Law and regulations provide that local board members be chosen for their judgment and common sense. The local and appeal board members are the only one who can classify. As State Director, I would be remiss in my duty were I to instruct the local board members on how they should classify.

I am sending a copy of your letter and a copy of the letter to which you refer to the Congressmen from New Hampshire: Congressman James C. Cleveland and Congressman Louis C. Wyman, who, I am sure, you are acquainted with.

We have excellent cooperation between our Senators and Congressmen in New Hampshire.

Very sincerely yours,

PHILLIPS R. HALL,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
NEW YORK, N.Y., July 9, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is in reply to your letters to Local Boards 3 and 4, which

were sent to me for reply. Thanks very much for sending me the decision of the United States Court of Appeals in the case of the National Student Association, Inc. against Lewis B. Hershey. I have heard some talk that there is a possibility that this case might go up on appeal. However, in regard to your inquiry, I would like to say that neither Local Board 3 or 4 has reclassified and ordered any registrant to report for induction as a result of the October 1967 letter of Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey.

I hope this answers your inquiry. I remain,
Sincerely yours,

PAUL AKST,
New York City Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Oklahoma City, Okla., July 8, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: We have received your letter of July 2, 1969.

This headquarters has received information concerning the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, in the case of the National Student Association, Inc., et al., Appellants vs. Lewis B. Hershey, Appellee.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.
Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOPE,
State Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 2, 1969, enclosing a copy of the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals concerning the letter from Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey.

I very much appreciate your taking the time to send this copy to me and I have advised all those local boards in my jurisdiction of the court's decision.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. MARTIN,
District of Columbia Director.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Cheyenne, Wyo., July 7, 1969.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: This is to acknowledge receipt of your July 2, 1969, letter pertaining to General Hershey's letter of October 26, 1967. Your letter has been referred to the General Counsel, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., for an appropriate response.

Yours very truly,

JACK P. BRUBAKER,
State Director.

NARCOTICS CONTROL

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week we received a message from the President of the United States on the subject of narcotics control. It appeared as though we were going to receive a number of legislative proposals to deal with an extraordinarily vexing problem that affects millions of people, hundreds of thousands of whom are presently narcotic addicts using heroin and millions of people using other forms of drugs. And I was shocked today, Mr. Speaker, to learn from reading the press that the President has advised us through the press and through

the Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, that there will be no new or significant legislative proposals coming over to this House.

Surely the administration's concern about the drug abuse problem calls for something more than merely submitting legislation to this House which reorganizes existing laws.

I am disappointed by this clear gap between rhetoric and performance. This Congress must now assume the initiative in seeing to it that the American people get the facts, not the rhetoric, about drugs and drug abuse.

THE ASTRONAUTS' TRIP TO THE MOON

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, On this historic occasion let us recall the words Will Rogers wrote on May 20, 1927:

No attempt at jokes today. An old, slim, tall, bashful, smiling American boy is somewhere out over the middle of the Atlantic Ocean, where no lone human being has ever ventured before. He is being prayed for to every kind of supreme being that has a following. . . . Every flyer that ever flies the Atlantic again will just be an imitation of Charles Lindbergh.

That quote could be applied today to a young man named Neil Armstrong, and his associates.

CURBING INFLATION THROUGH SAVINGS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, before the first of the week, I propose to introduce legislation to extend the surtax tables with the provision that all surtax collections be deposited in a special trust account in the Treasury, identifiable to the taxpayer and that the Treasury be directed to issue bonds representing the amount withheld from each individual taxpayer.

It is no secret that a further extension of the surtax collection will be asked before the end of this month. The leadership of the other body has already announced that no action on the surtax itself will be taken until after Labor Day.

In lieu of the extension of the tax collection being sneaked in the back door as an amendment to some unknown excise tax measure—like the heptanoic acid and crude chicory roots expedient—I propose that we face the problem honestly.

Taxpayers have been told repeatedly that extension of the surtax is not necessary for financing Government programs, but only needed to remove excess money from the pockets of the American people, as an aid in curbing inflation.

My bill is designed to accomplish that end. And, in addition, it will provide a savings for our productive taxpayers and prove educational in promoting the pur-

chase of Government bonds through payroll deduction plans.

My bill will provide:

For extending surtax collection tables to July 31, 1970;

That all moneys withheld representing surtax will be paid into a special trust account in the Treasury;

That IRS be directed to prepare forms so that moneys withheld can be identified by individual taxpayers when returns are prepared;

That the Treasury be directed to issue bonds—full faith and credit of the United States—representing amounts so withheld at interest computed as follows:

That the Treasury be directed to draw on trust funds for short-term borrowing at bid rate of interest—now about 7 percent;

That the bonds redeemable with interest on August 1, 1970—or at such time prior thereto as the President, by proclamation, suspends collection of the surtax.

I urge our colleagues to join in enacting good-faith legislation for a period of 1 year which will allow the administration time to adjust its spending program to its own budget and cure the real problem causing inflation—that is, extravagant Government spending.

I propose, however, that the money taken out of circulation from the taxpayer be only temporarily withheld—and to prevent the Government from spending it. When the need for removing it from circulation has ceased, in the judgment of the President, we would end the surtax collection and repay the funds so withheld to the same individuals from whom the money was collected, together with interest, at the actual rate which the Treasury is required to pay for short-term bank borrowing.

Using this approach we are keeping faith with the working people of America, who are the only ones being forced to sacrifice their money in the fight to curb inflation.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) the program for the remainder of this week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding that the program for Thursday will consist of H.R. 7491, a bill to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 8261, a bill dealing with the acquisition of control of air carriers, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate and making in order the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, both

of which have been previously announced.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is hoped that these two bills will be brought up and concluded tomorrow?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that both of these bills are programmed and will be brought up. It is hoped that they can be concluded in order that we may adjourn over until Monday at the conclusion of Thursday's business.

A GREAT DAY FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, a lot of different adjectives will be used to describe this day. It will be called historic, glorious, courageous, and adventurous. Without a doubt it will become a great day for America. It was my privilege to serve on the House Space Committee—and to support the space program—at the time President Kennedy announced his intention to put a man on the moon during the 1960's. All of us today have lived to see the dream come true. It is sad and unfortunate that the man who planned this journey to the moon did not live to see it completed.

Today we lead the world in space achievement. We responded to the challenge of sputnik in October 1957 and have surpassed the Russians' efforts. We now enjoy the prestige value of being the leader in the space race. Yet it is my considered opinion the time has come to slow down the program because of other objectives with higher priority.

To be at the Cape today would be like seeing Columbus off in 1492. I regret I could not be there but I felt I could not accept the invitation of NASA because I had opposed this year's authorization in the honest belief that we should not attempt further planetary exploration at this time.

When our astronauts succeed on Monday, July 21, to set foot on the moon, it will be one of man's most outstanding achievements. It will be the most ambitious and certainly the most courageous effort man ever attempted. Our good wishes, our hopes, and our prayers ride with our astronauts in the days ahead.

NEIL ARMSTRONG, ASTRONAUT FROM OHIO

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are proud of the crew of Apollo 11. However, when Neil Armstrong was named to be the first man to set foot on the moon, Ohioans were particularly pleased and elated as he was one of them. Neil, as you know, Mr. Speaker, comes from Wapakoneta, Ohio. With today's successful launching of Apollo 11, all Ohioans are rejoicing and saluting Neil Armstrong and wishing him well on his trip to the moon. In so doing, they are

not forgetting the other two brave men, Col. Edwin Aldrin, Jr., and Col. Michael Collins, riding with him on this history-making flight. Their prayers and best wishes are with all of them.

SALUTE TO APOLLO 11

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Apollo 11 is on the way, carrying with it a courageous crew, the diligent efforts of thousands, and the hopes and prayers of millions.

On a day such as this the collective chests of all Americans puff out a little farther, hearts beat a bit faster and, for a time at least, we put aside our differences to become linked by the common bond of pride and accomplishment.

Let the word go out that on this day, July 16, 1969, an American rocket, carrying not a warhead of death, but a message of peace, has split the heavens to reassert to the world the American belief that a free people, joined together in a representative republic, with the help of God, can indeed perform miracles.

I believe all Members join me in congratulating all who had a part in this great adventure, especially the American taxpayer who made it possible; and we wish good luck, Godspeed, and a safe voyage all the way to Michael Collins, Neil Armstrong, and Edwin Aldrin.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT OBLIGATE ITSELF TO PROGRAMS THAT CANNOT BE FUNDED

(Mr. BEALL of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, as a member of the Maryland General Assembly, I had the opportunity to vote for one of the country's most progressive attacks on the problem of water pollution. At that time Maryland became a partner with the Federal Government under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. Water quality standards were adopted for all the waters of the State and standards and plans for the implementation of policies were approved by the Secretary of Interior. The plan required that all municipalities in Maryland arrange financing and have under construction by 1971 the most advanced sewage purification works available through current technology. It seemed as though our State was well on its way to combating one of the Nation's most persistent and serious problems.

However, there was one dark spot in this otherwise encouraging picture. Some of those opposing the plan as it progressed through the general assembly pointed to the reliance being placed on the Federal Government to hold up its end of the bargain. The State was committing itself to expenditures of many millions of dollars on the premise that

the Federal Government would contribute its share on schedule. The doubters were assured that the Federal Government would produce when called upon, but, Mr. Speaker, it turns out that this was an empty promise.

And so, what do we find in Maryland now? We find that if Congress appropriates the amount of money recommended in the fiscal 1970 budget we will be getting about one-eighth of the amount needed to comply with the approved plan. We find that even if this appropriation is magnified 5 times, it will still fall far short of what has been promised and authorized to States such as Maryland which in good faith relied on the Federal authorities. As a result, because we have planned and cooperated with the Federal Government, our State is in serious financial trouble in this area of concern. At the time of enactment, State authorities were led to believe that they would receive \$57.5 million for the fiscal years 1968 through 1971. Instead we can now expect only one-quarter of that amount or \$14 million. We can, therefore, expect our sanitary facilities fund to go broke in early fiscal 1970 unless this appropriation is increased.

This is but one, of what has become an increasing number of programs passed by Congress with glowing press notices only to turn out to be an empty shell of legislation. Unless we reverse this trend and begin to realize that it is totally irresponsible to provide this seed money and these seed promises to prod States into action, only to find the necessary financial support missing, we are going to erode the confidence of most of our citizens in this Government.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming months of this session, I hope that we can keep examples such as this one in our minds in considering the proposals that come before us. We must look to the costs of these programs and we must look at the costs over long periods of time before we make a commitment. Authorizations not followed by appropriations have put States in financial difficulties and I think Congress has an obligation to be more careful in committing itself to programs that cannot be funded.

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE DURWARD G. HALL AT THE DEDICATION OF THE RALPH FOSTER MUSEUM

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, recently, my friend and colleague, the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, spoke at the dedication of the Ralph Foster Museum, located in the School of the Ozarks at Point Lookout, Mo.

In his remarks Congressman HALL made some observations regarding the amount of violence on our Nation's campuses this past year, and discussed some of the reasons why he thought it had occurred.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor I include this speech as a part of the Record, and

recommend its reading to the Members of this body:

REMARKS BY HON. DURWARD G. HALL, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE RALPH FOSTER MUSEUM, SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS, POINT LOOKOUT, MO., JULY 5, 1969

Victor Hugo once described responsible progress as, "The onward stride of God." Surely the evidence of both God and progress, is in our midst today.

It is most heartening to stand in this wing, The Ralph Foster Last Frontier Museum named in honor of my good friend who first taught me how to float fish, and view the culmination of years of search and study, of patience and perseverance. It is good to know, that men like Ralph Foster are still around. Men who have dwelt in the past, but live in the present, and continually look to the future.

This museum, located in the "Shepherd of the Hills" country, will become a mecca for the *Scholar* as well as the casual visitor, for here will be found much to study and enjoy. Indian artifacts from central America as well as our own midwest, including many pieces of great interest from the Spiro mounds of Oklahoma.

Items from the bluff shelters overlooking the White River of Missouri and Arkansas, rescued before the inundation.

The renowned *Cameo Collection* of Mr. and Mrs. Ed Smith of St. Louis.

The Sergeant John Butler *Coin Collection*, a treasure of more than 100,000 items of numismatics.

The original Kewpie Moulds, which produced the noted Kewpie dolls of Rose O'Neil, a doll which was to become as much a part of Americana as the Saturday night bath. Its creator came to be heralded as one of the world's most beautiful women, (a fact not disputed by those of us with good fortune to visit with her at Bonniebrook), and, it was Rose O'Neil, who, while living in New York, was the inspiration for the song, "The Rose of Washington Square."

In sharp contrast to the great beauty of Rose O'Neil, is the weapons display, featuring the frontier colt and holster of "Poker Alice", the cigar smoking, poker playing, toughest female gambler ever spawned.

It's been said, that just before Alice died, while on the operating table at the age of 79, she said to the surgeon: "go ahead and operate doc, it's all in the draw."

People like "Poker Alice," Rose O'Neil, the James Brothers, Teddy Roosevelt, and U. S. Grant are all here. Places like Pea Ridge, Wilson's Creek, and Gettysburg are also represented, helping to bring alive and make ever more interesting, the *past*; to be handled with loving care, treasured and preserved, and displayed in beautiful surroundings.

What more fitting place could be found for this museum, than the campus of this fine school.

What a contrast the school of the Ozarks provides with the present-day image of some of our nation's larger schools of learning, where the process of education has at times given way to the point of a gun. Where structures are burned and not builded. Where a small minority will worship a red clenched fist, instead of the God who made us all. Where permissiveness has given way to chaos, and the list of college presidents who have resigned, as a result, now totals more than 80. Pecky-pecky-pecky—weak kneed, not motivated by faith, and steeped in fear.

I think we can safely say, that proper disagreement and dissent are stimulating, but disorder and disruption are *illegal*. No institution can function on a basis of either law or democracy, if the administration of justice is made *selective*, with the rules waived, by weak administrators, on behalf of

a coercive few! Forcible takeover of campus buildings by *any* group, should be regarded as grounds for immediate suspension, and a public or private college president should refuse to negotiate with any such group.

Available statistics tend to point up the fact that all that is bad on the Nation's campuses today, cannot necessarily be blamed on the educational system, but must also be laid at the doorstep of a lack of parental care and discipline in the home.

Be that as it may, the fact is, that the education of the youth of America *must* continue unabated, and not be allowed to be brought to a halt by the efforts of the self-proclaimed Marxist-Leninist oriented, so-called Students for a Democratic Society, or for that matter, any other group.

On June 17th, President Nixon sent to the Congress a proposal to deal with campus unrest. It would permit college administrators to seek an injunction in Federal court against any student or group either planning, or actually involved, in violent actions; and it would amend the present law on withholding grants and loans to students involved in campus disturbances. It would give college officials full authority to determine whether a student has been involved in a serious disruption of campus life and should, therefore, lose Federal aid.

The people of America are disturbed about the forces working against this country today. Letter after letter comes into my office protesting the willful vandalism being perpetrated on many of our college campuses. I predict, that if the administrators of our Nation's colleges do not meet this challenge head on, the Congress will be forced to act.

It is axiomatic, that while I speak of campus chaos, here at the school of the Ozarks there is calm. While I talk of disruption, I see noting but unity, and while I refer to a lack of discipline, here there is compatibility. The school of the Ozarks could well serve as a model for those who search for an answer to the problems confronting our educational system in 1969. I know that across the land over 98% of all students are lawful, dedicated, and responsibly progressive, but I'm concerned with the moral stamina, will, and mores of a whole people who will let such a minority upset the whole.

Here at Point Lookout, in a part of the world that I like to describe to my fellow members in Congress as "God's Country", is a school created specifically as an institution of learning, where boys and girls with limited means, but will to *do*, can work for the education that will give them an equal or better start with others of their generation. I might add, that this has been accomplished with funds given by people who *care*, not by those with their hands out, expecting the Federal Government to be their mother, father, landlord and teacher, as well as their "big brother."

I've tramped these hills and watched this school grow since 1917. I've watched it emerge from a chinked-up log cabin, to the well-planned campus of today. I was here at the dedication of the magnificent chapel and bell tower. I was here at the dedication of the post office. I've happily and lovingly served my tenure as physician to the students. I've watched in awe at the creation of a four-year college, and beheld in wonderment the accreditation of that college by the North Central Association before its first class ever graduated, a feat claimed by no other like institution. I've basked in the wisdom and counsel of Doctor Good and Doctor Clark, and I have shared in the countless blessings that have heaped upon all those who have been a part of this segment of God's plan, indeed his great commission.

It is with justifiable pride that I have returned to this campus today, to help dedicate this fine wing named in honor of a man who exemplifies all that is good in America. Every piece of memorabilia found in this

museum will contain a little part of Ralph Foster, for every piece here, has played an important part in his life.

Ralph's generosity could very well be described in the words of William Penn who wrote: "I expect to pass through life but once—if, therefore, there be any kindness I can show, or any good thing I can do to any fellow being, let me do it now, and not defer or neglect it, as I shall not pass this way again."

Thank you Ralph Foster. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

HIGHWAY SAFETY: COMMENTARY NO. 8

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Subcommittee on Roads, of which I am a member, of the Public Works Committee, was privileged to have Dr. Robert Brenner testify regarding the effects of the 1966 Highway Safety Act. Dr. Brenner, who is the Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, provided a good deal of expert information regarding highway safety and the "need to turn people on to safety."

I want at this time to include for the benefit of my colleagues the following excerpt from Dr. Brenner's testimony.

Progress is being made—but clearly not enough. The motorcycle statistics indicate what can be done. Dr. Brenner testified that lack of funding has hampered his efforts. His statement is a thoughtful and challenging one—based on careful analysis and well worth reading by those concerned with all aspects of the problem of highway safety.

The excerpt follows:

EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNTERMEASURES

Despite the discouraging data for 1968, there are some encouraging indications that the programs initiated by the Department under the broad mandate of the law are beginning to take hold. In the 5 years preceding the passage of the two safety laws, highway deaths were increasing at an average of 6.9 percent each year. In the two years following passage of the law, this measure was down to a 2.3 percent annual average increase even though vehicle registration and mileage were up 6.4 percent and 8.6 percent.

Another very promising indicator, derived from data obtained from one insurance company covering four widely separated States, is that a sharp reduction is taking place in the number of casualties per crash. For example, while the number of crashes and casualties increased slightly in Illinois during the first 7 month period of 1968, casualties per crash were down 3 percent.

This downturn in the number of casualties per crash is particularly significant to the Bureau in light of the general approach it adopted in organizing for implementation of the Congressional mandate to bring the problem under control. The problem clearly was highway deaths and injuries, and the challenge was to bring about sizeable reductions in these totals—by whatever means worked best and most quickly. Stated simply, our goal is to reduce traffic injuries and deaths. To meet this goal we have identified three principal parts of an all-out attack on the problem:

First, we try to work to reduce those factors that cause crashes to occur.

Second, we are working on ways that, once

a crash occurs, will give the vehicle driver and his passengers a better chance of escaping without serious injuries.

Third, we are doing things that will better the chances of the already injured people to later recover. Let me give some examples of this three-part effort to reduce traffic deaths and injuries.

In the first, or accident avoidance attack on the problem, we are working on safety standards which will improve the manufacture of tires. If we lessen the chances of tire failures while driving, we are lessening the chances of a crash. Better designed highways, such as the interstate system of highways, also reduce the chances of a crash—in fact about halving the rate of traffic accidents on some of the older rural roads. Proper driver education and licensing are among our most important crash prevention programs under the Highway Act. But getting after the problem of drinking and driving is another, if not the most vitally important, crash prevention effort, and countermeasures aimed at reducing the incidence of drinking and driving are among our most important crash prevention programs.

To deal with the second, or crash phase of an accident a number of things have been done. This is to give people a better chance of walking away unharmed from a crash. One Federal standard requires that steering columns collapse on impact in a crash so that they do not spear you through the chest. Another standard requires that windshields be made to cushion and resist penetration of the head striking it in a crash.

But the best known crash protection feature is the safety belt—both lap and upper torso types now required in all new cars by the safety regulations we have issued. There is absolutely no doubt that safety belts provide a great deal of protection if used—and I repeat—if used. Some studies show that minor injuries have been reduced by about 30 percent and fatal injuries by about 80 percent through the use of combination lap belts and shoulder harness. Even for only lap belts, the death rate per crash is only 60 percent of the death rate for occupants who do not wear such belts.

In short, this is a proven lifesaving device. But we even have problems with it, for it is one thing to require seat belts in every new car, but it is another matter to get people to wear them. Perhaps only about 25 percent to 30 percent of the occupants are using seat belts even when they are available. Manufacturers now are required to equip all new cars with these lifesaving safety belts; but we cannot force people to wear them—this is up to the individual. In this regard in a recent talk to some teenagers I placed this question before them.

"So I ask you—the new generation of drivers—what do you think should be done to 'turn people on' to using proven lifesaving features?"

Let me cite another example of the need to "turn people on to safety." We strongly support and urge helmets for motorcyclists. And this is not based on guesswork either. In 1965 and 1966, the death toll increased by 35 percent in each year. During this period only three States had laws requiring helmets to be worn by motorcycle drivers and riders and we, therefore, urged the States to pass laws requiring that helmets be worn by motorcyclists.

In the two years following the issuance of our standards calling for motorcyclist head protection, 37 States passed laws requiring helmets. Many States also passed laws which require motorcyclists to take special tests before they can get a permit to operate a motorcycle. In the States where the new laws passed, a remarkable decrease took place in the number of motorcycle death rates—as much as 30 percent in some States. By comparison, some States which do not have these protection and special licensing requirements

showed a very sharp increase in motorcycle crash deaths for the same period.

Let's take a look at those statistics again—from a whopping 35 percent increase in motorcyclist deaths without the safety laws to a 30 percent decrease in these deaths when the laws were passed.

Considering this 65 percent swing in motorcyclist death reductions with motorcyclist safety laws it is difficult to comprehend that no less than 10 States and the District of Columbia still have no motorcyclist safety laws. It is even more difficult to comprehend that legislation has been introduced in several States to repeal motorcyclist safety laws already on the books!

Returning now to the third part of our three-part attack on reducing traffic deaths. Once people are injured in a crash, their chances of living and later full recovery depends directly on how quickly they receive proper medical attention. We are told that while something less than seven minutes goes by from the instant one of our men is wounded in Vietnam to the time medical attention gets to him, in contrast, 45 minutes is the average time it takes to get medical attention to an injured motorist on the Shirley Highway. In many rural areas of the country, hours may go by while an injured motorist lays dying waiting for medical attention to reach him.

Various types of emergency helicopter service patterned after the techniques developed in Vietnam are now being tried out with Bureau assistance in a number of States:

California, Nebraska, Arizona, Minnesota, Michigan, New York; one of the most important is now pending in Mississippi. We also are working on better systems of radio communication for calling for medical aid—for obviously we have to communicate the need for medical help before it can be dispatched.

These are only a few of the procedures now under development, and which in the years to come will give people a better chance of coming out of vehicle crashes with only minor injuries. The fact that the number of casualties per crash is coming down is a clear indication that the crash survivability phase of our program is working.

These are exciting safety possibilities that we are sure will save life and reduce injuries. But we are even more sure that the best way to avoid injuries still is to stay out of an accident. This adds up to one overriding fact—the overwhelming necessity for programs directed toward crash avoidance, toward the driver and those who would mix alcohol and driving. Because cars and roads are becoming safer all the time doesn't remove one iota of responsibility off the shoulders of any driver—teenager or adult—for safe driving. And the need for a systematic comprehensive approach on the full three-part attack on the problem has never been greater.

PROPOSAL TO CHANGE DEFINITION OF "AMMUNITION"

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

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Gun Control Act of 1968 became law, a cumbersome set of regulations were imposed upon American sportsmen. Under the present law and regulations the Congress and the Treasury Department have imposed upon all buyers of firearms and ammunition a clear-cut case of registration. Some will argue that this is not registration but under section 922 of the Gun Control Act you will find it states, and I quote:

It shall be unlawful for any licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer or licensed collector to sell or deliver any firearm or ammunition to any person unless the licensee notes in his record—

Required to be kept pursuant to section 923—

the name, age, and place of residence of such person if the person is an individual—or the identity and principal and local place of business of such person if the person is a corporation or other business entity.

Under section 923 the law reads:

Each licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, licensed dealer, and licensed collector shall maintain such records of importation, disposition, of firearms and ammunition at such place, for such period, and in such form, as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

To my way of thinking the Treasury Department has grossly misinterpreted the intent of Congress when it passed the gun control law and has set up what amounts to a de facto or back-door form of registration. The regulations issued by the Secretary call for the following:

First, date; second, manufacturer; third, caliber, gage, or type of component; fourth, quantity; fifth, name; sixth, address; seventh, date of birth; eighth, mode of identification, driver's license—other specify.

This certainly adds up to registration to me and there are a lot of people who will agree with me on this. Yet, Congress very definitely defeated an amendment last year that would provide for gun licensing and registration.

It could be argued that the Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to set up these regulations under section 923 but under section 922 the Secretary is told precisely what shall be required in the sale of ammunition. These include only name, age, and place of residence. Anything more than this—and the Secretary's regulations do require more—amounts to registration of the person, his ammunition, and his firearm. That is why I am introducing today a bill that will change the definition of "ammunition" in the Gun Control Act of 1968 so that shotgun shells, metallic ammunition suitable for use only in rifles or any .22 caliber rimfire ammunition would be exempted from the Treasury regulation. To force registration on folks buying this kind of ammunition will not cut down on the incidence of crime. The average criminal will not purchase this ammunition or will he seek to get it through the proper channels.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation will not only restore to the sportsman and law-abiding citizen the freedom to once again purchase the necessary ammunition without harassment but it will also serve to curb the bureaucratic excesses which have arisen under the regulations imposed by the Treasury Department. I ask your support on behalf of our sportsmen and the business men who have been carrying on under a heavy burden of redtape and clerical details.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore entered in my behalf for this afternoon be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICARE FOR MEXICO AND CANADA?

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I discussed the problem facing American citizens who are covered by medicare, but not while out of the country. I discussed my proposal to permit coverage for senior citizens in our neighboring countries—Mexico and Canada.

Today, I received a copy of a letter that was sent to Senator GEORGE MURPHY of California, by Mr. Allen Gleasner who resides in Guadalajara, Mexico. Mr. Gleasner offers some sound reasons as to why H.R. 8926, my bill to extend medicare to American citizens living or traveling in Mexico or Canada, should be passed. He explains that because medical costs are cheaper in Mexico, it could lead to savings on the part of U.S. taxpayers. Mr. Gleason also suggests that if this bill were passed, it might mean a lessening of the crowded conditions that exist in some U.S. hospitals.

I offer this letter as additional evidence for the need that exists for legislation in this area:

GUADALAJARA, JALISCO, MEXICO,
July 10, 1969.

HON. GEORGE MURPHY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Several thousand American citizens residing in Mexico and particularly in Guadalajara, join me in requesting you to do all in your power to extend medicare to cover us during our residence here.

Most of us are recipients of modest annuities or pensions and can ill afford to travel to the United States to receive needed medical attention.

I am enclosing a clipping from the Mexico City News with some of the pertinent facts underlined.

The savings to be realized to the U.S. taxpayers, which includes ourselves, are indeed great inasmuch as a first class hospital private room and bath ranges from \$6.40 to \$16.00 per day which of course includes meals and professional nursing care, compared to U.S. hospitals at \$45.00 a day in a four bed ward.

The medical profession compares very favorably with that in the U.S. In fact the local University of Medicine has many students enrolled to obtain their training due to the crowded conditions in the U.S. Medical Schools.

We read and hear on the radio about the crowded conditions in the U.S. hospitals, if medicare were extended to cover U.S. Citizens residing in Mexico I am sure it would help to alleviate this problem and be of assistance to us as well as the U.S. residents.

All of us here are paying U.S. Income Taxes as well as paying for medicare for which we receive nothing, not even a chance to vote in a Presidential Election.

We all urgently request you to support Rep. Cleveland's Bill H.R. 8926 to extend medicare coverage to Mexico.

I am a former resident of California and an ardent supporter of you and the Party you represent.

Yours very truly,

ALLEN G. GLEASNER.

BRITT FRANKLIN SHARES HIS FEELINGS IN HIS "JOURNAL"

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

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that just about all of us at some time, when enjoying our beautiful scenic splendors, can find a few choice words of expression that can be stirringly emotional and deserve a cherished place in our stored-up memories of times well spent.

However, while this is true, I find it almost incredible that a young man who is serving his country in Vietnam can still find time to reflect on his love of home, God, and nature and his comments can provoke in us a further awareness of the extreme beauty of serenity and fulfillment of life that we take so much for granted here.

Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues the article from the Bulloch Herald of Statesboro, Ga., about Air Force 2d Lt. Britt Franklin.

Lieutenant Franklin's journal is indeed thought provoking and I sincerely commend it to your attention:

BRITT FRANKLIN SHARES HIS FEELINGS IN HIS "JOURNAL"

Britt Franklin, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl Franklin of Statesboro, is hoping to be home for Christmas Day, 1969.

He missed being home for Christmas Day, 1968, for you see he was sent to Viet Nam by the U.S. Air Force in December and arrived at Nha Trang Air Force Base in South Viet Nam on that Christmas Eve.

Britt graduated from the University of Georgia in June of 1968 with an ROTC Commission. Following his graduation he worked with the U.S. Forestry Department for a short period and then entered the Armed Forces and was attached to the Air Force Intelligence at Denver, Colorado.

Second Lieut. Franklin is now stationed in Viet Nam and is doing duty with the Air Force Intelligence.

Since arriving in Viet Nam he has been keeping a "journal" and recently he shared some of these thoughts with his family.

Here are some of the things he's recorded.

"Wanta know what I miss?" My family, my home and friends. These are always on my mind, but my heart cries always for the freedom I enjoyed in Georgia, Colorado, Wyoming. I miss the little things—like the whirl of the wind thru the pines—the lonely way of broom sage—and me—just me—sharing the land with an open day—and God. Just wandering around the oak ridges carrying the old 12 gauge down thru a bottom—the evergreen tangle of galberries, mingled maddeningly with—and the sharp pain of a mistaken encounter with the bamboo briar.

"What a magnificent experience to walk along—alone or with friends and the dog "Ruff" around the glens—so full of essence of eternity itself—yet I cannot tell what eternity is, let alone put it on paper the feeling inside when I lean against a tree and sweep my eyes across the gently rolling, sandy hills—observe the wavy texture of the wire grass spreading across the ridges.

With the pine and scrubby oak mingled haphazardly throughout. And it's best if there's wind and clouds—the wind makes the grass shimmer, the trees move as with a new life—what does the wind say? Listen to that song—the song of freedom—of a full heart and the pride that comes from being an American—how to explain this burning inside? The clouds viewed thru the trees, they

give a dreamy turbulence to the scene—the rolling, boiling seems to swirl the tree limbs, rocking the tops with trembles and swaying.

"Up and going again—down on the old road once used to haul logs from the woods, past the decaying sawdust pile—lying silent for so many years—the home for ants, termites—Down further still, enter the run of Ten Mile Creek—here the galberries, the briars and the grapevine are at the height of their madness—blackgum, sweetgum, water oak tower overhead, their upper branches bare of leaves but heavy with the succulent mistletoe—so treasured at the Christmas season. And the famous Ten Mile Creek—here in its upper reaches very small, flowing lazily and very uncaring over white sand—and seeming to stop, deep and black in the pools—what a mystery to sit and stare at the tannen-stained whirlpools eddying around the bared root—and cast a glance into the trees—watch them dance to the slow power of the wind—a squirrel barks noisily down—"leave my place—here is my life and heart." So easy to kill. Raise the gun, take aim on the chattering ball of fur—"naw, what's the use—may be a deer close by—rather have a deer any day."

"Crossing the creek—wet and cold—how delightful to be a part of this! So alone here, yet so close to so many things.

Climbing out of the run—up onto the oak ridges again entering the thickets near our beloved "Duck Pond." Now we stalk quietly—hearing only that never ending wind—and the soft splash of water—getting deeper—a lot of rain lately has filled the road and firebreaks "squish, squish." Also "slosh, slosh." The water deepens—we are in the back edge of the "Duck Pond"—the blackgums and sweetgums grow thick and stunted—the wood ducks love the place—it is five o'clock—another 45 minutes yet—we'll find the place and wait. "Water—cold water, waist deep and chest deep—it doesn't matter. The sun drops lower, the clouds race on before that relentless wind—5:45—soon they'll come—or never—5:55—never. We walked all day, sat in the cold 'til "pitch black dark" watching for a duck—any duck. Nothing, but—Oh, God—what a fulfilling day and what an end!!! Alone in the swamp—perhaps it was this way 10,000 years ago—it's positively primeval to watch the night overpower the last flicker of day—and to listen as the sounds of a winter night settle over our little wilderness.

"We trudge back to the car—a mile, maybe two miles away. Two cold, wet miles—yet how warm we are inside—indeed we are bringing home hearts filled with a love no man can explain—and a knowledge of having been a little closer to God."

GODSPEED

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen I take pride in our space program. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee during the 90th Congress, I salute our gallant, dedicated pioneers in space. As a Representative for the Third Congressional District of Georgia, I congratulate the Armstrong-Collins-Aldrin team on embarking today, this morning, on their momentous journey and we shall pray daily for their success and safe return.

The builders of Apollo 11—Dr. Wernher von Braun, Astronaut Roger Chaffee, the taxpayers, and all who have made their contribution—have been mindful of the challenge, "Too low they build who build beneath the stars."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 1969 Captive Nations Week. July 13 to 19 is the 11th observance of this highly important week. We, in the U.S. Congress, join with millions of our fellow Americans in expressing to the world our firm determination never to forget the freedom aspirations of all the captive nations and to work in every possible manner for the achievement of their eventual liberation from the bondage of Red totalitarianism and Sino-Soviet Russian colonialism. Their fixed objective of national independence and freedom is our objective, and each Captive Nations Week observance stresses this fundamental truth.

The remarkable feature of the annual Captive Nations Week is its steady growth and expansion from year to year. As countless of our fellow citizens come to learn the long list of captive nations, dating back to 1920, the more they are impressed by the significance and importance of the week. Following the leadership of several of our Presidents, our State Governors and our mayors also proclaim the week, urging our citizens to dedicate themselves anew to the study of all the captive nations.

Under the guidance of the National Captive Nations Committee of Washington, D.C., State and local committees have been formed in practically all large States and major cities to observe the annual week. Moreover, the week has attracted the attention of numerous foreign countries so that in the Republic of China, South Korea, the Philippines, West Germany, Turkey, and elsewhere Captive Nations Week is being appropriately observed and free Asian parliaments are being asked to pass similar Captive Nations Week resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, there are already several concrete lessons that can be drawn from these annual observances. I summarize them in this fashion:

First, by their consistent opposition to and vehement castigation of Captive Nations Week, Moscow, Peking, and the lesser lights in the Red empire have shown since 1959 their fear of the total captive nations concept as reflected in Public Law 86-90;

Second, the growth and development of Captive Nations Week in this country and abroad have demonstrated the deepened understanding on the part of our people and others of the basic and fundamental importance of all the captive nations to our national security and that of the free world;

Third, our concentrated support of all the captive nations, including necessarily the dozen in the Soviet Union itself, is one of our most powerful non-military deterrents against further overt Sino-Soviet Russian aggression and a prime, formidable force for peace with freedom and justice in the world;

Fourth, a broad area of detailed work still remains to be done in exposing the complete breadth and depth of Sino-

Soviet Russian impericolonialism so that once and for all the peoples of the world will know and never forget who the real imperialists and colonialists are, so that the full impact of world opinion will fall heavily on the two last remaining impericolonialist centers; namely and solely, Moscow and Peking; and

Fifth, to open the full vista of this area and to prepare the ground for this vital work, a Special House Captive Nations Committee becomes more urgent, more necessary, more indispensable with the passing of every day. On this commemorative occasion, I again call upon the Rules Committee to at least vote on the measures which have been submitted to create this desperately needed committee. I again ask the members of that committee to begin with my own, House Resolution 102.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following material:

Proclamations by Gov. Russell W. Peterson, of Delaware; Gov. Warren E. Hearnes, of Missouri; Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, of Maine; Gov. Preston Smith, of Texas; Gov. David F. Cargo, of New Mexico; Mayor John V. Morris, of my hometown of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, of Baltimore; Mayor James L. Rogers, of Wheeling, W. Va.; Mayor Carmen J. Armenti, of Trenton, N.J.; Mayor Anthony B. Flask, of Youngstown, Ohio; Mayor Carl B. Stokes, of Cleveland, Ohio; Mayor Henry W. Maier, of Milwaukee, Wis.

Also, an article on the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution by Dr. Lev E. Bobriansky of Georgetown University that appeared in the summer issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly of 1969; an article on Captive Nations Week and the National Captive Nations Committee that appeared in the edition of Saturday, July 5, 1969, of Svoboda, the Ukrainian Daily; and an article from the Ukrainian Catholic Daily of Thursday, July 3, 1969, on the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week resolution, and a statement by the Women for Freedom, Inc., July 1969, on Captive Nations Week.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. RUSSELL W. PETERSON, OF DELAWARE, IN OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Communist imperialism has enslaved a substantial portion of the world's population, creating a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations, and constituting a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other countries.

It is vital to our national security that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of these peoples be kept alive, as this desire is a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a lasting peace.

Because the peoples of these subjected nations look to the United States for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence, a joint resolution of the Congress (PL86-90) has designated the third week in July as a time during which Americans are encouraged to join in demonstrations of support of the just aspirations of all captive peoples.

Accordingly, it is a privilege as Governor of the State of Delaware to join with the

President and Congress, in designating the week of July 13-19 as Captive Nations Week and urge all Delawareans to participate in appropriate ceremonies proving to those enslaved people that we uphold their cherished desire to be free.

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF
MISSOURI

Whereas, all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

Whereas, these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

Whereas, Missouri has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

Whereas, it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of Missouri to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of independence and human freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Warren E. Hearnes, Governor of the State of Missouri, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week and invite the people of Missouri to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Missouri, in the City of Jefferson, this 11th day of June, 1969.

WARREN E. HEARNES,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF MAINE

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the State of Maine, and call upon the citizens of Maine to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta, and sealed with the Great Seal of the State of Maine, this first day of July, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-nine, and of the Inde-

pendence of the United States of America, the One Hundred and Ninety-third.

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM BY PRESTON SMITH,
GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

AUSTIN, TEXAS.

Greetings:

In its thrust toward world domination, communist imperialism has deprived many millions of people of Central and Eastern Europe, Asia and even the Western Hemisphere of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Silenced, but unconquered, these people will never cease to struggle for their inalienable right to a free life.

The national security and well-being of the citizens of the United States is dependent on the continued desire for liberty and justice on the part of the peoples of these captive nations.

By action of Congress, the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week. It is fitting that we observe this period in tribute to the fight for freedom and in recognition of the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world.

Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of July 13-19, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in Texas.

In official recognition whereof, I hereby affix my signature this 3rd day of July, 1969

PRESTON SMITH,
Governor of Texas.

PROCLAMATION OF THE STATE OF NEW
MEXICO

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I David F. Cargo, Governor of the State of New Mexico, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13-19, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in New Mexico.

Done at the executive office this 30th day of June, 1969.

Witness my hand and the Great Seal of the State of New Mexico.

DAVID F. CARGO,
Governor.

Attest:

ERNESTINE D. EVANS,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF WILKES-BARRE,
PA.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Ru-

mania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, John V. Morris, Mayor of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Wilkes-Barre, and call upon the citizens of Wilkes-Barre to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

J. V. MORRIS,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN
BALTIMORE

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week, and inviting the peoples of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas J. D'Alesandro, III, mayor of the City of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" in Baltimore, and call upon the citizens of Baltimore to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Baltimore to be affixed this first day of July, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

THOMAS J. ALESANDRO III,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK
IN WHEELING, W. VA.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, James L. Rogers, Mayor of Wheeling, West Virginia, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Wheeling, West Virginia, and call upon the citizens of Wheeling to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

JAMES L. ROGERS,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN
TRENTON, N.J.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Carmen J. Armenti, Mayor of the City of Trenton, New Jersey, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as: Captive Nations Week in Trenton, and call upon the citizens of Trenton to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of

oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the City of Trenton this 7th day of July, 1969.

CARMEN J. ARMENTI,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF YOUNGSTOWN

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Anthony B. Flask, as Mayor of the City of Youngstown, Ohio, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as "Captive Nations Week" and call upon the citizens of this community to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and cause the Seal of the City of Youngstown, Ohio to be affixed.

ANTHONY B. FLASK, Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"
IN THE CITY OF CLEVELAND

Whereas, by act of the United States Congress and by Proclamation of the President of the United States the 10th Anniversary of Captive Nations Week will be observed July 13-19, 1969, by millions of our citizens throughout our nation as well as those of 17 other Nations in the Free World; and

Whereas, Captive Nations Week provides an occasion for all Clevelanders to show their friends, relatives and allies in 27 Nations, subjugated to enslavement through direct aggression by the imperialist forces and policies of Communist Soviet Union, that they have not been forgotten; and

Whereas, the oppressed and enslaved people of the Captive Nation look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about and restoring to them, their religious freedoms and individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is the Prayer and hope of us all as we commemorate the 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, that it will be the Will of the Creator, that all peoples of all Captive Nations, again will enjoy full liberty, complete freedom and rejoin their places in the family of Free Nations.

Now, therefore, I, Carl B. Stokes, as Mayor of the City of Cleveland, Ohio do hereby proclaim the week of July 13-19, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" in Cleveland, and

invite and urge all citizens to give renewed devotions to the aspirations of all people for independence and human liberty.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Corporate Seal of the City of Cleveland to be affixed this 10th day of July 1969.

CARL B. STOKES,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE

Whereas, This year marks the Tenth Anniversary of the enactment by the 86th Congress, in July, 1959, of Public Law 86-90 which designated that the third week of July is to be set aside each year for the observance of Captive Nations Week in order that our citizens may be reminded of the millions of peoples in the countries to Soviet-dominated East-Central Europe who are struggling valiantly to throw off the yoke of oppression so that they may again enjoy the freedoms which should rightfully be theirs; and

Whereas, Events of the past year throughout several of these countries have offered graphic proof that the fires of freedom are still burning brightly in the hearts of the people, many of whom have given concrete evidence of their willingness to sacrifice even life itself in their intense desire to regain the rights which are their heritage; and

Whereas, We who take our freedom for granted have a solemn obligation to assure these captive peoples that they have our moral support and encouragement in their struggles against overwhelming odds, especially since we know that their desire for liberty and independence constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and offers one of mankind's brightest hopes for a just and lasting peace;

Now, therefore, I, Henry W. Maier, Mayor of Milwaukee, do hereby join with governmental leaders throughout our great country in proclaiming the week of July 13-19, 1969, to be Captive Nations Week in Milwaukee, and I call upon our citizens to reaffirm their faith in the undaunted spirit of the freedom-loving peoples of the nations of East-Central Europe who struggle against Soviet domination. I further urge ethnic groups throughout our city to mark this period with such special observances as they feel are appropriate in order that their friends and relatives living in these countries may be encouraged in their struggle to share again in the blessings of freedom.

HENRY W. MAIER,
Mayor.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTIVE
NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The 1969 Captive Nations Week Observance is the occasion for the Tenth Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution itself. As many know, this politically far-seeing resolution was passed by the United States Congress in July, 1959 and caused a ferment in imperialist Moscow that has continued to express itself in numerous ways down to this day. Ten years ago, headlines read in the vein of "Senators Douglas and Javits Rebutts Khrushchev's Diatribe on Captive Nations Week Resolution." "American Labor Backs Captive Nations Week Resolution." "Resolution Irritates the Bear."¹ In the course of the decade, Moscow and its syndicate members vehemently decried the resolution as "villainous demagoguery," "propaganda spectacle," "a despicable animal campaign," to mention only a few choice phrases.² In 1968, while Moscow was preparing for the rape of Czechoslovakia, a policy of silence was tuned on and, instead, with the blind consent of our Government, Moscow answered the annual observance by

Footnotes at end of article.

pulling off the Moscow-New York air run precisely during the Week. This propaganda stunt, staged a month before the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, made our officials look silly, but it in no way stifled or curbed the expanding observance of the Week, either here or abroad.

On this 10th, if one can look back for a moment, the most significant reaction to the annual Week was registered by Mikhail Suslov on July 17, 1965 in Vilnius, Lithuania. Coinciding with the observance and seizing upon a Russian-staged event in the Baltic, Suslov railed, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But this will never happen!"³ The location was Lithuania, the event was Russia's blessings on the forcible annexation of the three Baltic nations twenty-five years ago, but the meaning of this calculated statement was with application to all the captive nations.

Why does the writer select this reaction over those of Khrushchev, Podgorny and others? For the simple reason that Suslov is the chief Russian ideologist, a member of the Central Committee's Presidium, and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Significantly enough, Suslov has weathered all political storms in the Soviet Union. Lest it be forgotten, he has served on the highest echelon under Stalin, he continued without interruption under Khrushchev, and he remains as a prize asset under Brezhnev and Kosygin. Clearly, Suslov is the thinker and principle of continuity of successive totalitarian regimes in colonialist Moscow. He well knows the psycho-political significance of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, even if some of our leaders and many of our citizens don't. Suslov's memorable position on this expresses that of every totalitarian in the Kremlin.

That Moscow's fixed and obnoxious position on the resolution will again reveal itself in full bloom, there can be no doubt. It will play the game of confetti diplomacy with us and our allies as long as it suits its purposes, and in the process hope that resistance to the permanent captivity of all the nations in the Red Empire, particularly as manifested in the annual Week, will subside. Undoubtedly, it will commit more Czechoslovakian rapes with impunity and blatant disregard for Western interests.⁴ For several years Moscow has been tightening its totalitarianism and imperialist reins within and outside the Soviet Union, building its military strength at an inordinate pace, and intensifying its cold war operations all over the world, including the United States. To think that all this is being done merely to achieve parity with the United States for a deal on division of spheres of influence is a gross misreading of contemporary developments. We will need the captive nations more than ever as our natural allies in the enemy's camp.

Regardless of the insensitivity and even plain ignorance displayed by some of our leaders toward the captive nations movement, this 10th anniversary bridges the end of one decade and the beginning of another. The 60's have seen its expansion both in the United States and abroad. The expansion has been slow but steady, pinpointed and yet generalized, embattled and doubly persevering. In seventeen Free World countries it has taken hold, and its prospects for the next decade, the 70's are brighter than ever. The following resolution passed in Saigon last December exemplifies the spirit, conviction, and dedication that permeate the movement.⁵

"RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 13-19, 1969

"In view of the fact that since 1959—when the U.S. Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed it into Public Law 86-90—All Communist Capitols have bitterly denounced the Annual Week as being inimical to their fundamental interests; and also in view of the fact that to the mounting consternation of Moscow, Peking, Havana and others, the Captive Nations Week Movement has steadily grown in the United States, and every President in this decade has issued a proclamation in behalf of the independence and freedom of every captive nation in Central Europe, the Soviet Union, Asia and Cuba;

"In the belief that the movement to support freedom and liberation of all captive nations has now taken hold in numerous other countries in the free world as evidenced by week observances in the Republic of China, Korea, Argentina, Australia and a number of other countries;

"Maintaining that, for the security of the free world and for cold war victory over the deadly forces of communism and Sino-Soviet, Russian imperio-colonialism, it is indispensable for all free men regularly to make known their determination never to acquiesce to the permanent captivity of the 27 nations in the red empire;

"The Second Conference of the World Anti-Communist League now resolves that:

"The League and its members and associated groups will exert every effort to make the 10th Anniversary of Captive Nations Week on July 13-19, 1969, the most successful yet by:

"1. Urging each head of state to issue a captive week proclamation patterned after that of the President of the United States;

"2. Conducting observances of the Week in member countries and utilizing all media so that our combined message will be conveyed to the Captive Nations; and

"3. Dispatching the published results of this event to the National Captive Nations Committee in Washington, D.C., for their appropriate transmission to the United States Congress and the President of the United States.

"Submitted by

"RAMA SWARUP,
"Chief Delegation, India."

PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND JUSTICE

As we realistically look ahead, the plain fact to be soberly recognized is that the basic issues that existed at the time of the Congressional passage of the resolution still are with us today and will be so as we enter the 70's. The full reality of the captive nations, the ever-growing threat of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, and Moscow's drive for world domination have been, are, and will continue to be the basic issues. And no amount of confetti diplomacy, political zigzags, and boundless rhetoric about domestic priorities, nuclear destruction, campus riots, military-business complexes and other sickly symptoms of an abetted implosion can conceal the urgent pressures of these issues. Those in the movement have no doubt that a recovery of our realism lies ahead. This is the time to readjust our perspectives, cease drifting with every ephemeral upsurge, and begin to view essentials in toto, with a firm reassertion of national principles and goals.

On the occasion of this 10th, one is reminded of the words uttered by Khrushchev in "the spirit of Camp David" ten years ago. Mimicking past dictators, he claimed that the West is "hit by old age."⁶ 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," opined 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 was the full power of the American heritage. That boundless power is reflected in all spheres of our society, regardless of some of its imperfections. And it is this power, diversely generated in the solidity of American institutions, that provides the inspirational drive, the intuitive vision, the courage and will, the principled behavior which have helped to shape the soul of America.

Our recurring capacity for placing first things first, for planning under the guidance of fixed principle and toward well-defined ends, is a facility 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 determinants: 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, which is vitally important to the captive nations as well as to ourselves.

In these times, and on this occasion, it is worthwhile to 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 and Experiment 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 assaulting our institutions, had no faith in these principles or in themselves before Moscow evolved as a military contender. 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

³Footnotes at end of article.

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.

JUSTICE AND FREEDOM FOR PEACE

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. Moscow's offer of peace and friendship are as spurious as its 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 the Kremlin and its syndicate is freedom and slavery.⁷ One imperialist system was smashed, another surges forth to threaten our national existence. Peace and friendship are the effects, the consequents, 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 its predecessors of many centuries, for the present Russian totalitarians the slogan of peace and friendship is only an instrument of calculated deception. Its logic rests only in the complacency, doubt, confusion, and naiveté it can breed in the camp of the targeted non-Russian victim, including the United States.

THE PERSISTENT COLD WAR GAP

The issues of ten years ago are the same today when we now consider 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.

Here, too, it is amazing that in all the 60's dither about "gaps," the truly most essential gap—the gap that will determine whether we'll plunge disadvantageously into a hot global war or face, in moral surrender, a cold war defeat—has scarcely been mentioned. The cold war gap, rather than any other gap, has accounted for freedom's tremendous losses these past three decades. Just bear in mind that the tides of freedom even receded when the other "gaps" were non-existent. "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.

"The best way to eliminate war," said Khrushchev openly, "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 has been 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 and with Pavlovian effect, in developing the implosion factor. 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 global war at considerable disadvantage or humiliating cold war surrender, it is indispensable for us now to face up to the persistent 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 "parity" and even in some respects inferiority, 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, ABM's 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, and Latin America. Unless one is so far gone with haunting hallucinations of push-button co-annihilation, 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 in an incessant war of diplomatic maneuvers, propaganda, subversion, and a host of other paramilitary phenomena.

Quite precisely, the cold war is 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 genuine 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 security and 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 selfsame 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 true Leninist, Stalin and all who have followed have exploited the fake philosophy of communism as a cold war instrument in the same way that the previous Tsars manipulated the equally fake philosophies of Russian Orthodox supremacy and Pan-Slavism. Also true to tradition, they have belittled non-interference as concerns free interest in their captives just as their forebears had done in connection with their enslaved nations. Interference, in the Russian view, is only a one-way street, outside the empire and the new Brezhnev doctrine surpasses anything of the past. The Tsars were also masters in instigating anti-Jewish agitation to discredit legitimate movements and institutions: the Red Tsars have shown equal mastery in dipping into the sewers of prejudice to accomplish similar ends, particularly with the myth of Ukranian anti-Semitism.⁸

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

When the Captive Nations Week Resolution was passed in 1959, little did we anticipate that it would provoke Moscow to think that this intellectual gap in our country has been spontaneously closed. Its actions showed that it has feared this deeply, and with good reason. Once this gap is filled, in our eyes and the eyes of the Free World, Russia *per se* would 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 super-patriotic rhetoric to declare that, on the basis of projected current trends, easily within the next fifty 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 110 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.⁹ One of them, Ukraine, with its 45 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 forty-six 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 the Russian totalitarians have 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 and Red syndicate members, 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,

Footnotes at end of article.

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 USSR. About 45% of these forces consist of captive non-Russians, and these, by basic policy, are largely dispersed from their respective homelands in this substrata empire. Our memories are short, and our perspectives are narrow. Only in the past world war, more like yesterday, 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, Tsar Nicholas II scared Europe with the "steamroller," his imperial armed forces; and now the Red Tsars engage with differing intensity in nuclear blackmail. In three major wars in this century, the multinational forces controlled by Moscow disintegrated early in the deadly game. Contrary to popular myth, both Napoleon and Hitler were defeated not by forces but by the emptiness of their ideologies. Both had nothing but continued slavery to offer to the Russian 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 USSR are marks of our intellectual lag regarding this basic empire.¹⁰ 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.

THE WILL FOR FREEDOM

Now, finally, the *why* of our position on peace with freedom and justice during this 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. 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 about which we should be most growth-conscious is the state of world freedom.

In this year of the "10th" and going into the '70's, we can do much to further this will for freedom. One, you can write to the Members of the Rules Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives and urge them to pass the measures for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. The majority is for it, but the chairman of the committee, Rep. William Colmer of Mississippi, has obstructed its very consideration. Two, you can request your representatives

in Washington to demand of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee a full inquiry into U.S. policy toward the USSR. The policy of the last thirty-six years has proven to be harmful to our interests, and there are other courses of action to insure the uneasy peace. Such an inquiry is inevitable in time, but better sooner than later. Third, you can also press for a more vigorous and enlightened policy in U.S.I.A. as concerns all the captive nations. Fourth, to close the serious cold war gap, you can also further the move for the creation of a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy. And lastly, you can broaden the observance of Captive Nations Week as a national forum for the basic issues discussed above. With these steps alone, an education for freedom by contrast would be launched to completely dwarf the dangerous nonsense now current on our campuses and in several of our cities.

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 freedom and justice. It is the essence and spirit of the Captive Nations Week Resolution.

FOOTNOTES

¹ For these and other accounts, see *The Ukrainian Bulletin*, New York, August 1-15, 1959.

² See author's pamphlet *Ten Years of Captive Nations Week*, New York, 1968.

³ Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1957, p. 154.

⁴ For author's interpretation of this, see "We Told You So," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Spring, 1969.

⁵ *Congressional Record*, February 5, 1969, p. 2859.

⁶ Interview by Major Salah Salem, *Reuters*, Cairo, November 10, 1959.

⁷ E.G. Russian religious genocide is a striking point today as seen in V. Tancher, "Unitate—Enemies of the Ukrainian People," *Pravda Ukrainy*, November 27, 1968, p. 4.

⁸ For a typically foolish editorial on this, see "Soviet Anti-Semitism," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1969.

⁹ Confirming what the author has held for years is Farnsworth Fowl's "Russians Becoming a Soviet Minority," *The New York Times*, April 27, 1969.

¹⁰ An example of massive misconception is Stephen S. Rosenfeld's "The Ukraine: Questioning for Pride," *The Washington Post*, March 14, 1969.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 5, 1969]
NATIONAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE SPURS OBSERVANCE OF "WEEK"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and Chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, issued a statement urging all American ethnic organizations and patriotic societies to use the maximum of all available media to focus attention on the captive nations.

Officially, the "Week" falls in the period of July 13-20, 1969, and is highlighted as the "Tenth Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution."

In a letter sent to every U.S. Senator and Congressman, Dr. Dobriansky invited them to make statements on the floor of Congress during the "Week," and stated:

"The basic issues facing our nation today are the same as they were ten years ago, except that we're at a greater disadvantage in coping with them. Our illusions of the 60's have not rendered the captive nations—the peoples themselves—any less captive. While we attend to derivative issues such as Vietnam, the ABM, etc., it would be fatal to have our attention diverted from the original issues of the captive nations and Soviet Rus-

sian imperio-colonialism. Among the many actions that can be taken both for our security and the freedom of one billion captive peoples, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations and a full-scale Senate reappraisal of U.S. policy toward the USSR—Moscow being the only formidable enemy—would unleash an Education for Freedom Through Contrast which, more than anything else, would redirect the energies of our youth in constructive union with those of youth seeking liberty and freedom throughout the Red Empire."

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT SOUGHT

In the House of Representatives Cong. Daniel J. Flood (Democrat) and Cong. Edward J. Derwinski (Republican) introduced special resolutions calling for support of the captive nations movement.

During the "Week" a series of manifestations, rallies, and meetings will be held in Washington, New York, Chicago, Phoenix, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Los Angeles and in other cities.

On July 16, 1969 the NCWC will hold the 10th Anniversary Banquet at the University Club, at which Mr. George Meany, President of AFL-CIO, and Dr. Ku Chengkang, President of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, will be honored.

OBSERVANCE IN NEW YORK

Dr. Ku will also be honored in Philadelphia and New York City, where special dinners and receptions will be organized in his honor.

As in previous years, the observance of "Captive Nations Week" in New York City will be observed by various groups and organizations. A liturgy for the captive nations will be celebrated at St. Patrick's Cathedral on Sunday, July 13, 1969 during which Rev. George Muresan, a Rumanian Eastern-Rite priest, will preach on the persecution of the Eastern Churches by the Communists.

Following the mass, a rally will be held in Central Park, sponsored by the New York Chapter of the National Captive Nations Committee under the Chairmanship of Judge Matthew Troy. Mayor John V. Lindsay and others will address the gathering. Mayor Lindsay will also sign a proclamation at New York's City Hall.

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, July 5, 1969]
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1969

From July 13 to 20, "Captive Nations Week" will be observed throughout the land with appropriate ceremonies, manifestations, meetings and solemn liturgies in churches, as provided by Public Law 86-90. President Nixon is expected to issue his first Presidential Proclamation, calling on all Americans to observe the Week with meaningful dedication to the cause of freedom of the captive nations.

This year the Week will be observed under the impact of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last August, and the observance itself will have a different significance. Prior to the seizure of Czechoslovakia many leaders, especially the mass communications media people among us, were prone to denigrate the meaning of Captive Nations Week and regarded it as an irritant used by "exile groups" to antagonize Moscow and thus impede "peaceful coexistence."

But the brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet and satellite forces demonstrated the perpetual aggression of Moscow and brought a new threat to Central and Western Europe. Therefore, the position of the captive nations and their unceasing fight for freedom and national self-determination can now be viewed from the viewpoint of the rest of free Europe, which is threatened and which may also become captive, if the free world continues to be indifferent to the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The American people, blessed by God with freedom and material wealth have the opportunity to express themselves on the tenth anniversary of "Captive Nations Week" and to demonstrate to the captive nations that they are their true friends and allies. The U.S. Government and the governments of other free countries can enhance their prestige and influence by capitalizing upon the cleavages and discontent which the captive nations create for the Russian Communist masters.

On this occasion, we should make sure that the concern over the captive nations is part and parcel of our foreign policy, and that it is more than just speech-making and ceremonial manifestations, but that it is one of the basic principles and a dedicated policy of our commitment to the cause of universal freedom.

Ten years ago the U.S. Congress enacted this far-sighted legislation which is the Captive Nations Week Resolution in defense of the captive nations. It is now up to our policymakers to make appropriate use of this legislation in our policies at home and abroad. For the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" essentially is a weapon of truth and an instrument of freedom against slavery and oppression.

[From the Ukrainian Catholic Daily, July 3, 1969]

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS TO BE MARKED

PHILADELPHIA.—The 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week proclamation will be marked with special ceremonies here at Independence Hall on Sunday, July 20. The Captive Nations Week resolution, authored by UCCA president, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1959. It calls for the proclamation by each incumbent President of the U.S. of the third week in July as Captive Nations Week until such time as all the nations enslaved by Moscow regain their national freedom.

The Philadelphia CNW Committee which is headed by Dr. Austin App, president, Ignatius Billinsky, vice president, Mrs. Margot Rotla, secretary, and Albert Beglan, treasurer, has prepared an interesting program to mark this year's anniversary observance.

The keynote speaker will be Dr. Ku Chang-Kang of Formosa, president of the Asian Anti-Communist League, a member of the Presidium of the National Assembly of Formosa and special adviser to the President of Nationalist China.

Other prominent personalities at the Captive Nations Week anniversary observance in Philadelphia will be: Stanley Miller, a member of the Gubernatorial Cabinet of Pennsylvania, the Hon. Mayor James Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia, Dr. Austin App, and others.

Eleven national groups will take part in the manifestation. A special highlight of the program will be the signing of a "Declaration of Independence" by the members of the Philadelphia CNW Committee and representatives of the national groups in the historic Congress chamber where the American Declaration of Independence was signed.

At the close of the program a wreath-laying ceremony will take place at the foot of the Liberty Bell.

The program, which is scheduled to begin at 5:30 p.m., will be directed by the CNW Committee vice president, Mr. I. Billinsky.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Ten years ago, President Eisenhower proclaimed the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. This tenth anniversary will be observed from July 13 to July 20 in 1969. Each succeeding president has called for appropriate observance of such a week.

In this land of the free, it is difficult to believe that there can still exist in this twentieth century, systems of government which deny their people fundamental human rights, and base their industrial and technical progress on the labor of depressed and deprived masses of their people, or that intellectuals and others are still being imprisoned or exiled to slave labor for daring to question or protest the harsh dictatorships that deny basic freedoms. The guilt of many present-day regimes is all the greater because they are signatories to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, in most cases, members of the United Nations dedicated to implementing those very rights, assuring freedom and justice to all.

While condemning colonialism and assisting in the dissolution of empires, what have the Communist nations of the Soviet empire and mainland China done except deny freedom to their own people, at the same time seeking to reduce to colonial status whatever territories they could dominate as satellites? What has happened to the basic freedoms and fundamental human rights in 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 others? Is there nothing free nations can do when people cry out "Come over to Czechoslovakia and help us!"?

Within these United States are many people of many nationalities whose parents sought freedom here from religious, political and/or economic oppression. There are many others who themselves were forced to flee their native lands after World War II, when Communism took over in Eastern and Central Europe, and soon thereafter in mainland China, Tibet and Cuba. On such an anniversary as this, those who walked out on Communism are saddened by the remembrance of relatives and friends still in the satellites and the "People's Republics," another name for the colonies of the Communists. Unlike most Americans, who have known life only under freedom, they understand the true meaning behind Russia's misuse of such terms as "peace," "democracy," and "coexistence". They know that many are serving out 25-year sentences in slave-labor camps for such "crimes" as establishing schools or Red Cross chapters or instilling children with a love of their own language or cultural heritage!

We have reason to believe that Russia's violent opposition to Captive Nations Week is evidence of its effect upon the people of her own republics and satellites, renewing their hope of freedom, strengthening their will to resist. We believe her greatest fear is that the rift with mainland China, the turning from Moscow of Albania and perhaps soon Rumania, and open criticism of Moscow's policies by the Communist Party of Italy, will continue until the non-Russian peoples within the U.S.S.R. may break away from Russia's domination. There is no monolith today. The rifts, schisms, fissures are too wide and too deep.

What can we of the free world do to stop this tyranny and treachery? We can be vigilant and careful not to be duped by those who think Freedom is an ideal and not a living force. It is both. We can urge free nations to abandon trade with those who use enslaved peoples for the purposes of the State. We can impress upon all statesmen that the choice of human freedom is always a higher ideal than the choice of peace, for peace without freedom is no peace at all.

Therefore, we the undersigned, call upon all people in this and other countries who love freedom to continue the pressure of public opinion and public expression, added to our hopes and prayers, until the Com-

munist bloc crumbles and freedom is restored to all captive nations.

BYELORUSSIAN AMERICAN WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN IN EXILE.

GEORGIAN NATIONAL ALLIANCE.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

WOMEN FOR FREEDOM, INC.

(NOTE.—This statement was prepared and distributed by Women for Freedom, Inc., July, 1969.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in paying tribute to this 10th anniversary celebration of Captive Nations Week. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), not only for having taken this time today, but for his long leadership in the establishment of Captive Nations Week, and also his fight for the creation of a special Captive Nations Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives. I am proud to have been so closely associated with him in this long fight.

A good deal of water has passed under the bridge since we first succeeded in establishing Captive Nations Week 10 years ago. Many cynical individuals regarded this action at the time as purely a gesture, without any intrinsic meaning at all. They assumed that the military might of the Soviet Union and the vehemence with which the Soviets held their sway over the captive peoples of Europe and Asia could never be removed, least of all passage of a few well-meaning words and resolutions in the U.S. Congress.

How wrong they were. I would not, of course, suggest that the changes that have taken place in the captive nations area over the past 10 years have resulted solely or even principally from the actions of the U.S. Congress in establishing a Captive Nations Week and fighting for a Captive Nations Committee. But the cracks in the Iron Curtain and the fissures in monolithic Soviet control, which have developed in recent years, and the repeated evidences that the spirit of freedom and desire for liberty on the part of captive peoples are not dead but very much alive indeed, have strongly underscored the faith of those of us who fought this battle in the belief that freedom can never be suppressed and that captivity must never be accepted as inevitable.

The differences which have developed in the past few years between the Soviet Union and Communist China, for example, erupting even now into actual armed conflict, demonstrate the instability of this kind of totalitarian system.

The brutal actions of the Soviet Union a year ago in the military invasion of Czechoslovakia, followed by a subtle, but nonetheless relentless taking over of control over the lives and activities of the supposedly independent Communist peoples, also demonstrate the fragility of this Communist structure and the complete inability of the Soviet system to live alongside any kind of freedom.

The upheavals which have taken place in the Soviet Union itself in the years since our resolution was first adopted and Captive Nations Week established, also indicate the difficulties which a totalitarian system unwilling to brook any differences of opinion, must encounter. Mr. Khrushchev, eager to make some concessions in Soviet theory to avoid warfare with the West, has been relegated to limbo of an unperson for his efforts. In his place the hard-nosed Mr. Brezhnev and behind him the even rougher and tougher Soviet marshals, have now taken over full control, unwilling to allow even the very modest gestures toward relaxation initiated by Mr. Khrushchev to continue, lest the spirit of freedom become so intoxicating for the Soviet people as to threaten the future of the communistic dictatorship.

Most recently of all, as still further evidence of the soundness of our cause, was the tremendous reception given to President Nixon on his recent visit to Rumania. Contrary to the dictates of the Soviet masters, the peoples of the captive nations are indeed favorably disposed toward the United States, and welcome friendly relations with our country.

The brusqueness with which the Russians have now warned the Rumanians against any further displays of friendship toward America demonstrates again the tenuous hold over the hearts and minds of the captive peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are celebrating Captive Nations Week once again this year. We have indeed made great progress, in these 10 years, and I feel even more strongly now than I did in days past that the day of real freedom for the peoples of Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world is not really so far away as we had once thought it might be.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that we this afternoon are commemorating the 11th annual Captive Nations Week.

I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) for extending his leadership in this field and making the arrangements for all Members to effectively demonstrate their interest and their determination to see that the captive nations of communism achieve their freedom.

Mr. Speaker, as a continuation of my remarks today on this memorable occasion of the 11th observance of Captive Nations Week, I am pleased to include the following material:

Proclamations issued by—

Gov. Paul B. Ogilvie of my State of Illinois;

Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Jr., of Florida;

Gov. Deane C. Davis of Vermont;

Gov. Harold LeVander of Minnesota;

Mayor Nelson Howarth of Springfield, Ill.;

Mayor J. Bracken Lee of Salt Lake City, Utah; and

Mayor Sam Schwartzkopf of Lincoln, Neb.

An article by Erik A. Dundurs from the Republican nationalities division of Minnesota.

An article by Father Denis Dirscherl, S.J., from the July 20 Our Sunday Visitor, Huntington, Ind.

An article by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky from the spring 1969 Ukrainian Quarterly.

Two news releases issued by the National Captive Nations Committee dated May 26, 1969, and June 9, 1969.

Two news releases issued by the Arizona branch of the Captive Nations Committee.

The material follows:

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF ILLINOIS

The imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led to the enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and others and

The desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war and

The freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence, and

The Congress of the United States has by unanimous vote declared the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week so that the people of the United States may express their sympathy with, and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 13, 1969 to be observed as Captive Nations Week in Illinois, and I call upon our citizens to observe this occasion in a manner fitting and proper.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol in the City of Springfield, this third day of July, in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and fifty-first.

RICHARD B. OGILVIE,
Governor.

PAUL POWELL,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF FLORIDA

Whereas, among all the peoples of the Earth, Americans, by virtue of their constant attention to democratic principles, have become the leaders in mankind's never-ending struggle for freedom, and

Whereas, this position of leadership places upon the people of this nation the great responsibility of keeping the flame of liberty kindled in the hearts and minds of all men everywhere, and

Whereas, great segments of the world's population live in the limbo of complete subservience to governmental doctrines that strip their souls and minds of all individualism, mental and physical freedom, and

Whereas, these people stand in great need

of encouragement and reassurance from their fellow men who have the privilege of living in the light of freedom that liberty will ultimately prevail;

Now, therefore, I, Claude R. Kirk, Jr., by virtue of the authority vested in me as Governor of the State of Florida, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13-19, 1969, to be Captive Nations Week in Florida, and urge all citizens to join in this observance by offering their assistance and encouragement to these freedom loving people.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, the Capital, this 7th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-nine and in the recorded history of Florida four hundred and fifty-seven.

CLAUDE R. KIRK, JR.,
Governor.

Attest:

JANE ADAMS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF VERMONT PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week of July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence,

Now, therefore, I, Deane C. Davis, Governor of the State of Vermont, do hereby proclaim the week commencing July 13, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in Vermont.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Vermont this fifth day of June, A.D. 1969.

DEANE C. DAVIS,
Governor.

FREDERICK H. REED,
Secretary.

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF MINNESOTA

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of people of these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as

the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Harold LeVander, Governor of the State of Minnesota, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Minnesota, and call upon the citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State Capitol this third day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine and of the State, the one hundred twelfth.

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.
JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies, and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Nelson Howarth, Mayor of Springfield, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 20, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Springfield, and call upon the citizens of Springfield to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Springfield to be affixed, this — day of — 1969.

NELSON HOWARTH,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION—SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of many nations; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week;

Now, therefore, I, J. Bracken Lee, Mayor of the City of Salt Lake City, Utah, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Salt Lake City and call upon the citizens of Salt Lake City to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be affixed this 1st day of July, nineteen hundred and sixty-nine.

J. BRACKEN LEE, *Mayor.*

PROCLAMATION—CITY OF LINCOLN, NEBR.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement 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, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war, and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence.

Now, therefore, I, Sam Schwartzkopf, Mayor of the City of Lincoln, Nebraska, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Lincoln, Nebraska, and call upon the citizens of Lincoln to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Official Seal of the City of Lincoln to be affixed this 9th day of July, 1969.

SAM SCHWARTZKOPF,
Mayor.

FREEDOM FOR THE CAPTIVE NATIONS (By Erik A. Dundurs)

"In providing for the designation of an Annual Captive Nations Week, Public Law 86-90 implies a continuous commitment by the United States to facilitate conditions favorable and conducive to a variety of peaceful

means leading to the eventual liberation of nations held captive by the Red tyranny.

With Captive Nations Week of 1969 approaching, we must recommit ourselves to this just cause." (Nationalities Division, Republican Party of Minnesota.)

A BEGINNING OR AN END?

Ten years ago, when Public Law 86-90 was unanimously passed by the United States Congress, it was a sincere manifestation of concern for the Communist-enslaved countries:

"[Public Law 86-90, 86th Cong. July 17, 1959]

"S.J. RES. 111

"Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as 'Captive Nations Week'

"Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

"Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society, has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

"Whereas 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; and

"Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian Communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence 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, Turkestan, North Viet-Nam, and others; and

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

"Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

"Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week

with appropriate ceremonies and activities. 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."

Providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, the United States Congress made it clear that proper observance of the Week is of great importance, not only for the extension of freedom but also for its retention.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the first Captive Nations Week proclamation in July of 1959 and invited the people of the United States of America to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities so as to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of the Communist enslaved nations:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

"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, 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 18, 1959, 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 seventeenth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

"By the President:

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Since according to the law, the President is 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, Presidential proclamations of Captive Nations Week have become an annual affair.

As expected, governments of the Communists bloc have reacted to the proclamations with abusive vehemence, since the Captive Nations cause strikes at the very basis of their blueprint for conquest.

When President Eisenhower stated in 1959 that "there can be no true peace which involves acceptance of a status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and re-

pressions of human beings on a gigantic scale . . .", a new hope was injected into the plight of Communist captives.

When Richard M. Nixon, then Vice President, gave strong personal endorsement to the goal of the National Captive Nations Week Observance, the stage was set for the United States to assume leadership in using every peaceable means in bringing about a favorable climate for the restoration of freedom and independence in all Captive Nations.

This favorable climate was of a short duration and when the Eisenhower era ended, the winds of accommodation with the Soviet Union increased in velocity. In advancing a Trojan Horse within the framework of peaceful co-existence, the Kremlin's purpose was to gain sufficient time to achieve a "Nuclear Stalemate".

Interpreting the term "peaceful co-existence" at face value, the United States embarked upon a policy of appeasement, carefully avoiding any irritation of the Soviet empire.

This, quite obviously, resulted in diluted Captive Nations Week proclamations with the very minimum of publicity emanating from the White House.

On April 9, 1963 Congressman Clark MacGregor addressed the U.S. House of Representatives in support of a Special Captive Nation Committee.

After commending his colleagues—Congressman Daniel J. Flood and Congressman Edward J. Derwinski, among others, for their efforts to establish this special committee (H.R. 14). MacGregor, among other things, stated the following: "The International Communist organization has consistently shown that it fears a growing world knowledge of and interest in the Captive Nations. We need to do everything we can to bring the facts to all the world". And yet, the White House turned thumbs down! Today, there still is no Special Captive Nations Committee.

During the Johnson Administration the process of building bridges to the Soviet Union was accelerated. If one examines the Captive Nations Week proclamation of 1968 and compares it with the one issued by President Eisenhower in 1959, the U.S. policy of appeasement is clearly in evidence. In fact, the words "Communism" and "Soviet Union" no longer appear in the 1968 proclamation:

"CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

"(Proclamation 3875, July 10, 1968)

"By the President of the United States of America.

"A Proclamation

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

"Whereas human freedom, national independence and justice are fundamental rights of all peoples; and

"Whereas the enjoyment of these rights, to which all peoples justly aspire, remains severely limited or denied in many areas of the world; and

"Whereas the United States of America, in keeping with the principles on which it was founded, has sought consistently to promote the observance of fundamental human rights throughout the world;

"Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1968 as Captive Nations Week.

"In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 10th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-eight, and of the Independence of the United

States of America the one hundred and ninety-third.

"By the President:

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

"[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5 p.m., July 10, 1968.]"

One could argue, that changes in the text of the resolution have been so radical, that it no longer express the intent of Public Law 86-90.

And what about Cuba? With the Monroe Doctrine forgotten and with a Communist nation 90 miles from our shores, can we as Americans still claim that we are upholding the moral imperatives and noble declarations in our Constitution?

The year of 1968 represented the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and yet there were more people living in bondage then, than at any time in human history! While Western colonialism has become a thing of the past—Eastern colonialism is rampant. But are we pointing this out to the world?

The answer is no. On the contrary, strange as it may be, we have addressed ourselves to the inequities in human and civil rights of such countries as South Africa and Rhodesia, without even mentioning the slave-masters of the East.

What are some of the reasons for this double standard approach? Is it the realization that an approximate "Nuclear parity" now exists between the United States and the Soviet Union and that they could act and react one upon the other with overwhelming devastation? Or is it an erosion in our desire to uphold the true principles of freedom in supplanting them with the philosophy of "Peace At Any Price"?

I would suggest that it is a mixture of both, producing unfounded fear and stimulating the erosion of principle.

The truth remains, that the Soviet policy of peaceful co-existence, aiming at the moral and political disarmament of the West, will be modified only to the extent of their momentary tactical needs and not by Western conciliation. Anything less than Western military superiority, dedication and firmness, will only stimulate the expansionist tendencies of the Communist world.

"Nuclear parity" has not kept the Soviet Union from the blatant violation of basic human rights of the citizens of Czechoslovakia in malicious disregard of the United Nations charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

North Korea and North Vietnam continue to pursue their aggressive policies in spite of the military might of the United States and so does Red China.

With over 1 billion people in Communist bondage, the United States government must properly and honorably cope with the continued manifestation of Communist aggression. It is clear that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will become meaningless unless its pronouncements are vigorously enforced by all signatory nations and are equally applied whenever and wherever freedom is threatened or abused.

Public Law 86-90 implies a continuing responsibility by the United States to facilitate conditions favorable and conducive to a variety of peaceful acts leading to the eventual liberation of nations held captive by the Red tyranny.

"Those who want us to relax and who counsel policies of accommodation that would freeze the status quo of a world half enslaved, are betraying our civilization," said Eugene Lyons, Senior Editor of Reader's Digest.

If International Communism would succeed in extinguishing the aspirations of free men held captive, as it temporarily does their civil liberties, a great battle would have been lost by a free world yearning for peace with justice.

Dr. Walter H. Judd, former U.S. Congressman and an undisputed expert on Communism said recently: "The strongest allies the Free world has, are the captive peoples enslaved by Communism. They know the misery of serfdom first hand and are most strategically located to turn the tide when the right moment arrives. We must never do anything to weaken their hope and their will to survive."

With Captive Nations Week of 1969 approaching, the United States must re-assert its position of the alleged leadership of all free peoples.

The Free World and the Communist captives look upon President Richard M. Nixon to re-assert this leadership. In fact, it is a must, since what is morally wrong can never be politically or diplomatically right!

If the 1969 Presidential proclamation again embraces the intent and language of the original Congressional resolution, the President will have lived up to an early statement of his own-proclaiming that "We will never write off the millions of people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Their freedom shall always be our objective. When freedom is threatened anywhere, it is threatened in America . . ."

The test is yet to come . . . and the outcome will signify a beginning or an end to Captive Nations Week as an instrument for freedom.

The captive nations

Armenia	1920
Azerbaijan	1920
Byelorussia	1920
Cossackia	1920
Georgia	1920
Idel-Ural	1920
North Caucasia	1920
Ukraine	1920
Far Eastern Republic	1922
Turkistan	1922
Mongolian People's Republic	1924
Estonia	1940
Latvia	1940
Lithuania	1940
Albania	1946
Bulgaria	1946
Serbia	1946
Croatia	1946
Slovenia	1946
Yugoslavia	1946
Poland	1947
Rumania	1947
Czecho-Slovakia	1948
North Korea	1948
Hungary	1949
East Germany	1949
Mainland China	1949
Tibet	1951
North Vietnam	1954
Cuba	1960

WHO'S NEXT?

South Vietnam?	Tanzania?
South Korea?	Bolivia?
Algeria?	Thailand?
Colombia?	Greece?
Congo?	Guatemala?
Laos?	Chile?

"Humanity is tormented once again by an age-old issue—is man to live in dignity and freedom under God or be enslaved—are men in government to serve, or are they to master, their fellow men? It befalls us now to resolve this issue anew."

[From Our Sunday Visitor, July 20, 1969]

RUSSIA'S CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Father Denis Dirscherl, S.J.)

"We want and implore you to help us . . . for we cannot oppose this force . . . other than through passive resistance!" This was Radio Prague's agonizing cry to the world on August 21, 1968, when the Russians stormed into Czechoslovakia. The Czech cry of despair repeated the Hungarian plea over Radio Budapest on October 23, 1956: "We ask you

to help us, to support us. Time is short. Help Hungary, help us, help us!"

In the last two decades the Czechs, Hungarians, and Poles have all rebelled against the Russian yoke of communism, to little avail. In each case Russian troops and the indiscriminate use of their heavy armor routed the forces of freedom. The freedom fighters, in the last resort, were helpless without outside assistance. The United States and the rest of the free world watched from the sidelines, afraid to aid these captive peoples of the Russian Empire.

After the dramatic events in Poland and Hungary, dedicated Americans and patriots of other countries decided to do something concrete for the peoples held by the military might and political overlordship of the Russians. They formed the Captive Nations Resolution, and now each year the United States and some seventeen other countries mark this observation with parades, memorial speeches, and quiet discussion.

The central motivating factor in the Captive Nations concept is the critical need of all free nations to keep the plight of oppressed people before their eyes, not to allow the routine of everyday monotony to dull our sensitivities to all peoples existing without the free exercise of self-determination. This notion is doubly difficult to appreciate because we live in an era of acute self-inspection here in the United States. But in spite of our current propensity to "meacupalism," the Captive Nations notion warrants, even demands, some special consideration.

Professor Lev Dobriansky of Georgetown University helped originate the idea of Captive Nations Week in the late 'fifties. In 1959 President Eisenhower signed the resolution into Public Law 86-90. This year the eleventh annual observance takes place from July 13-19. These yearly observances have enjoyed success because its originators and adherents keenly appreciate the value and need of good propaganda in the best sense of the word. It's role is crucial in our age of so-called peaceful co-existence, convergence, detente and cold war psychology.

Effective propaganda is the one thing that the Soviets have capitalized on in the half century of their existence, achieving goals and concessions from the West often through mere bluff and bluster. Because of these ploys they have become a giant world power. In the West we have repeatedly failed to enter into the real "mind" of the Kremlin leadership and the psychological world view of the Russian masses. As Senator Henry Jackson of Washington has remarked, "We have never been in the same league with the Russians in the psychological war of wits and words."

The response of the Russians to the Captive Nations Week observance is particularly enlightening, and informative of the ideological make-up of the Soviet camp. In July, 1965, for instance, Michael Suslov, Chief Party theoretician, commented on the observance of Captive Nations Week.

Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke. These international gendarmes, stranglers of freedom and independence, would like again to enslave the free nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. But this will never happen!

This response of Russian leaders is typical, that is, the Russians project their own designs into the motive, plans, and policies of others.

One of the major emphases of the Captive Nations concept is to bring out into bold relief the gun barrel philosophy of the Russians and its allies. Unquestionably much of the communist success in the past has been achieved because of this old philosophy.

As Mao Tse-tung once declared: "Every communist must grasp the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun . . . in fact we can say that the whole world can be remolded only with the gun."

The bulk of Russian and other communist acquisitions and annexations have resulted from a three-pronged attack: by force through overwhelming military superiority, internal infiltration, and political blackmail. Soviet Russian imperialism started in the early '20's with the Outer Mongolia area. Poland was partitioned in 1939, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a portion of Finland followed in 1940, Bulgaria and Albania in 1946, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands in 1945, Rumania in 1947, Czechoslovakia in 1948, Eastern Germany in 1949, followed by North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba in the '50's.

In regard to the Russian carving up of the world's real estate salami style, it is interesting to note Karl Marx's view of Russia in his own day. Writing for the New York Tribune of April 19, 1853, Marx asked: "What had to happen? The ignorance, the laziness, the pusillanimity, the perpetual fickleness and the credulousness of Western Governments enabled Russia to achieve successively every one of her aims." Even in his own day Marx called Russia a "conquering nation."

The nationality question also has a central function in the Captive Nations concept. Here it is important to recall that the words "Russia" and "Russian" have been banded about in the past with little care and necessary distinctions and explanation. The Russian Empire is made up of many different nationalities. And without these other nationalities the Russian Empire would be a second-rate power. As in Czarist times, so too today, Russia is bent on completely "Russifying" every formerly free country in their empire, including the Ukraine, White Russia, the Caucasus area, the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Latvia is a prime example of Russification. According to recent reports, Latvians constitute only 60 per cent of their own country. It was 75 per cent in 1939. Today even their capital, Riga, has a minority of Latvians. Other Latvians have been "deported" to different sectors of the Russian Empire.

The forces of continuity are indeed powerful, almost overwhelming in that land once called "Holy Russia." And in many respects, Marx's devastating critique of Russia is still valid, even more poignant today when the Russian appetite for aggrandizement grows apace. Too much of Russia's brutal past still lives on in the Russian Empire today. Indeed contemporary Russian leaders have realized the most extravagant dreams of 19th century Russian nationalists and Pan-Slavists. Now after the Czech, Hungarian, and Polish debacles, East Europeans sadly realize what kind of "brotherhood" the Russians are talking about.

The Captive Nations Week is a fitting time to recall and realize that the opposition is not almighty, that it is grossly insecure and suffers pangs of inferiority, hiding as it does behind the facade of concrete walls, war zones, barbed wire fences, guard towers, trenches, empty wastes and no man's lands. Such oppression is surely destined to be short lived. The human spirit will not long tolerate it, as such observances as Captive Nations Week remind the Russians of this shattering truth.

WE TOLD YOU SO

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia is a subject that most of our illusionists prefer not to discuss nowadays. They have scarcely recovered from the shock they received in the summer of 1968. Détente, cultural exchange, East-West trade, the psychological sport of reducing tensions, more treaties with

the USSR, and all the superficial attitudes induced by almost a decade of confetti diplomacy were suddenly hollowed by the brute reality of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. It still is a real question whether our illusionists in Government, in Congress, the press, and among our numerous organizations will profit from this rude awakening or will continue to blindly pursue their illusions for whatever fearful reason. Regardless, those, like myself, who have consistently and with complete certitude pointed to the real enemy of the Free World—Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism rather than the mythology of communism—can in all humility of truth utter "We told you so."

At an annual function connected with the National War College three months later, the writer was interestingly confronted by this general question raised by colleagues who occupy high positions in State, the Armed Forces, and CIA: "Doc, how do we get out of this bind? For years we have pushed the bridges of understanding policy to fragmentize communist East Europe, only to have it dashed by brute Russian force." My answer very simply was this: "What I tried to teach you ten years ago is that you, and thus we, will never succeed in dislodging the tentacles of the Soviet Russian octopus so long as we do everything to preserve the octopus itself, which in its total form means the Soviet Union." Assuming an accurate knowledge and understanding of the USSR, truly an imperium in imperio, it doesn't require much common sense to perceive its powerful ability to squelch any liberalizing forces at work in its colonial tentacles, particularly a potentially explosive one such as Czecho-Slovakia. It wasn't at all difficult for this writer and others, such as Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki of Catholic University, to publicly predict the crude Russian action in Czecho-Slovakia.¹ At this point one can predict that if Rumania attempts what the Reds in Czecho-Slovakia endeavored to do, it will even be easier for the Russian-directed octopus to move in. Indeed, one can soundly speculate that the security of both Yugoslavia and Albania will inversely diminish with the further build-up of Soviet Russian naval power in the Mediterranean. The specific date and time aren't important; the evolving circumstances and will for action are.

Guided by empirical evidence, of which the tragedy of Czecho-Slovakia is only the most recent in a long string of lessons since World War II, those of us who have rationally maintained that in structural terms the Soviet Russian totalitarians cannot and will not change, are in position once again to contend that the so-called dogmatism ascribed to our posture is actually a time-proven realism based on historical experience and existential analysis. The illusionists may by force of communications media perpetuate their myths and wishful thinking, even in the face of the Czecho-Slovak tragedy, but the oft substantiated premises of the mischaracterized "dogmatic position" will re-emerge with impressive impact again and again.

These fact-founded premises are concrete and yet comprehensive. One, in a positive dimension, answers the fundamental question "How has all this come to be what it is?" by stressing the evolution of the Soviet Russian Empire from the RSFSR in 1917 to the USSR in 1923 to points beyond since 1940. Once this line of evolution is understood, the full view of the USSR as an empire in itself comes into full bloom and mythical conceptions, such as "the Soviets," "the Soviet nation," and "minorities in the USSR," are scrapped for their ludicrous worth. Flowing from this is the second perspectival premise, namely, being an empire in its own essence, the USSR must of necessity expand in influence, control, and domi-

nation. There can be no inward-turning other than at the risks of structural erosion, non-Russian nationalist explosions, and certain imperial disaster and collapse. Third, interwoven with this, is the empirical premise covering Moscow's systematic build-up of all necessary instruments for such expansionism—military, propaganda, diplomatic, economic, political etc.—all integrated in a working context of persistent psycho-political warfare. And lastly, as a negative premise, is the accommodation of all this and more by our failures to cope properly and adequately with this last, threatening empire in the history of mankind. What has transpired in Czecho-Slovakia is only one additional bit of evidence certifying to the power of the basic forces dominating Eastern Europe—the prime enemy of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and the invincible nationalism of all the captive non-Russian nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union. We haven't even begun to tap the latter force and its overwhelming potentialities.²

TIME FOR REASSESSMENT OF CONCEPTS AND POLICY

It seems almost like stating the obvious that it is high time for a serious and thorough reassessment of our concepts and policy regarding the Soviet Union. On the heels of the brutal Russian invasion of Czecho-Slovakia, Presidential candidate Nixon sensed this when he declared "And a realistic appraisal of the assumptions and premises that underlie American policy toward the Soviet Union, a policy of realism toward the Soviet today, will be a policy that is directed toward their prudence and not just toward their good will."³ But, quite logically, before we can sensibly reformulate policy and higher generalizations, we must patiently reexamine our working concepts, the meanings of our words, and the framework of our conceptions. This is a self-evident priority.

Plainly, words have consequences. Repeated over and over again, they can lead or mislead, they can affect or infect, they can persuade or dissuade, they reflect realistic concepts or unrealistic ones. On the world scene today no group comprehends and values this more than do the masters and propagandists of totalitarian Soviet Russia. We, however, pass words uncritically. As a consequence, we continue to wallow in a morass of illusions about Russia, the Soviet Union, and the so-called "Soviet sphere of influence." No matter how you choose to view them, words contain the power of meaning. Needless to say, without them we have no natural way of transmitting our thoughts, be it accurately or inaccurately, truthfully or untruthfully. And no amount of trite and self-indicting utterances, such as "Oh, that's just a matter of semantics," can hide this truth.

It was Socrates who for all time taught, "The beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms." Though we don't always practice it, you and I know that wise behavior presupposes clear thinking. But such thinking—and thus intelligent behavior—cannot be attained without distinct and rationally defined terms. Put another way, prudent action demands clear thinking and this requires logical concepts with conformable terms or words. When we examine the terms and concepts used by many Americans in relation to the Soviet Union, the beginning of wisdom in our policy and action toward this primary empire remains somewhat remote.

Beyond all doubt, the most common and persistent illusion is the verbal equation of Russia and the Soviet Union. Interchanging and equating the two makes them appear identical with reference to territory and peoples. It is equally inaccurate to identify Russia with the old Czarist Russian Empire, again in terms of territory and peoples. Poland was a part of that empire. Were the Poles therefore "Russians"? The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is at least nominally more in

conformity with the basic facts of distinctive nations, cultures, and religions which characterize the present Soviet Russian Empire than was the previous Czarist Russian Empire.

For a realistic policy toward the USSR, it is absolutely necessary for us to extinguish this basic illusion and honestly revise our many misconceptions as we face up to the fundamentals of this not too complex empire within an empire. If some would take the trouble to glance at the constitution or a map of the USSR, they would find that what they call "Russia" is only one national area in that empire. At that it is federated with other national units and thus known as the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. It is only one of the fifteen republics in the USSR. This, in part, is Russia. This is Soviet Russia which by imperialist aggression annexed to itself numerous non-Russian nations to form the first spurious federation called the RSFSR and, through further aggression, the second, even more spurious federation called the USSR. In effect, what emerged is a federation within a "federation." This is confusing to many Americans. Only aggressive Soviet Russia profits by the persistence of this confusion.

When many uncritically use the term "Soviets" with reference to the controlling operations of Russian Moscow, they compound this state of confusion. First, they do violence to the only true meaning of the term "soviet"—a council of workers and peasants. The soviets, in plain fact, do not rule in the USSR. Second, they blur the objective and fundamental distinctions existing between Russian nationals and the different non-Russian nationals in that area. This blinds them to the opportunities open for the building of progressive restraints on Moscow's warlike policies. And third, in their own minds they nurture the self-deluding thought of the USSR being a monolith, a homogeneity of "Soviets," of Soviet men and generations.

The pointed irony of all this is revealed by these facts. In the old Russian empire the Czars made every attempt to erase the distinctiveness of the non-Russian nationals by throwing the wrap of Russian nationality over them. "Peoples of Russia," "Great Russian and Little Russian" and other verbal devices were contrived to create a monolithic appearance. Their policy of Russification failed. Profiting by the lessons of this failure, the Soviet Russian totalitarians have subtly pursued the same policy under the formula "national in form, socialist in content." In plain language, this is designed to eviscerate the national substance of Moscow's captives as it develops a Soviet man, a Soviet people. Their language, their culture, their allegiance will, of course, be Russian. Red Moscow also aims at a monolithic image. Now we find ourselves, the advocates of national self-determination, unwittingly abetting this process by the uncritical use of "the Soviets." Indeed, what irony!

Thus, for a policy reorientation based on accurate and realistic concepts, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that by language, history, culture and religion, the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are as different from the Russian—in some respects more so—as the French are from the Italians or the Japanese from the Koreans. By all criteria of nationhood they stand in sharp contrast to the tribal conglomerations we mischaracterize as nations in the greater part of Africa. From the viewpoint of truth alone, to subsume the non-Russian nations of Lithuania, Ukraine, Georgia and others under the concept of "Russia" bluntly contradicts objective fact. It makes as much sense as identifying the Irish with England. Obviously, too, the illusion of equating Russia and the USSR weakens our capacity to evaluate the supposedly internal problems of this empire. It blocks a full appreciation of its major sources of weakness. It is as harm-

Footnotes at end of article.

ful and misleading as calling the Soviet Union a "nation," whether Russian or plain Soviet.⁴ Finally, it is equally evident that this persistent illusion produces an adverse psychological reaction among the peoples in the various nations so misidentified. The reaction of a Turkestanian, Latvian or Ukrainian being called a Russian is similar to that of a Slovak being misidentified as a Czech or an Irishman as an Englishman. In the eyes of the people involved the illusion suggests a stamp of approval on the present Red Russian Empire which holds them in bondage.

THE PITIFUL JOHNSON RECORD

Expressions of this illusion projecting Russia as the Soviet Union abound in this country. Generally, the press is notorious in this regard and, on the basis of it, spreads other fictions. For example, at the time of the 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, we read this bit of fiction: "As the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics approaches its 50th anniversary, the theme of Soviet progress is sounded daily . . ." ⁵ Even as of this writing the USSR hasn't been in existence for 50 years, but then, for the editors of the paper, Russia is the USSR. Many of our intellectuals fare just as badly. For example, a study paper, which influenced heavily the Kennedy Administration, contains these gems of thought and conception: "But since the Soviet Union is now a powerful nation and may in time become an affluent one, it may be possible for the Soviets to learn to identify the cumulative mutual advantages to be gained from restraint, cooperation, or common endeavors"; "American security is precarious because it rests excessively on the threat of punishment against a nation, the Soviet Union, which has and will retain the power to devastate the United States."⁶ With a determining conception of the USSR as a "nation," all sorts of wild ideas follow.

My good friend, Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado, once wrote to me, "You are, of course, absolutely correct in your article, but the public and most of the Congress consider and treat the Soviet Union as one country. Even the press considers one a 'Kook' if talk veers to the theory of separate nations bound together only by a system of common tyranny."⁷ This interesting observation shows the amount of popular education that still is required on this crucial subject. The examples of fiction given above can be multiplied endlessly, for they appear almost daily in our press, periodicals, and other communications media. Here is a choice "intelligence report" on Czecho-Slovakia: "If you study such a map, you will find that Czecho-Slovakia, put together 50 years ago as an independent nation, is bordered by Poland, Russia . . ." ⁸ Of course, facts have it that Czecho-Slovakia is a state of two nations, Czech and Slovak, and is bordered not by Russia but rather by Ukraine in the USSR, but these elude what purports to be an "intelligence report." Worse still is this heavy dose of fiction in the report: "In World War I, Russia suffered approximately 10 million casualties at the hands of the Germans. In World War II, Russia suffered another 20 million, so that today there is hardly any family in Russia which has not lost someone to German militarism." As pointed out in my book *The Vulnerable Russians*, this partial myth was disseminated by President Kennedy in the Adzhubel interview in 1961 and in his American University address in 1963. The non-Russian nations bore the greater brunt of both wars, but by this myth you'd think the Russians did all the suffering!

How can we, in the shortest possible time, extricate ourselves from such illusions so that our policies and plans for all contingencies in relation to the Soviet Union may be more realistic and successful? Is the situa-

tion a hopeless one, considering the scope and extent of these illusions? Our ordinary, time-consuming processes of education certainly can't perform this task. What can be the enlightened leadership provided both by the Presidency and the Congress. In the former, addresses, pronouncements and policy statements could set the tone of new thought about the USSR; in the latter, a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations, concentrating on those in the USSR, could also provide our general citizenry with a new outlook on the USSR. It wouldn't take long for the press, academia, and other sections of our society to absorb the new concepts and patterns of thought regarding this most vital of all foreign policy subjects. In both instances, rapid re-education by contrast is provided by the pitiful record of the previous Johnson Administration.

Doubtless, the pathetic Johnson record is far more the responsibility of those cast as advisors than of the President himself, who actually had a minimum of interest in foreign affairs. For a political warfare analyst in the Kremlin, the following few examples of misconception and short understanding must have constituted a source of enormous encouragement and inspiration. In one of his earlier speeches, President Johnson observed "The common interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many—and this I would say to the people of the Soviet Union: There is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere."⁹ Here you have it—the USSR is Russia, the people are Soviet, non-Russian nationals are non-existent, and the substrate empire is a ghost. With this preconception, what can you expect of realism in policy formulation?

The President never learned the fundamentals governing the USSR, nor was he expected to with the type of advisors who surrounded him. Two years later he details further his conception of the USSR as follows: "Two days ago, not very far from here, I met with Chairman Kosygin of the Soviet Union. The nations we spoke for are two of the most powerful nations in all of the world. In the family of nations, two of the strongest have two of the greatest responsibilities."¹⁰ Contrary to all facts, the USSR is viewed by the President as "a nation," and the participation of the Byelorussian and Ukrainian nations in the United Nations, albeit by puppet representatives, is also an apparition. The nonsensical aspect of this misconception was seen in many of LBJ's messages to the USSR as, for example, on the 49th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution: "On behalf of the people of the United States I send sincere greetings and best wishes to the people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the occasion of their national holiday."¹¹ A national holiday for the Latvian nation, Armenian, Byelorussian and the other nations making up the peoples in the USSR? The contradiction is obvious.

One of the major foreign policy addresses by Johnson stressed the continuity of U.S. policies toward the USSR and Eastern Europe, based on these same misconceptions, and the bridges of understanding route, citing the nominally foolish Consular Convention, a new cultural exchange agreement, more East-West trade, an air agreement with the USSR and other superficial paraphernalia of our confetti diplomacy that the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia denuded to pulp. "Under the last four Presidents our policy toward the Soviet Union has been the same," declared Johnson.¹² When one looks at the record of phenomenal expansion in territory, influence, and domination by Moscow during the terms of our Presidents, extending to only ninety miles off our own shores, it is hardly one to gloat over for the sake of continuity. And this because the continuity applies also to the underlying misconceptions and misunder-

standing of this policy. Johnson continued, "We want the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to know that we and our allies shall go step-by-step with them just as far as they are willing to advance." What occurred in Czecho-Slovakia is enough to show the naïveté of grouping the USSR and the nations of Eastern Europe together.

The pitiful Johnson record goes on and on, but let us cite just a few more choice examples of unreality, basic misconception, and negative understanding. In another address the President, with some shallow propagandistic bravado, declares "I call on every industrialized country—including the Soviet Union—to help create a better life for the people of Southeast Asia."¹³ Aside from the evident fact that Moscow, through Hanoi, has had the U.S. by the tail in Vietnam for more years than any American wishes to remember, since when is the Soviet Union, a forced imperium of numerous countries, including Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania which formally we still recognize, a single "industrialized country"? The numerous absurd contradictions one is led into by the fundamental illusions should by now be quite obvious. Far worse, of course, are the higher generalizations derived from these contradictions and misconceptions, which shape our policy determination. For example, in his address to the United Nations, Johnson stated, "The great transition from colonial rule to independence has been largely accomplished."¹⁴ Really?—in a period when the largest empire under Moscow has been formed from the Danube to the Pacific to the Caribbean, all within the short span of fifty years!

Nevertheless, leading to the tragedy of Czecho-Slovakia, President Johnson continued to exhort, "We will continue to build bridges across the gulf which has divided us from eastern Europe. They will be bridges of increased trade, of ideas, of visitors and of humanitarian aid."¹⁵ And we were all led in part into the bind crystallized by the Russian invasion of Czecho-Slovakia. First, the bridges possessed too few lanes to allow for intercourse with the captive nations themselves as against the Red state toll-takers. Second, and more important, they failed to extend far enough into the Soviet Union, part of which after all is an integral section of Eastern Europe, to circumvent the impasse created in Czecho-Slovakia. Once again, as a fundamental formula, to get out of similar binds and to minimize wastes of effort, capital and even lives, as in Vietnam, the pressures must be directed toward and concentrated on the captive nations in the USSR itself. What a new and innovative departure this would be from a falling policy under the last five Presidents. It cannot be attained without the extinction of our basic illusions.

A SECOND FUNDAMENTAL ILLUSION

A second fundamental and persistent illusion in this country that hampers our policy is the myth of equating the USSR with the U.S. This myth is usually entertained by those who, unlike Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, realize at least the existence of other people than just the Russians in the Soviet Union.¹⁶ This illusion spreads the fiction that the USSR is a federal union of states like the U.S.A. It underlies the present fallacious usage of the nomenclature "the Soviets." Yet, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the federal union of the United States came into being and expanded by the free will of previously independent and autonomous states and territories; whereas, in sharp contrast, the Soviet Union emerged entirely on the basis of armed conquest and the forced incorporation of conquered countries. However, few can forget how some of our experts have uncritically equated Ukraine with Pennsylvania,¹⁷ others paraling it with Texas, and one or two compar-

Footnotes at end of article.

ing Byelorussia with Massachusetts.¹⁸ A *New York Times* editorial artlessly viewed the Soviet Union as "the second richest nation of the world,"¹⁹ while in a report on the Soviet school system a United States Commissioner of Education simply dubbed "the U.S.S.R., as a nation."²⁰ These examples of fundamental misunderstanding can be multiplied endlessly, across the board of our society. As a matter of fact, even Khrushchev was inspired by the concepts of our former Vice President to speak of the USSR and the U.S.A. as "the largest nations of the world."²¹ This is advantageous but blunt contradiction to USSR's constitution and all his previous and subsequent statements for internal empire consumption.

Sadly enough, this second basic illusion persists to this day. Is it little wonder that our people still cannot appreciate the tremendous fact of Moscow's colonial domain, inside as well as outside the USSR? With no exaggeration, the Soviet Union, behind its nominal facade of federalism, is the greatest and worst empire in the pages of human history. Reading Russian organs, such as *Izvestia*, *Pravda* or *Trud*, will not convey this basic truth. Unlike American correspondents and observers, European analysts concentrate also on the organs of the non-Russian republics and get to understand the scope of colonialism and imperial rule within the Soviet Union.²² Nevertheless, to his very last day in office Secretary of State Dean Rusk believed areas such as Ukraine, Armenia and Georgia are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union." Clinging to the USSR—USA illusion, he never repudiated his observation that "Reference to these latter areas places the United States Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical state."²³ Since when is an imperial state scarcely fifty years old "historical" and its parts "traditional"? But such are the absurdities we arrive when our fundamental concepts are invalid, unrealistic and misleading.

It is sincerely hoped that as we enter another decade these and other illusions will be extinguished. Such necessary extinction can only come with a radical revision of our concepts pertaining to the Soviet Union, the sole major threat in this world to the security of the United States. It is ironical, indeed, that Red China, in its rift with Moscow, had alone emphasized the imperial nature of the USSR, so much so that as far back as 1964, Khrushchev screamed "Things have gone so far that the Chinese leaders are making territorial claims on the Soviet Union and one wonders that they do not suggest the dismemberment of the Soviet Union."²⁴ Other empires have collapsed; there is nothing sacred about the USSR, and its collapse would be the greatest boon to all mankind, including long enslaved Russian people.

The necessary revision of concepts would naturally lead to an equally necessary alteration of policy. Following the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia, Lord Caradon, the British delegate to the U.N., was excessively restrained when he retorted to Jacob Malik's defense of the rape in these words, "I like to remind my Soviet colleague that my country has done more to end imperialism than any other country in the history of the world."²⁵ The Russian's insular retort was, characteristically, "Don't stick your nose into other people's affairs," the old Russian non-intervention technique where it contravenes Russian intervention in other peoples' affairs. Why the U.S. delegate, in the spirit of Adlai Stevenson's memo of 1961, wasn't more forceful in this debate is a good question. Now with the Brezhnev Doctrine, justifying all sorts of Russian adventures into other peoples' affairs in order to maintain Russian hegemony over Moscow's extended empire, we can prepare for more "We told you so's." For the doctrine, with all its nominal socialist embellishments, is nothing more than a

contemporary version of traditional Russian imperialism and can be successfully countered only when we begin to center our diverse efforts on the empire within the empire. Then, too, we may also say, "We told you so."

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Congressional Record*, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C., September 11, 1968, p. H8532.

² A few of these are pointed out by Victor Zorza, "Nationalism Has Soviet Union Worried," *The Sunday Star*, Washington, D.C., February 23, 1969.

³ Richard M. Nixon, Address to American Legion, *Congressional Record*, October 28, 1968, p. E9522.

⁴ E. g., John F. Kennedy, *State-of-the-Union Address*, text, January 30, 1961.

⁵ "Soviet Progress," Editorial, *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., November 2, 1967.

⁶ Vincent P. Rock, Study Phoenix Paper, *Common Action For The Control of Conflict*, Institute For Defense Analysis, Washington, D.C., 1963, pp. 20, 58.

⁷ Letter, August 13, 1965, with reference to article "The Second Treaty of Moscow."

⁸ Lloyd Shearer, Ed., "Intelligence Report," *Parade*, Washington, D.C., September 22, 1968, p. 4.

⁹ "Text of President's Speech on U.S. Aim to Keep Peace," *The Washington Post*, June 4, 1965, p. A6.

¹⁰ "LJB: 'Count Your Own Blessings,'" *The Washington Post*, June 28, 1967, p. A14.

¹¹ "Lyndon Sends Reds Note On Anniversary," *Chicago Tribune*, Chicago, November 7, 1966, p. 18.

¹² "On Improving Relations With Eastern Europe," *The New York Times*, October 8, 1966, p. 12.

¹³ Text of President's Speech on Viet Nam Policy," *The Evening Star*, May 13, 1965, p. A-7.

¹⁴ United Nations, December 1963.

¹⁵ Text of President's Speech at Marshall Library, *The Evening Star*, May 24, 1964, p. A-23.

¹⁶ See *Congressional Record*, August 10, 1961, p. 14316.

¹⁷ E.g., George F. Keenan, *American Diplomacy 1900-1950*, The University of Chicago Press, 1951, p. 135.

¹⁸ Review of the *United Nations Charter*, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 1955, p. 1832.

¹⁹ "Khrushchev Asks for Credits," June 6, 1958.

²⁰ Lawrence G. Derthick, "Inside Soviet School System," *Congressional Record*, June 24, 1958, p. A5746.

²¹ Text of Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's Statement, *Soviet News Agency Tass*, August 5, 1959.

²² E.g., an outstanding account on record, "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire," *New Zuercher Zeitung*, Switzerland, November 20, 1960.

²³ Dean Rusk, Letter to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, U.S. House of Representatives, August 22, 1961.

²⁴ Nikita S. Khrushchev, Address, Prague, Czech-Slovakia, September 5, 1964.

²⁵ "Briton's Jibe Angers Soviet Envoy," *The Washington Post*, September 12, 1968, p. A22.

[News release, National Captive Nations Committee, May 26, 1969]

MEMORANDUM ON "10TH"

Dear Associated Members: In two months we will be observing the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. As in previous years, NCNC is coordinating the Week observance and, on this special occasion, urges each of our 37 organized committees to prepare and act on the following plans:

1. The Week falls in the period of July 13-19, 1969 and is highlighted as "The 10th

Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution," and calls for maximum use of all available media to focus attention on the captive nations.

2. A quick response to inquiries on the background of the Week can be furnished by providing copies of NCNC's chairman's book *The Vulnerable Russians*, which is now in its second printing and can be acquired by writing to the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007.

3. The "10th" can also be impressively featured by ordering "10th Anniversary Captive Nations Medals" in silver and bronze from Mr. Viktors Viksnins (312-588-2085) of the Captive Nations Friends Committee, 4146 N. Elston Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60618. These would make wonderful presentations for persons to be honored in your area. NCNC has ordered a quantity to honor Congressmen and Senators at the Washington Banquet.

4. Most important for our cause and the fundamental importance of the captive nations to U.S. security is the 10th Anniversary Banquet planned by NCNC for Wednesday, July 16, 1969 at the University Club, 1135 16th St., N.W., Wash., D.C. at 6 p.m. (reception) 7 p.m. (dinner). To show full solidarity of our effort, your committee is requested to order at least a table of 8 at \$12.50 per person. Individual captive nations groups will order their tables according to nationality background. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang of China and Mr. George Meany, AFL-CIO President, will be honored on this momentous occasion. Because of limited seating at 200, orders will be honored on a first-come-first-serve basis, with a deadline of June 30, 1969 and submitted with check payable to the National Captive Nations Committee to our financial secretary, Mr. Walter Pretka, 797 Princeton Place, Rockville, Md. 20850. This is a high point of this year's observance, and we depend on your enthusiastic cooperation for our mutual success.

5. The themes we propose are: "The 10th: Let's Not Forget the Captive Nations"; "Only An Honorable Peace With Self-Determination by South Vietnam"; "A New, Realistic Policy Toward Russia and the USSR"; "Let's Launch Now on This 10th a Drive for America's 200th Anniversary of the Spirit of Independence in 1976."

6. Enclosed is our brochure for publicized use in your area and in preparation for a Captive Nations Conference in Washington this September, about which we would appreciate your views at the forthcoming July Banquet.

Hoping for your full support in July and the best Week ever.

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

[News release, the National Captive Nations Committee, June 9, 1969]

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

In the interest of our national security and in pursuit of truth through open public discussion, we invite our communications media to undertake for a brief period what can rightly be called "Education for Freedom by Contrast." This can be done through public service time and space. There has been more than enough concentration on campus riots, poverty campaigns, racism and other domestic, implosion factors; for realistic balance, let our people know how the other half of the world lives, particularly the captive nations in the USSR.

The period of such constructive exposure is the 1969 Captive Nations Week Observance, scheduled for July 13-19. It will highlight the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution, which our Congress passed in July 1959.

As the record shows, in our times no ideal force has sobered Moscow more than

this very resolution. Part of this record is documented in significant detail in the book *The Vulnerable Russians*, which is now in its second printing and can be purchased from the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007. The work explains the Nixon-Khrushchev encounter over the resolution ten years ago and why to this day the Russian totalitarians have vehemently opposed it for their own comparative advantage.

In advancing the unique captive nations concept, NCNC is coordinating the observances of local and state committees in all sections of the country and, through the World Anti-Communist League in Seoul, Korea, in 17 Free World nations. Large rallies are being planned in Buffalo, New York City, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, Phoenix, and Los Angeles.

In the Nation's capital, Congress will again observe the Week, and a stronger proclamation by the White House is expected. A highlight of the observance will be a 10th Anniversary Captive Nations Banquet on Wednesday, July 16, 1969 at the University Club, commencing at 7 p.m. On the occasion, Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, first President of the World Anti-Communist League and head of the Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League, will be honored along with ten Honorables of our Government for their unstinted support of the captive nations movement.

NCNC was virtually alone in predicting the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia in 1968. It is urging the following themes for the "10th": "No Forced Coalition Government in Saigon," "A New Realistic Policy Toward Russia and the USSR," "Imperialist Moscow is the Chief Enemy to World Peace," "No Deals With the Red Empire."

[News release, Captive Nations Committee, Arizona]

July 13-19 has been designated as Captive Nations Week 1969.

This is the 11th observance of a week set aside to remind us that captive nations—the peoples themselves as against the totalitarian Red states and their Communist Party apparatus are still very much captive.

The Captive Nations Week Resolution was passed by the United States Congress in July 1959. The Resolution was adopted as Public Law 86-90 which designated the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week.

The purpose of this observance is to remind the world of the plight of the unfortunate people in nations enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy. It also symbolizes for billions of captive peoples the firm dedication of America to their freedom and independence.

More than any event, it shows the right things about America stand out most when contrasted with the combination of political oppression and rampant economic poverty that exists in the Red Empire, particularly, the Soviet Union.

We, the citizens of Arizona, can back up these actions by our whole-hearted participation in our local observance of Captive Nations Week—in a rally that will be held July 15 (Tuesday) at Grady Gammage Auditorium at 8:00 p.m.

[News release, Captive Nations Committee, Arizona]

PURPOSE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEES

The purpose of the National Captive Nations Committee is broad and multiple in scope:

First and foremost, firm adherence to our Declaration of Independence—that we Americans, in the interest of our own national security, will never forget the captive nations or accommodate ourselves to their present captivity.

Promote and accelerate the freedom as-

pirations of the peoples of the captive nations, to which they are entitled by their Creator.

Continuous rejection of existent colonialism effected by Russian aggression and "wars of liberation," and focusing world attention on the last remaining empire, the Soviet Union itself.

Restore the great image of America and defend every point of NCNC's purpose—a challenge to every American's courage of convictions and conscience.

A resolute stand against misleading Cold War theories of "peaceful coexistence," "lessened tensions," "trade with Red countries," "bridges of understanding," etc., while the rape of nations exists.

Regardless of political persuasion, instill in all men their sacred duty and responsibility for the preservation of freedom in the full tradition of our American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in a Captive Nations Week rally in Taipei, Taiwan, on Thursday, July 10, 1969. From this rally I would like to insert into the RECORD as a continuation of my remarks the following:

Message from President Chiang Kai-shek supporting Captive Nations Week;
Address by Chairman Ku Cheng-kang;

Speech by Vice President Yen Chia-kang;

Remarks by U.S. Ambassador McCone;

Cable message to President Richard M. Nixon;

Cable message to captive nations and people; and

Message to the Armed Forces of the United States of America, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand in South Vietnam.

I also insert, Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, an editorial of July 9 from the China News which typifies the press commentary in the Republic of China on the occasion of Captive Nations Week observance.

The material follows:

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MESSAGE TO THE TAIPEI RALLY SUPPORTING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Since 1959, the United States has been observing the third week of each July as Captive Nations Week to support the aspirations of people all over the world for justice and freedom. This movement has elicited a profound response and has had a far-reaching effect throughout the world. Sympathy and support have been aroused for captive peoples, strong anti-Communist tides have been raised behind the Iron Curtain and lethal blows have been dealt against the dark reign of Communist wickedness.

As I have said before, the Chinese Communist regime is the source of all the evil in Asia and must be destroyed before the evil can be eradicated. This means that the free world must concentrate its strength and finally dispose of the Mao regime, the most evil enemy of humankind within the Communist camp, so that the people can be delivered from slavery. In the last few years Mao Tse-tung has carried out a "cultural revolution" in an attempt to seize power, prolong his personal totalitarian rule and destroy the cultural traditions of the Chinese people. Last spring he brought together a nondescript group for the so-called Ninth National Congress. This represents not the end of the "great cultural revolution" but the beginning of another round in the bloody struggle of power-seizure. The evidence of this is clearly to be seen since Congress adjournment in the mounting anti-Maoism

within the Communist Party and the anti-Communism outside the Party. Now at the end of his rope, Mao Tse-tung can be expected to lash out in a last frenetic struggle and to subject our mainland compatriots to more atrocious persecution and pull tighter the bonds of slavery.

We have always felt the suffering of our mainland compatriots as though it were inflicted on us. We have never failed to push forward in our task of preparing for early counterattack to deliver them from their crucible of suffering. The anti-Mao struggle that our mainland compatriots have carried out in diverse ways is now a solid, substantial movement of Mao suppression and national salvation. This assures a new opportunity for our counterattack and guarantees final success. We are confident that in winning anti-Communist hearts on the mainland and joining with formidable anti-Mao forces, we can deal blows from within and without that will sound the death knell of the Mao regime.

I have often said that we do not need even one soldier from other countries of the free world in our counteroffensive against the traitors on the mainland. What we do require is the free world's moral support. Anti-Communism is the common responsibility of all free people. The Communists will never limit their aggressive ambitions to one country or one region. They seek to conquer the whole world and all humankind. In their counterattack, the free nations should not fight individually and run the risk that Communists will defeat them one by one. Adopting a consistent strategy, we should combine together for joint operations. World peace, security and freedom are not divisible. The loss of any one of these anywhere in the world will affect the destiny of all of us.

Because the root cause of Asian turmoil and insecurity lies in the Maoist usurpation of the Chinese mainland, we must deliver the Chinese people from Maoist slavery and restore their life of freedom and democracy. Only then can we assure the stability of Asia and the world. All the people of this island bastion of the Republic of China, civilians and military have joined hands with the anti-Mao and anti-Communist freedom fighters on the mainland and have sworn to fight to total victory in this sacred struggle. We pray that the peoples and countries of the free world will understand that man cannot exist half free and half slave. If they do so, they will surely summon their courage in the cause of justice and make the sacrifices required to rescue those who are enslaved and to assure peace with honor and freedom without qualification for all the people of the earth.

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN KU CHENG-KANG AT THE MASS RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS AND PEOPLES

Your Excellency, Distinguished and Honored Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: Full ten years have gone by since Congressional leaders in the United States initiated the "Captive Nations Week Movement" in 1959. Events in these ten years have made clear several vitally important trends in the world situation.

First: International Communism and the authoritarian Communist Party rule that exists in various countries—which together constitute the darkest and most barbarian force of enslavement known in the history of mankind—have already revealed themselves to be ideologically bankrupt, fragmented, and the object of everyone's contempt. These phenomena reflect the decline of the entire Communist movement. Fundamentally, it means that man has reached the turning point toward victory in his fight for freedom and in his struggle against enslavement.

Second: In the last decade, the awakening

of and efforts exerted by the free peoples toward unity has unceasingly progressed. From anti-Communist unity among the people, we have progressed to strengthened cooperation and mutual assistance among the governments of nations. From a tendency among newly formed nations to placate or align with the Communist nations, we now see them taking up a steadfast anti-Communist stand. From anti-Communist activities in the free areas of the world, we now witness a vast wave of struggles for freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

Third: And yet, there has remained in these ten years an undeniable cross-current; a cross-current caused by the swelling of appeasement. And this surge of appeasement is a result, on the one hand, of a last gasp of the declining Communist influence, and, on the other, of a loss of courage and fighting spirit among certain nations. It represents, as President Nixon said, a decline in idealism.

It is precisely because of these three phenomena that the present complications have arisen. Freedom continues to grow and burgeon, and the movement to achieve freedom continues to expand and advance. But the final victory of freedom has yet to be achieved. And in many areas, the threat of the evil influence of Communism remains unabated.

It is my belief that this is a phenomenon that should not exist, yet exists; a tendency that should not grow, yet grows. We have the utmost faith that, under the present trend of historic development, the enslaved and oppressed peoples will achieve freedom. At present, we have only to hold righteously steadfast and to exert our efforts in the following three areas so that we may achieve our goal of winning the victory of freedom.

First, we must take urgent steps to encourage political turmoil behind the Iron Curtain, aggravate internal contradictions and dangers, and assist the development of freedom movements and anti-Communist uprisings. We must first proceed firmly with the Anti-Mao and National Salvation United Front movement. We must take advantage of the internal unrest and agitation that is following in the wake of the Chinese Communist 9th Congress and offer every assistance to the anti-Mao, anti-Communist movement on the China mainland and to the united anti-Communist, anti-Mao regime activities of the Communist armed forces and cadres, the intellectuals, peasants and workers, and the minority border groups. Then, we must urge world forces of freedom to aid the continuation and expansion of freedom movements in Eastern Europe. This step is especially urgent in our effort to disperse the Communist movement and eliminate the Communist camp since the recent world Communist Congress in Moscow revealed that splits continue among the various national Communist parties and freedom and independence movements are rising in the captive nations. And, finally, we must appeal to the free world, especially to those nations in a position of leadership, not to abandon their basic ideal and moral responsibility of "liberating" the Iron Curtain nations. We strongly believe that removal of the Iron Curtain in Asia constitutes the most effective way to buckle and eventually collapse the Iron Curtain in Europe. By supporting the Republic of China in leading and completing the anti-Mao and anti-Communist fight on the mainland, we will achieve our goal without an all-out war and without the threat of a nuclear war.

Second, we must bind still tighter in unity the forces of freedom throughout the world to form a united front against international Communism in response to President Chiang's call to "let a united free world defeat a fragmented, contradictory Communist bloc." In this respect, we must work hardest

at establishing at an early date regional security organizations in every part of the world. Mao Tse-tung and the Chinese Communists are not only the source of all the evils in Asia, but also constitute a serious threat to the well-being of the entire world. Therefore, there is all the more urgent need to accelerate the establishment of a regional security organization for Asia and the Pacific region. We must be determined and united in halting the spread of international Communism and in breaking up its insidious burrowing. In terms of common anti-Communist action among the peoples of the world, we have already laid a foundation in the World Anti-Communist League. But we must advance further to achieve close anti-Communist ranks among the free nations of the entire world and use our combined strength and unit to defend ourselves and to defeat Communist enslavement. In addition, we must seek the speedy formation of a world-wide common strategy against the Communists. Not only must we possess a common strategy in our fight against Communism, but we must also formulate a common strategy in talking with the Communists. Thus, we may achieve victory at the conference table as well as on the battlefield.

Third, it is still more imperative that we should exert effort on the critical struggle to cure at its root the ill of appeasement. The free world must revivify the spirit of idealism, courageously uphold the dignity of man and his freedom, and exert the greatest and most beneficial efforts without giving in to, retreating from, or currying favor with Communism. Therefore, the free world must: (1) remain adamant in opposing the admission of the Chinese Communists into the United Nations; (2) abandon the ill-conceived move of establishing diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communists; (3) eliminate the hallucination and misconception that it is possible to maintain "peaceful coexistence" with the Communist enslaver; (4) give a fatal blow to the expansion and aggression of international Communism; (5) oppose any intrigue of international Communism to set up a coalition government in South Vietnam; the United States must beware of a rise in the tendency toward a new isolationism and take effective preventive measures.

That freedom will be victorious is foreordained, but I have confidence in exerting efforts in the above-mentioned three areas. Freedom will achieve its victory at an earlier date. Today, as we are gathered here in observance of the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week movement sponsored by the United States, I offer a guarantee to you representatives of friendly nations and to Congressman Derwinski, who represents the United States on this occasion. I guarantee that in this bitter struggle of historic importance, the people of the Republic of China will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with all freedom-loving peoples in the world to win freedom for all mankind until the freedom achieves its final and total victory.

VICE PRESIDENT YEN CHIA-KAN'S ADDRESS TO THE TAIPEI RALLY SUPPORTING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Anti-Communist Fighters, Ladies and Gentlemen: The Captive Nations Week initiated in 1959 by U.S. Congressmen and ever since given universal support by the free world has today attained its tenth anniversary.

In the history of the world anti-Communist movement, the Captive Nations Week and the Freedom Day both symbolize man's struggle to fight against slavery in pursuit of freedom. The Captive Nations movement seeks to tear down the Iron Curtain and help captive peoples regain their freedom. This has not only stressed the free world's lofty ideals in maintaining righteousness

and human rights but has also inspired the confidence of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the fulfillment of their aspirations to survival and freedom. Though the world still remains only half free, the worldwide anti-Communist revolution is gaining ground and momentum due to Communist disunity, widespread uprisings behind the Iron Curtain and increasing anti-Communist solidarity of the free world. Under these circumstances, observation of the Captive Nations Week in consonance with our political march toward the China mainland is highly significant.

In the last half century, more than a billion people have been shut behind the Iron Curtain. While this tragedy was brought about as a result of Communist infiltration, subversion and armed aggression designed to communize the whole world, it was also attributable to the free world's failure to be on the alert and the rising tendency to appease Communism. Of the peoples thus victimized, the Chinese have suffered the most. As early as 1921, after international Communism was frustrated in its designs to expand into Western Europe, its attention was shifted to China as its new target. Since then the Communists have obstructed efforts at national unification and reconstruction in an attempt to turn the China mainland into a base for expansion and aggression in Asia. Unfortunately, it was not until the fall of the China mainland that the free world community began to understand the role we played in the anti-Communist struggle. Its indifference in place of compassion and its interference in place of support have thus finally led to the communization of the mainland!

With Communist occupation of the mainland, millions of the Chinese people fell under the yoke of Mao Tze-tung's totalitarian rule. In the last two decades, the free world has witnessed many bloody occurrences. Thousands upon thousands of the Chinese people have died under Maoist tyranny. The mainland has truly been turned into the darkest of hells. However, the Maoists are not content with enslaving the Chinese people alone.

As adherents to Marxism, Leninism and Stalinism, they have resorted to the use of force for external expansion to fulfill their dream of world hegemony. From Korea to Vietnam, from Asia to Africa, and from the Middle East to Latin America, virtually not a single place has been spared from the violence incited or instigated by the Maoists. The fall of the China mainland to the Communists, therefore, resulted in the erection of the world's biggest Iron Curtain and has posed a prime threat to world peace.

For the last two decades, we have continuously stood in the forefront of the anti-Communist cause. We have engaged in preparations for mainland recovery and have been steadfastly waging a political warfare against the Chinese Communists. With more than 40 years' experience in anti-Communism, we are convinced that the anti-Communist war is primarily an ideological one. To win the final victory, we must first overwhelm the enemy on the political front.

After years of unremitting efforts, we have brought together the hearts of our countrymen living at home and abroad and within and outside the enemy's frontiers and successfully formed the Anti-Mao and National Salvation United Front. Our righteous call has engendered towering anti-Communist tides on the China mainland and has directly or indirectly prompted schisms in the Chinese Communist Party, violent struggle among Red cadres and demoralization in the ranks of the Red forces.

With the situation becoming increasingly favorable to us, we feel an urgent need to intensify our political march, hasten the collapse of the Peiping regime and thereby eliminate a major source of all the evils in Asia and the world. We are confident that

our achievements on the political battlefield will lead to the disintegration of the Iron Curtain and the liberation of our suffering compatriots.

In this decisive stage of our anti-Communist struggle, we must emphasize that such a struggle is not confined to any one country or any one area. We do not expect to involve others in our anti-Mao and national salvation war. However, we do expect moral and material support from friendly countries and, more important, a united stand in the anti-Communist struggle.

The Maoists' evil deeds of the last few years have gradually made many free world people see the true image of the Chinese Communists and have led to increased vigilance. However, appeasement still exists on the international scene. If this is allowed to persist, the free world would not only feel disconcerted at the remembrance of the freedom fighters who have died in Korea and Vietnam and stand abashed before the freedom-loving people who have paid such a great price to assist captive nations in their anti-slavery and freedom-seeking struggle, but would directly abet Communist aggression while discouraging the uprising of enslaved people. Should that be the case, the free world would face endless turmoil.

History tells us that the appeasement of the Nazis almost buried all of Europe and that the appeasement of the Communists has compelled countless people of Eastern Europe and Asia to live a sub-human life. The free world has paid a heavy price for its forbearance and retreat. Such tragedies cannot be permitted to recur. I take this opportunity to urge all freedom-loving countries and peoples of the world to step up their support to enslaved peoples. Let us arm ourselves and clear away the inky appeasement shadows in a global movement of self-purification. The free world can win the ultimate victory in the anti-Communist revolution through steadfast struggle.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR MCCONAUGHY AT CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY, TAIPEI, TAIWAN, JULY 10, 1969

Mr. Vice President, Chairman Ku, Committee Members, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a great honor for me to participate once again in the annual observance in Taipei of Captive Nations Week.

Ten years ago a Joint Resolution of the Congress of the United States authorized and requested the President of the United States to proclaim the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week until such time as freedom and independence should have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. Human freedom, national independence and justice are fundamental rights of all peoples everywhere in our world. Unfortunately, the enjoyment of these basic rights is still denied in many areas of the world and our observance of Captive Nations Week remains a solemn obligation to remember those deprived of liberty.

The United States of America, in keeping with the principles on which it was founded, has sought consistently to further the observance of fundamental human rights throughout the world. Thousands of Americans have given their lives during the last few years for this very cause in the Republic of Viet-Nam. Americans have not only fought for the liberty of others beyond their own frontiers, but have struggled within their own borders to achieve a just and honorable society for all that could serve as a model for peoples everywhere. The United States, in close association with like-minded countries in all parts of the world, will remain steadfast to the great cause of the defense of man's inalienable right to freedom.

The part of freedom is not an easy one to follow but it is the only course that leads to the full flowering of the human spirit. It is a path that should be denied to none. That it

is, in fact, closed to so much of the human race in this supposedly enlightened second half of the Twentieth Century is a cruel and indefensible injustice to which we must not become reconciled. The day when we no longer will need to observe the annual ceremony which we now attend will indeed be a blessed day for all peoples everywhere. In the meanwhile it is fitting that we should pause once each year to pay tribute to the victims of tyranny, and to renew our consciousness that our own freedom is not complete while our brother men in such appalling numbers remain enslaved.

CABLE MESSAGE TO HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

YOUR EXCELLENCY: In holding a mass rally today in Taipei to observe the Captive Nations Week initiated by the United States in 1959, we, representing various walks of life in the Republic of China, should like to pay our higher respects to the United States for the preservation of human freedom and for smiting the Communist enslaving forces. One of the basic principles the United States ever holds is that freedom is one of the unalienable rights. This principle has been demonstrated by the United States, under Your Excellency's leadership, in her fight against the armed expansionism of the Communism. Your Excellency said in a speech to the graduating class at the Air Force Academy on June 4: "This is why I believe a resurgence of American idealism can bring about a modern miracle—a world order of peace and justice." These words have won praise and respect of all people in the free world.

At present time when the international Communist camp is going to fragment, and when the Peiping regime is confronting chaos and collapse within, The U.S. leadership and help are needed more than ever for the free world in this anti-Communist struggle and for the captive peoples in their resistance against the Communist enslavement. It is the expectation of all the freedom-loving people throughout the world that the United States would carry through her liberation policy and take active action in strengthening the free forces behind the Iron Curtain. In order to deal a deadly blow to the Communist aggressors, we are sure that the United States will support the Republic of Vietnam to win an honorable victory on the battlefield and frustrate the wicked design of the Communists to set up a coalition government in South Vietnam and to compel the unilateral withdrawal of the Allied forces. As the way for uniting the people in the free world into an anti-Communist force has been paved, a further step must be taken to develop a regional security system. Economic and military assistance from the United States is of unparalleled importance for Asian peoples to found a regional security system and to strengthen their defense. The Chinese Communists are the source of all Asia's troubles. The United States should take advantage of the chaotic situation on the China Mainland to help Chinese people in their fight to overthrow the Mao Tze-tung's tyrannical regime, and should stand firm against recognition of the regime, against its admission to the United Nations, and against any diplomatic or trade relations with it.

The people of the Republic of China pledge that they will stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of the United States and all free peoples over the world to set up an international anti-Communist and anti-Maoist united front, and will strive unceasingly until the day when the Iron Curtain has been lifted and the shackles bonding the captive peoples released. We salute you and hope the Sino-American friendship will last forever and our two nations' joint efforts in supporting the captive peoples in their

struggle for freedom will score an early victory.

Yours respectfully,

KU CHENG-KANG,
Chairman, Mass Rally of the People of the Republic of China in Support of the Struggle of Captive Nations and Peoples for Freedom.

CABLE MESSAGE TO CAPTIVE NATIONS AND PEOPLE

Dear Friends Behind the Iron Curtain: The people of the Republic of China took the lead to respond to the Captive Nations Week Movements a decade ago when it was initiated by the U.S. Congress and proclaimed by U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Now, this movement and the Freedom Day Movement, which marks the return to freedom of the 12,000 POWs in Korean War on January 23 fifteen years ago, have become two worldwide important occasions of commemorating the struggle for human freedom and against enslavement. To observe the Tenth Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week movement, we people from all walks of life in the Republic of China, are holding our Mass Rally in Support of Captive Nations for Freedom, here in Taipei. We like to reaffirm our support for your unflinching anti-Communist and anti-slavery struggle for freedom and justice.

It is evident that the Communists will bring forth more sufferings to peoples behind the Iron Curtain before their totalitarian and vicious rule comes to its fatal end. On the other side, captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain will also rise to resist in a more drastic pattern. Though the Czechoslovak anti-slavery movement is suppressed for the time being, the seed of the revolution against the Communist rule has been sowed and can never be destroyed. As the international Communist parties are in split among themselves, the anti-Communist camp is growing stronger in various aspects, and anti-Communist forces inside and outside the Iron Curtain are consolidated, the victory of the struggle for freedom and against enslavement has been guaranteed. The armed anti-Communist forces on the China mainland are rapidly developing. Cooperation among Asian and Pacific nations is being strengthened. Especially the so-called "new isolationism" was positively refuted by President Nixon; and the anti-Communist strategy of the U.S. is under an over-all revamping.

All these testify to the fact that a new anti-Communist situation is under development. But we all understand that freedom must be harvested through struggle. We shall never relax our fight. On the contrary, we should intensify our struggle and to deal a deadly blow to the enslaving rule in order to speed up the coming of the victory of freedom.

My dear friends behind the Iron Curtain, the Captive Nations Week movement will mobilize the free world to give you unceasing support in your fighting for freedom and against enslavement. Let us join hands to march toward our common goal and to launch fatal attack at the Communist totalitarian rule!

We wish you continued success and an early victory.

Sincerely yours,

KU CHENG-KANG,
Chairman Mass Rally of the People of the Republic of China in Support of the Struggle of Captive Nations and Peoples for Freedom.

MESSAGE TO THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, KOREA, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, THE PHILIPPINES, AND THAILAND IN SOUTH VIETNAM

General Creighton W. Abrams, Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Forces in South Vietnam, and all officers and enlisted men of the

Armed Forces of the U.S., Korea, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines and Thailand in South Vietnam: In response to the U.S.-sponsored Captive Nations Week movement, we, people from various walks of life in the Republic of China, hold our Mass Rally in Support of Captive Nations for Freedom today in Taipei. The Rally unanimously resolved to pay to you our highest respects for your heroic efforts in fighting in the battle front for the independence of the Republic of Vietnam, and for human freedom and world peace.

Having suffered a deadly blow and being on the edge of defeat, the Viet Cong is taking advantage of the "peace talks" to regroup and reinforce themselves. Fighting for human freedom against an undercurrent of international appeasement, your heroic and justice spirit has written down a glorious and brilliant page in the history of human freedom. While Allied forces in Vietnam are revamping their strategical disposition, we people of all circles in the Republic of China pledge to continue our struggle until we have recovered the China mainland and eliminated the Chinese Communists which are the very source of world menace today, to fight in a different field against our common enemy, and finally to win our early victory in liberating all captive peoples from behind the Iron Curtain.

We salute you and wish you continued success!

Yours respectively,

KU CHENG-KANG,
Chairman, Mass Rally of the People of
the Republic of China in Support of
the Struggle of Captive Nations and
Peoples for Freedom.

[From China News, July 9, 1969]

NO MORE CAPTIVES

Tomorrow's Captive Nations Week rally will call attention to the tragic fact that since Communist aggression first began, no enslaved country has been liberated.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia tried and failed. They received no free world help and the Soviet Union did not hesitate to use its military strength.

North Korea was virtually free late in 1950. But the Chinese Communists came crashing across the Yalu and the United Nations forces retreated. In Asia the Communists still hold North Korea, North Vietnam and the mainland of China.

Captive Nations Week, which was started by President Eisenhower, is dedicated to the proposition that in the goodness of time, all the enslaved will be set free. That will be as true in Asia as in Europe.

The movement keeps alive the hopes of those who have waited so long for the free world to come to their rescue. To buoy their faith in liberation sparks anti-Communist activities on the Chinese mainland and elsewhere.

In this particular year, the freedom fighters who speak out during Captive Nations Week have a further obligation to warn against any addition to the list of the enslaved.

There are those in the free world who say that South Vietnam must be handed over to the Communists or to a coalition that in the end would mean the same thing.

Some Americans say they are weary of fighting, that if the South Vietnamese don't want Communism, they should fight their own war. They want to get out of South Vietnam at any cost.

The eyes of these appeasers can see no farther than Saigon. If they looked to Moscow and Peking, they would find two Communist regimes that have never thought of withdrawing from Vietnam. Both are waiting for the U.S. pullout so they can move into the power vacuum.

What other nations might be captured in East Asia? South Vietnam is the prime target but not the only one. Laos is fighting Com-

munists. So is Thailand. Malaysia fought once and may have to fight again. Communist threats lie just beneath the surface in both Malaysia and Singapore. Indonesia barely survived three years ago. The Huks are gathering strength in the Philippines. South Korea repels Red aggression as a daily occurrence. Communists seek to create civil turmoil to further their goals in Japan.

For 1969, Captive Nations Week dedication should be to the preservation of the nations that are already free as well as to keeping alive the liberation hopes of those who live in chains. The loss of even the smallest part will weaken the whole, as we have already seen in the communization of only three Asian lands.

The Republic of China has a further obligation because the Chinese Communists are the principal reservoir of aggression, danger and evil in this part of the world. If the Maoist Communist hold on the mainland could be broken, North Korea and North Vietnam would not remain enslaved for long. Soviet expansionism could be contained.

If the wall can be held in South Vietnam and further concrete steps taken toward free China's mainland recovery, there is every reason for confidence that the era of Asian captive nations can be ended within the foreseeable future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago Congress by passage of a joint resolution inaugurated the observance of Captive Nations Week. On this our annual observance of Captive Nations Week in the House, I join in calling attention to the issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for 100 million people of East and Central Europe.

The years have been long ones for the people of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Their subjection to Communist domination during and following World War II has tolled misery, blood, and sorrow.

The plight of these courageous people has testified to the world that individual freedom cannot exist in a Communist state. The incidents in Czechoslovakia last August are a continuing reminder of that fact. The world once again witnessed the undying aspirations of a people struggling for national freedom and their suppression.

This year I have reintroduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee would focus on the problems of the captive nations and peaceful means by which we can assist the people of these nations in their just efforts to regain individual freedom and liberty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution which Congress passed in July 1959 and President Eisenhower signed into law as Public Law 86-90. Captive nations, of course, are not new to our generation; they date back to the establishment of the first geopolitical units. The history of Europe shows an almost continuing back-and-forth domi-

nation of one nation by another. Essentially every ethnic group has been a captive state at some time in its history.

In this century, captive nations have resulted largely from the Communist effort to dominate the world. Since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the subsequent establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, buffer-zone territorial acquisition by the Russians resulted in the subjugation of numerous small neighboring states. In fact, one-half of the 16 constituent republics making up the Soviet Union are captive nations.

Other captive nations were drawn into the Communist bloc when the Iron Curtain was lowered over Eastern Europe and the Bamboo Curtain on the fringes of Asia. Other attempts at national enslavement have been made in Africa and Latin America.

For some national entities, such as Armenia and the Ukraine, captivity dates back almost one-half century. Despite this lengthy period of servitude, we should not assume this is a permanent condition. Nationalism is an unquenchable flame and we have many historical examples which regained independent status after hundreds of years of occupation and domination. Let us hope and pray that it will not take that long for the present captive nations to regain their freedom.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is traditionally a time set aside to commemorate the noble struggle of weak and oppressed nations for freedom. This is not a new struggle. It is one that has been waged since man first appeared on this earth. And perhaps because it is such an old struggle we may sometimes overlook its overwhelming importance. Let us continually renew our concern for it.

There are peoples who have virtually never been free, who have never known life without the presence of the dark cloud of a dominant government, a repressive government, and a restrictive government. When we look at the tiny Baltic States, at Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and too many others, we realize how lucky we as Americans are. But the very fact that we are free, that we are strong, that we do govern ourselves, places a tremendous responsibility on us. We must strive with every effort to perpetuate our ideals of self-determination and liberty for all. We must let the captive nations know that their struggle is not ignored nor forgotten by manifesting our sympathy with their cause. We must conduct our Government and ourselves in keeping with our highest ideals as an example and inspiration to nations whose faith in democracy is constantly being tried, whose struggle for freedom constantly thwarted.

The repressions that we have witnessed in the past year in Czechoslovakia have drawn our sympathy; the reaction of the courageous Czech people has elicited our deepest respect. There was a daring experiment; one, it seems, that was too daring, too threatening to the Russian system whose continuance depends on hard-line adherence to all its precepts and laws. We must continue to oppose

the precepts of that system. Our opposition should be focused on its defects, the limits it imposes on individuals and minorities and the freedoms it abridges.

Czechs are suffering and have suffered tremendously. That they are willing to continue to suffer shows their dedication to their beliefs. The setback they received last August in the visible form of Russian tanks was unjust and frightening. It was a shattering blow to the morale of a people who had been riding on the exhilarating crest of a wave of liberalism for six months. Russia had to stop that wave before it became too large and swept away her control. Freedom of the press and of speech were ended; liberal government leaders were removed; and hard line Russian puppets were restored. The Czechs are weary and depressed, but they have not given up. The press continues to be defiant and there is evidence of dissent from many diverse areas of Czech life—from intellectuals, workers, youth, and middle class. The knowledge that we support their efforts at liberalization is very important to their morale. We must continue to express our concern for their struggle and our belief in their ideals. We must let it be known to the world that we are opposed to any form of unjust oppression and that we support the striving of captive nations everywhere for independence and liberty.

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, each year during the month of July the American people and the citizens of 17 other nations of the free world observe Captive Nations Week. This week was established in 1959 by a joint resolution of Congress. Its purpose is to make the people of the world cognizant of the untold millions who suffer under the yoke of Communist imperio colonialism.

Since its inception, Captive Nations Week has become a significant part of our national lives. Each year, Americans throughout the Nation hold appropriate ceremonies in remembrance of those individuals imprisoned behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains.

It is fitting that this week should fall in the same month as the celebration of independence in the United States; for the people of the captive nations are striving for that which we have attained: personal liberty, political freedom, and the right of national self-determination.

For some 20 years, the peoples of the captive nations have suffered under the oppression of Communist rule with little or no freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. These people, however, have not, and with God's help, will not lose their all-encompassing desire to be free.

Thus, with a great deal of pride and sadness do I rise today to speak in remembrance of our fellow men enslaved by communism. I, as I know all of the free peoples of the world, hope and pray for the time when Public Law 86-90 is no longer needed; the day when the peoples of the captive nations are free and are able to shape their own destinies.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in this special observance of the 11th annual Captive Nations Week.

We in Congress join with millions of

Americans each year in expressing our determination to strengthen freedom and support liberty for the oppressed. Each year we call for liberation of peoples trapped by the tyranny behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and those people living in captive nations renew their hopes as a result of our concern and support.

The right of people everywhere to determine their own future is a basic international right which America must continue to recognize in its foreign policy, in the United Nations, and in the hearts of our citizens. If this truth were universally accepted, there would be no bloodshed in Vietnam or in the Middle East and hundreds of millions of people in captive nations would be free today.

Perhaps the most important reason for this special week is to sustain the hope for freedom which continued to burn within the captive nations. Hope and faith in freedom will one day liberate those in captivity.

Just as today, we in America watch the first manned moon flight, so one day will we see millions of oppressed people enjoy the experience of freedom for the first time.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there are many who are willing to bet the pessimistic prediction of George Orwell is correct, that the symbol of our age will be a boot stamping on a human face, forever. The peoples of the captive nations have long been victims of such a boot and the force it is using to destroy their rights and freedom recently has grown heavier. The example of Czechoslovakia is public notice to all the world and especially the citizens of the captive nations that the rulers of the Communist empire have no intention of recognizing personal liberty or a nation's right of self-determination.

Our proclamation of Captive Nations Week is one portion of a great body of evidence that the United States stands firmly against the oppression of personal liberty. A prediction such as that of Orwell begs for a challenge, and it is answered year after year by free people in words and actions. With our support the hopes of the captive nations will be bouyed to the end that soon they will be able to participate in world decisions speaking with a voice that is their own and not that of the wearer of the tyrant's boot.

America's heritage and character demand that we express full support for all on whom a despot treads. To do less would be to disavow our founding principles and to surrender to the apparent strength of present reality. We are as a nation committed to change when change will bring about self-determination and freedom of conscience and expression. We owe it to the captive nations, from whom we have drawn so much, to ally ourselves wholeheartedly with their efforts against enslavement and oppression.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, we are gathered together solemnly in this Chamber to commemorate and protest the enslavement of untold millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. We commemorate Captive Nation's Week not in celebration, but in mourning for

the past and present and hope for the future.

There are those among us, no doubt, who question the need for these ceremonies. Let them look to the treachery of the last two decades. Let them look to the forced detention and privation of the people of Albania, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia. And, if after looking, they still cannot see, let them examine the freedoms afforded those suffering people. The rape of Hungary, the bloody suppressions of Poland and East Germany and only recently the murderous actions of the Russian tanks against the helpless Czechs stand as unimpeached testimony to the callous disregard of the Russian oppressors for their victims.

But, Mr. Speaker, oratory alone will not rent the Iron Curtain, nor will it remove the shackles of slavery. We must resolve not to offer our suffering brothers behind the red wall a hollow bone. We must constantly remind the world of the prostitute governments which rule these people illegally and immorally. And we must afford the people themselves a measure of hope.

The Godless dictators in Moscow have temporarily subdued the bodies of their victims, but they have not and they cannot conquer either their minds or their spirit. A man's mind and spirit remain free so long as he has hope and so long as he believes. Our moral responsibility is to give them reason, valid reason, to hope and to believe.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, I think that we should examine the threat of communism as a whole as well as offer praise and encouragement to the peoples of the captive nations.

Since 1848, when Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels collaborated on the Communist Manifesto, communism has been a threat to free society. The philosophy expounded in this treatise calls for the violent overthrow of all governments by the proletarian classes. This makes communism an international movement, a movement which supercedes all nationalities and national biases. This threat to free society became even worse with Lenin's ideological innovation: the power elite. Thus, communism's ideology changed from that of rule by the people to rule by an elite group of men who impose their will upon the whole country.

This is the threat of communism. We in the free world must not be fooled by false claims of friendship. Communists can never be our friends; they can only coexist with us. And even this cannot go on for long. Despite all claims of friendship and converging philosophies, their basic philosophy dictates the spread of communism. This is what guides all their actions.

It is true that today our country, as well as most other countries of the world, have instituted a great number of social reforms. Communism also stands for such social reforms. But, the one great difference between the free world and the Communist world is freedom itself. We in the United States and the other

countries of the free world have the freedom of choice; free people can choose their leaders, who respond to their wishes. The people of all Communist countries have their leadership imposed upon them. There is no freedom of choice.

Since the Communist revolution in 1917, when this philosophy was put into practice, they have followed a policy of expansion and coexistence, never retreating, always holding any ground gained. This is shown so well by the example of the captive nations. Back in the period between the revolution and Lenin's death, Soviet Russia expanded its borders by imposing its ideology upon the peoples of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasia, Ukraine, Far Eastern Republic, Turkistan, and the Mongolian People's Republic. By aiding minority Communist revolutions, it spread its influence and imposed its power upon those small, proud countries. The first real period of coexistence came between 1924 and 1940, while the Soviet Union was building itself up from a weak, unstable country. Then, due to World War II, communism had the chance to expand, and expand it did. It expanded its influence in the west to Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany and expanded in the east to North Korea, Mainland China, Tibet, and North Vietnam. Now is the second period of coexistence. Will the next significant period be expansion, or will it be contraction?

But this coexistence is only a means to an end: that end is world domination by communism. As we can see by the example of Czechoslovakia, Soviet Russia intends to use all means necessary to maintain its influence over all Communist countries. Even though the world Communist movement has been committed to "base their relations on the principles of complete equality, respect for territorial integrity and state independence and sovereignty, and noninterference in one another's affairs," the Brezhnev doctrine supersedes any of these doctrines of "territorial integrity." This doctrine in effect says that Russia can interfere in the relations of any Communist state when the internal and external forces hostile to socialism seek to revert the development of any socialist country toward the restoration of the capitalist order, when a threat to the cause of socialism in that country, a threat to the security of the socialist community as a whole emerges, this is no longer only a problem of the people of that country but also a common problem—and of—concern for all socialist states. This, as well as the example of the captive nations as a whole, contradicts any statements relating to Communist self-determination such as the one in a *Kommunist* editorial of April 21, 1969, stating:

Socialism guarantees the right of peoples to their own state system, their national language, their culture, and their national traditions, as well as equal opportunities for the representatives of all nations.

Therefore, we, as the leaders of the free world, have an obligation to lead the support for the oppressed people of the captive nations. The freedom-loving peoples of the Western world just by being free are a threat to communism and a shining light to the people under its yoke. We must not forget these peoples; we are in a never-ending struggle to liberate them. Liberty is the desire of all peoples, and liberty, not totalitarianism, is the world's destiny.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the House in once again observing Captive Nations Week.

Ten years ago the Congress passed Public Law 86-90, establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week. The late President Dwight D. Eisenhower was the first Chief Executive to issue a Presidential proclamation to that effect.

The purpose of this observance, in part, is to remind those of us who partake of the blessings of freedom here in America that many millions of people in other areas of the world do not enjoy national independence. It also serves as public testimony that we in the United States have not forgotten those who are denied their rights of nationhood and that we have not abandoned our traditional role as champion of the right of independence for all the nations of the world.

It has often been said that the right of self-determination is the foundation on which all other rights rest. If self-determination is denied, no other right is secure. Millions of people today are forced to live in nations under Communist domination where the right to free speech, free press, and free assembly is held in utter contempt.

I know I speak for many in my own State of Illinois whose ancestral homeland is in one of the captive nations and who continue to pray that liberty will soon be restored to these gallant and long-suffering people. I know, too, that I speak for many Americans of all nationalities who share this same dream.

I am proud to join with the voices of the free world in rededicating ourselves in the great cause of liberty for all peoples. Our words and deeds must continue so that we can soon realize a day of true world freedom. I have faith that one day the people of the captive nations will once again be masters of their own destiny.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of Captive Nations Week through congressional action in 1959 constituted a formal commitment by the American people through their representatives to reaffirm each year that the plight of the millions of people held in Communist captivity will never be ignored by or acceptable to Americans. The captive nations resolution demonstrates to the prisoners of these immoral and illegal regimes that the United States has not forgotten them. Observance of this week symbolizes our protest of this theft of freedom by the Communists.

We, in the United States, must show our support of the right of all people to pursue their political, economic, and cultural development as they deem best. It

is certainly fitting that we in the free world who have enjoyed for centuries the priceless rights of democracy, do all that we can to give hope and support to those captive nations which aspire to national independence. Their moral is their strongest weapon, and we, who often take for granted the rights of democracy, can reinforce this weapon by showing that their plight is recognized and their energies are still appreciated.

There is no better time than today to suggest that we reverently use our freedom in the acquisition and maintenance of justice among men and nations. We would also reassure our brothers in captivity that America has neither abandoned them to the tyranny of communism nor forgotten their long, bitter struggle for freedom and self-determination.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, as I have over the years, I am glad once again to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant peoples who live in involuntary servitude in the captive nations.

It is appropriate that we who enjoy the blessings of liberty pause for a time to reflect on the elemental human rights which are denied to the heroic peoples of Eastern Europe. Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press are so elemental to our democratic way of life that we often fail to consider that oppressed peoples living under Communist tyranny have been brutally denied these basic human and political rights. However, this annual observance affords us an excellent opportunity to show our support for the right of all people to pursue their political, economic, and cultural development as they deem best.

Recent events in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other Iron Curtain countries clearly demonstrate that the Soviet masters are learning that liberty cannot forever be stifled. The daring bravery of the Czechoslovakian people excited freedom-loving peoples everywhere, and served as a dramatic reminder to the Russian tyrants that freedom is destined to ultimately triumph over slavery.

It is my unceasing hope that the pressure of world opinion will soon force the soviet oppressors to release the captive nations from bondage.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week. It all began 10 years ago when this Congress passed the famous Captive Nations Week resolution that President Dwight D. Eisenhower thereafter signed into Public Law 86-90.

Since that time, the United States has conducted 10 annual weeks in symbolic behalf of the captive nations. Thus a fine tradition has been built and solidly maintained. And I am joining with my colleagues at this time in order to perpetuate this wonderful tradition.

One of the principal objectives of Captive Nations Week is the education of the American people regarding the captive nations, especially those in the Soviet Union. With a greater understanding of the problem, the people will better recognize and appreciate the current status of these nations and their courageous peoples.

I am pleased to note that the annual observance of Captive Nations Week has grown over the past 10 years. Evidence of this may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each year.

One of the outstanding developments of the movement has been its reception in foreign countries. In 17 countries, ranging from Korea to Australia, India to Turkey, and West Germany to Argentina, the observance is now held regularly.

The movement has gained a firm foothold in Asia. For years now, the Republic of China has been in the forefront of Captive Nations Week rallies. And for the first time, the Republic of Korea issued a Captive Nations Week stamp to commemorate the 10th observance.

This is an appropriate time to discuss the issues which are of vital interest to the captive nations. These issues of course focus upon the course of East-West relations.

On a more personal note, this 10th observance of Captive Nations Week represents an important event that we should all remember. The courage and strength displayed by the brave peoples of these nations merits our attention.

I hope that by our action here today we have helped all the captive nations' citizens, as well as the American people, to see that we recognize the problems and are working to solve them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to make these remarks on the occasion of the 10th observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this year, Captive Nations Week serves as an especially timely reminder that the Communist threat to national and personal liberty throughout the world is clearly not an anachronistic fiction perpetuated by politicians and overzealous American patriots.

Indeed, the patently belligerent actions of the Communist governments during the past year can only reinforce our distrust to those who continue to suppress their own peoples, to subjugate those nations too weak to resist the use or the threat of armed force, and to strive toward eventual worldwide Communist domination.

Regardless of what those who urge us to trust our self-avowed enemies may intuitively want to believe, we simply cannot ignore the facts; we cannot overlook the manifestly aggressive and hostile actions of those whose foremost goal has never ceased to be the spread of their ideology to all parts of the world through calculated delusion and through overt force.

Certainly the blatantly imperialistic crushing of Czechoslovakia's move toward increased freedom cannot be ignored by those who desire liberation and self-determination for all of the world's subjugated peoples. Indeed, the Soviet military aggression on Czechoslovakian soil cannot be interpreted as anything but a desperate, 11th-hour attempt to suffocate the hopeful stirrings of democratic and libertarian sentiment which threatened to weaken the Soviet grip on that conquered nation.

We must remember also that the

Czechoslovakian atrocity was not simply an isolated incident or a miscalculated over-reaction to a specific internal threat. On the contrary, the Soviet response to Czechoslovakia's muffled bid for freedom was yet another chapter in the historic succession of Communist takeovers, subversions, and acts of overt and covert oppression; it was merely a particularly blatant manifestation of the same basic Communist strategy we see being applied in Vietnam, in the Middle East, in Latin America, and in faltering new African nations.

That strategy has always been to forward the fundamental goal of world Communist domination by whatever means deemed necessary by the handful of dictators who pretend to speak for the more than 180 million people comprising the citizenship of the captive nations.

In view of these constant reminders of the plight of our friends imprisoned behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugar Curtains, Captive Nations Week should not be necessary to awaken us once a year from our complacency and our increasing tolerance of Communist belligerency. We are constantly confronted with the ruthless tactics of those who would deprive not only the already conquered regions, but also those of us fortunate enough to reside within the tenuous borders of the free world, of the truly essential human freedoms which we have come to take for granted.

In the face of ever-increasing dissatisfaction and criticism within our own country, we have repeatedly demonstrated that very quality which the most vocal dissenters insist is lacking in the United States, and which is indeed conspicuously absent in the captive nations: the right of free speech and lawful dissent. Contrary to the charges of many deluded Americans, the frequent and vociferous dissent which is allowed in this Nation is the mark of a truly free society which is sufficiently secure and confident of the support of its people to tolerate a wide range of divergent viewpoints, and to be responsive to the serious, constructive criticism that is offered.

We must dedicate this week to the heightened awareness of those who are not so fortunate, that we may be always reminded of their plight and may add our encouragement to their continued efforts toward liberation and self-determination. During this week, we must strengthen our determination to protect our cherished liberties where they now exist, and to work toward the ultimate goal of guaranteed basic freedoms for each individual and independence for all nations.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, it seems to me there is a lesson to be learned in the experience of the 27 captive nations of Eastern Europe. The price of freedom is eternal vigilance against despotism and ideologies that imprison men's minds.

For, although we in America are free of the tyranny of foreign domination, the freedoms that we enjoy must constantly be renewed by each generation if they are not to lose their significance.

And yet, as we constantly strive for a better, more decent, and just society, how modest our struggle seems, compared to the energies spent challenging Communist domination in Eastern Europe.

Over a decade ago the Hungarian people attempted to break open the iron claw of Soviet control, and they paid dearly in blood and sacrifice.

And last year, in events that caused the world to cry out in grief, the Czech people were forced to bow before the sheer military brutality of invading Soviet forces.

Although in both instances Soviet troops and tanks crushed the physical resistance to their presence, they failed to crush the fires of freedom that continue to glow in the hearts of these subjugated people.

As we express our solidarity with the citizens of the captive nations then, their hopes of freedom should serve as a reminder to us who so cherish our liberty that America must never cease its efforts on behalf of these people. In this endeavor, as we strive for a world free of war and despotism where a just and lasting peace can be realized for all, it is worth pondering the late President John F. Kennedy's thought that America's mission in the world is based "on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny."

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was just 10 years ago this week that Captive Nations Week came into being officially under a resolution passed by the Congress and signed into law by the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The resolution authorized Presidents to proclaim Captive Nations Week each year until such time "as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations in the world."

Our Nation is among 17 nations of the free world which join in this observance—which this year comes while there remains fresh in our minds the Soviet Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia last year.

It is thus especially timely to remind the world that our determination continues in refusing to acquiesce, by deals or default, to the permanent captivity of over 27 nations and to continue to seek by every peaceful means to accomplish their eventual freedom.

While it is vital that we attend to immediate issues such as Vietnam and our national defense, we must at the same time continue to press our effort to free the captive nations.

Following is the text of the Captive Nations Week Manifesto for this year:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO, 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still

unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsive to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other

members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nations Week, July 13-19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,
Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

JOZEF LETTRICH,
Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to take this occasion to call the attention of the Members and others to the article by Msgr. John Balkunas on "Religion Under Communism," as follows:

RELIGION UNDER COMMUNISM
(By Msgr. John Balkunas)

(NOTE.—The author is a noted American clergyman and lecturer. Monsignor Balkunas is also a cultural and civic leader of the American-Lithuanian community and President of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent, CACEED.)

The story of Communist persecution of religion in East-Central Europe is a sordid drama of hate and violence. Yet, even today, we see and hear reports by touring Westerners, including in some cases clergymen, who declare: "I have seen the crowded churches, the religious services, the priests and ministers." On the basis of a superficial glance, these tourists thus conclude that there is real freedom of religion in the Communist states.

Ideologically the Communists cannot permit loyalty and faith in a Divine authority. To do so would threaten the very foundation of the official materialistic philosophy. Atheistic communism cannot view man as an individual value possessing an immortal soul.

Although the Communists cannot succeed in rooting out a man's yearning for religion, they seek to replace faith in God with a secular cult dominated by the Communist ideology.

The Communist attack on religion and churches is generally carried out in four forms. First, terror and violence are employed against the clergy and the faithful. Second, religious groups are deprived of their newspapers, publications and books. Third, organized religion is either suppressed or is dominated by the Communist regime. Fourth, indoctrination of youth in Communist ideas is given top priority.

But despite these maneuvers, religion continues to exist and in some areas it even prospers. Parents give secret religious instruction to their children. Young people are insisting upon Church weddings and baptisms for their children. Feast days and religious festivals continue to be observed in spite of regime pressures.

ALBANIA

The Moslem and Orthodox Churches were purged and their hierarchy "nationalized." The Roman Catholic Church, which accounts for 10 per cent of the population, was persecuted by mass arrests of the clergy. All in all, however, the anti-religious campaign has not fulfilled its objective. In June 1967 a meeting of the Party Committee of Gjirokastra dealt with the questions of youth education and stated that it was not justified to assume that religion did not exist any more in Albania because churches and mosques were closed. On the contrary, religion was still alive among the people, including the youth.

BULGARIA

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church was transformed into a "people's Church," serving State interests. The regime created an Exarchate and Patriarchate in order to break off all external connections. According to an article that appeared in the April 18, 1968 issue of *Rabotnichesko Delo*, the percentage of Orthodox believers declined from 84.89 in 1948 to 75.25 in 1962. This could be attributed to the docility of the Orthodox leadership vis-a-vis the Communist regime. Although there was no official Catholic Church in Bulgaria, the number of Catholics doubled between 1934 and 1962. In the same period the number of Protestants quadrupled. The Muslims increased from 13.51 in 1945 to 18.88 per cent in 1962. Only ten thousand Jews remain in the country. Some 40,000 took advantage of the opportunity to migrate to Israel.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

After January 1968 the relations between the State and the Churches improved. The churches were permitted to submit their grievances and demands to the newly appointed special rapporteur of the cabinet for ecclesiastical affairs, the then Deputy Premier Dr. Gustav Husak. A procedure for rehabilitation of church leaders unjustly persecuted in the past was initiated. As a result of this new atmosphere, negotiations between the Holy See and Prague regarding normalization of their mutual relations are now taking place.

All Christian churches and religious communities rallied in support of the liberal Communist leader Dubcek and President Svoboda during the seven months of the "Czechoslovak Spring" (January-August, 1968) and, in particular, during the August invasion and later under the Soviet occupation. This move was spontaneous and sincere, since for the first time after twenty years of oppression the Churches enjoyed relative freedom.

At present, parents reportedly do not have to fear harassment for sending their children to classes of religious instruction. Nor is there yet any visible anti-religious propaganda, even though the Soviet and the Warsaw Pact countries' newspapers and magazines repeatedly stress the need to improve atheistic education and propaganda to ultimately eradicate all religions.

ESTONIA

The Soviet press is usually silent on the question of churches. Therefore little information is available on Church-State relations. For example, the Lutheran Church of Soviet-occupied Estonia was granted membership in the Lutheran World Federation at the Helsinki Conference of August 1963. The meeting was attended by the Archbishop of the Estonian Church, Jaan Kivilit. Obviously the Church could not apply for membership in an international organization without the approval of Soviet authorities. Despite this, the Estonian papers did not mention the admission of the Soviet Estonian Lutheran Church into the World Federation.

HUNGARY

A new situation has developed in the wake of last year's negotiations conducted in Budapest and at the Vatican. On January 23, 1969 Pope Paul VI filled ten Church posts in Hungary in one of the most sweeping moves to restore Church life in the country. The appointments ended a five-year deadlock between the Vatican and Budapest and affect the government of eight of Hungary's eleven dioceses. However, a Vatican announcement made clear that the two sides were still at odds over the status of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, who has been in self-imposed asylum in the American Embassy in Budapest since Soviet tanks crushed the 1956 uprising.

The Protestant Churches also had to face regime attacks. In 1967 the Reformed Church worked out a new constitution. Only persons

approved by the regime belong to the new leadership. The Lutheran Church is headed by Bishop Ottlyk, whose direct contacts with the Party are generally known in Church circles.

LATVIA

Latvia is a predominantly Lutheran country. Of the 287 Evangelical Lutheran Churches in service in 1937, only 86 remained open in 1968. According to the regime-supported Church Yearbook for 1968, published in Riga, only 32 pastors are permitted to perform their duties. Others are forced to do manual labor. The Latvian Baptist Church is still administered by 60 pastors. Latvia's half a million Roman Catholics are serviced by only 70 per cent of the prewar clergy.

Latvian clergymen who are allowed to go to international gatherings in the free world do so as a part of Soviet delegations. The separation from the free world is so hermetic that theology students are never permitted to study abroad, and only in a very few cases have Western clergymen been permitted to officiate at church services.

LITHUANIA

Eighty per cent of Lithuania's 3,096,000 people are Roman Catholics. Police action against the clergy and the faithful continues. Churches have to pay high taxes. For example, the Cathedral of Kaunas has to pay an annual tax of 6,000 rubles. All Church buildings and chattels are property of the State for which the faithful must pay high rents. Every clergyman must register with the Council of Church Affairs. Priests are forbidden to communicate with the lay people or to teach children religion; they are ridiculed in the press and have no civil redress.

According to the law of May 20, 1966 parents guilty of any effort to educate a child religiously are liable to three years imprisonment. On June 29, 1968 a new family law was promulgated in Lithuania, requiring parents to bring up their children according to the Communist moral code. In the event they do not fulfill this obligation, the children may be taken from them, and they would lose their parental rights. A student accused of practicing religion or being a believer finds it extremely difficult to continue his studies in the universities. All government employees, teachers and students are under constant surveillance.

POLAND

The Roman Catholic Church in the course of Polish history has always identified itself with national ideals and has been considered a symbol of Polish freedom. Under the pressure of the events of October 1956, the Communist regime agreed to improve the situation of the Church. The Catholic Primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, reached a new agreement on Church-State relations. The agreement, while recognizing the lay character of the schools, provides for religious teaching for children who have their parents' consent.

Ever since 1957, the State—by means of administrative measures—has been trying to whittle away these advantages. Nevertheless, the relations between the Gomulka regime and the Church are probably better now than they had been during the past few years. Evidence of this is the granting of a passport to Cardinal Wyszyński for his visit to Rome. Suddenly it is not quite as difficult to get a permit to construct a new church; it is not as difficult to get a permit for public processions on holy days. In fact, at a Corpus Christi procession in a village outside of Warsaw, the militia were even directing traffic.

But the Communist regime has not withdrawn from the battle. The regime has recently given considerable publicity to what is believed to be the first civil "christening" of a child in a civil registry office, with the

authorities bestowing the name on the child in a completely civil ceremony. The same is true of marriages—efforts continue to make more of the civil signing of the registry book and thus denigrate marriage ceremonies in church.

RUMANIA

The era of open religious persecution came to an end a few years ago. The general amnesty of 1964 set free a great majority of political and religious prisoners. The octogenarian bishop Iuliu Hossu, the only survivor of the suppressed Catholic Church Hierarchy of the Byzantine Rite, is still incarcerated. Otherwise, only sporadic arrests and trials on religious grounds have been staged during the recent years.

Both the State and Church contributed to bringing about the uneasy, but relatively quiet coexistence. The clergy and faithful have painfully learned to limit their activities to strictly religious functions on the premises of the churches, and to individual pastoral guidance. Sermons must follow certain pre-established norms. Even anti-religious propaganda and indoctrination have changed their tone by being more subtle and more persuasive. Churchgoers continue to be tailed, but more discreetly. Children and youths generally are kept busy on Sundays with "voluntary programs."

RELIGION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Since religion is one of the factors in the formation of man's convictions and disposition, and the Church is a repository of his trust and devotion, the resolute efforts of the Communist system to divert the action of religion and church to the service of its cause is understandable. Church and religion must either serve the Communist system, as in the case with the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and Rumania, or the Church must be completely eliminated from social life.

One-third of the world's population is living under an atheistic system which is applying every possible means to destroy Christianity as well as other religions. This is undoubtedly the most dramatic struggle ever witnessed in the world's history of religion. Yet the situation of Christianity in the countries within the Communist orbit is not without hope.

Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights declares: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practicing worship and observance."

With this in mind, we hope and pray that the time will come when the free nations will effectively help make the Declaration applicable in the full sense of the word for all peoples. Our efforts and energies should be directed toward this aim. All freedom, it should be remembered, are secure within the freedom of thought and conscience.

Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. Speaker, once again this Congress is meeting to proclaim and urge nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week. It is the 11th consecutive year that leaders of this Nation—the symbol of freedom to hundreds of millions still denied that basic right of man—formally issue words of hope and encouragement that one day all men may hold their heads high, proud in the knowledge that they too are free. Free to come and go as they choose; free to worship as they choose; free not only to think as they choose, but to express those thoughts in words and print; free not just to choose those who would govern them but also to criticize those governors.

Many of those living in the lackluster light of Communist domination are bound by ancestral ties with us here today. In some cases these ties may have loosened with the passage of generations; but in others, they are kept strong by communicating with relatives in lands where the liberties we long have enjoyed have either disappeared or never existed.

Just a few days ago, Americans across the length and breadth of this Nation celebrated the most important day in their history—the Fourth of July. That day is our own special symbol, our reminder of the time when this Government's forefathers broke the shackles which bound them to another country and other rulers. Those shattered chains of tyranny acted as a magnet, subsequently drawing millions of people to "the land of the free." America became known as the melting pot of the world where nationalities, religious and political beliefs and philosophies gradually mixed, resulting in a product of men who led this Nation to heights of greatness never before achieved in the history of this world. The strength of its greatness is its freedom; the belief all men are created equal with the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Yet we do not forget the nations of our parents and grandparents. In my congressional district, for example, customs and traditions of a multitude of nationalities are kept alive through various annual summer festivals which includes the famous "International Village," a gala 3-day celebration at McKeesport, Pa. The festival is one of gaiety, drawing together Slovaks, Czechs, Hungarians, Poles, Irish, Scots, Germans, English, and a host of others from the industrial area known as the Mon-Yough Valley. They sing, dance, and dress as did their ancestors, sharing in traditions which have spanned the centuries. But they are aware they can do so only because they are Americans and free to do so.

Last summer, a segment of those people were given a grim reminder how precious that freedom is. They, as you here must, remember Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1968. They, as you, read and heard how the Czech people sipped briefly the heady wine of freedom. They, as you, learned how quickly the sweet turned sour with a brutal retaliation for having even dared try to escape the yoke of domination.

In 1959, the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his office as President of these United States, proclaimed the third week of July as Captive Nations Week and invited the American people to observe the occasion with appropriate ceremonies and activities. Included in the official proclamation was the stipulation that similar action be taken each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." This has been done by the late President John F. Kennedy, former President Lyndon B. Johnson, and now by President Richard M. Nixon. How many such proclamations will be issued until their hopes are converted into reality, no one knows.

But we, as free Americans, and those citizens of captive nations, must never lose the courage to continue striving, in

any way we can, toward that day when freedom and justice replaces tyranny and terror in every corner of our God-given earth.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the observance of Captive Nations Week, a week which should have special meaning to all of us who have the very great privilege of living and working in freedom within the United States. This annual event serves as a vivid reminder to all Americans of the plight of the 100 million East and Central Europeans living in captivity under the tyranny of Communist rule. Through this observance our citizens, together with those of 17 other nations in the free world, reiterate their deep concern for their captive brethren as well as their determination to work toward the restoration of freedom and self-determination for all peoples.

The 1969 observance of Captive Nations Week, during the period of July 13 through 19, is of particular significance for two important reasons. This is the 10th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution which the Congress passed in July 1959 and which President Eisenhower signed into Public Law 86-90. Most importantly, however, this year's observance comes in the wake of the Soviet Union's brutal reminder in Czechoslovakia last August that the Communists have not mellowed and that they will continue to suppress with any means necessary the natural efforts of people toward self-determination and freedom. Czechoslovakia serves as a critical example that communism cannot succeed in governing people without the use of coercion and suppression of human rights.

It is more than fitting, therefore, that we forcefully renew our conviction that we will not acquiesce to the tyranny suffered by the people of the captive nations. Our determination in this regard could not have been better expressed than through the address recently given by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, at the Captive Nations Week rally held on July 10, 1969, in Taipei, Taiwan. Mr. DERWINSKI has shown great devotion to the cause of human freedom, both as a fellow member of the National Captive Nations Committee and through his leadership in the Congress toward policies of firmness, courage, and realism in our relationship to the Soviet Union and other Communist governments. My distinguished colleague deserves the sincere appreciation of all freedom-loving people, and at this point I include in the RECORD a copy of his speech on this subject:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. DERWINSKI AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RALLY, TAIPEI, TAIWAN, THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends: I speak to you today as a representative of the National Captive Nations Week Committee of the United States. The goal of this committee is to help produce a world of permanent peace and freedom in which all peoples now held in bondage by communism will enjoy their true national independence.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States I am proud of and impressed by the fact that an overwhelming number of my colleagues have given their personal support

to the cause of restoration of freedom to the captive peoples of communism.

This month, the tenth observance of Captive Nations Week is being celebrated in the United States and seventeen free world countries. Since that first July in 1959, after the United States Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution and President Eisenhower signed it into law, we have conducted ten annual weeks in symbolic behalf of the captive nations.

Captive Nations Week is accomplishing what it set out to do. The apparent disintegration of the Communist monolith favorably reinforces the course and goals of the movement, particularly the force of patriotic nationalism which we stress. Needless to say, squabbles and rivalries between and among totalitarian Communist parties, which dominate the regimes of the Red states, do not make the peoples, the nations themselves, any less captive.

The international Communist conspiracy is the great threat to world peace and stability. True peace and freedom, the legitimate goal of all mankind will come to Vietnam, Cuba, China, and other oppressed lands only when the peoples are represented by governments of their own true choice.

Let me briefly review the captive nations question and its importance to the free world. The first period of Communist expansion affected those nations of eastern Europe formerly a part of Czarist Russia, such as the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and Armenia, which were incorporated into the Soviet Union soon after the Bolsheviks established power. The second wave of expansion occurred following World War II when the Soviet Union dropped the Iron Curtain of terror between the East European nations and the free world and provided massive support to the Communist forces in China. By direct use of its forces in nations occupied at the close of World War II, the Soviet Union established puppet governments whose power was insured by Soviet military might and terroristic policies against their populations. Resistance to the Communist regimes was crushed by mass executions and deportations. Tragically, millions of people survived the attempted world conquest by the Axis powers only to fall prey to Soviet domination imposed by methods which equaled the atrocities committed by our World War II opponents.

Communism attempts to eradicate the individuality of people and thus runs headlong into the deep-rooted age old nationalistic traditions of the captive peoples. That is why in our struggle against communism we can remain confident of the ultimate triumph of free men over the evil ideology which we combat.

For years communism has claimed to be the "wave of the future." Its pressures in diplomatic, propaganda, economic, and military fields created the image of an irresistible force. However, the failure of any Communist government to provide true progress for the people it controls and the outright rejection of communism in election processes throughout the world clearly demonstrates that communism is a self-defeating philosophy.

In Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America the Communists continue their efforts to subvert governments. However, their efforts are basically nonproductive.

Just a few years ago many free world statesmen naively proclaimed that "communism is mellowing" and the day would come when free world cooperation with Communist tyrants would be possible. The Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and the direct military activities by the Communists in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia show that far from mellowing, the Communists are actually striking out with greater intensity. I regard their efforts as desperate moves by tyrants who know their defeat is inevitable.

I believe that we in the free world have

clearly gained momentum in world affairs but to reach maximum effectiveness we must develop a totally coordinated attack against the Communists in propaganda, diplomatic and economic fields. The Communists must be kept on the defensive in all fields and the internal dissent which exists in every Communist-held nation must be effectively nurtured by free world forces.

I re-emphasize that one of the main reasons why communism will meet defeat is the failure of Red efforts to suppress legitimate nationalistic aspirations. The Soviet Russians are attempting to achieve the dreams of the Russian czars for territorial expansion, and thus the people of the captive nations realize that they must maintain their traditional language, culture, religious beliefs and distinctive traditions as weapons to overcome false Communist ideology.

In the United States during this Captive Nations Week we of the National Captive Nations Week Committee are stressing current key issues which are intended to remind free world citizens of the facts of life in world affairs and to encourage free peoples to continue the necessary efforts to see freedom restored in all lands now ruled by Communist governments.

We advocate a full-scale debate in the United Nations of Soviet colonialism. We specifically ask that the membership in the United Nations of the Soviet shadow governments in Byelorussia and the Ukraine be terminated. We strongly oppose the admission of the Peking government to the United Nations. We feel that admission of Red China would be a mockery of the principles of the United Nations. The Chinese Reds are continuing subversive activities throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and admitting them to the U.N. would, in effect, be encouraging their future transgressions.

We strongly oppose any liberalization of trade with any Communist government. Trade experiences with the Red totalitarian states since World War II provide solid historical lessons for not repeating mistakes. We have ample evidence that governments such as the French and British have failed to achieve any positive results for themselves or the free world by recognizing the Peking government. As a matter of fact, the positive and effective steps the free world governments should take are to terminate diplomatic relations with the Communist governments that do not honestly serve and represent their people. An international quarantine of Communist governments would hasten their collapse.

The Captive Nations Week Committee in the United States believes that the proper objective in Vietnam should be victory and liberation by the South Vietnamese of the 17 million captive North Vietnamese.

We believe that it is a sound premise of political warfare that liberation must be the ultimate goal so that we can effectively move forward in all fields of the cold war, thus directly contributing to the internal collapse which is taking place in the Red world.

My dear friends, I am absolutely confident that the free world will triumph over Communist tyranny and that all peoples will ultimately enjoy the blessings of freedom and international tranquility.

In recent years we have seen Communist setbacks in Indonesia and Vietnam, new unrest in Czechoslovakia, and failure to make any progress in Latin America and Africa. The Soviet Union and their puppet governments are at a low point in their effectiveness at the United Nations. On the other hand, the crisis in Czechoslovakia reminded the free world that communism cannot mellow and that Red governments automatically suppress any attempt at intellectual, economic or social freedom.

Time is on our side. Justice is on our side. The spirit developed in Captive Nations Week observances throughout the free world pro-

vide the spark to effective year-long efforts in the unending struggle for freedom.

I salute your determination to see that freedom and a legitimate government are restored to your compatriots on the mainland. I am positive that the cause of freedom will triumph over the Communist enemy and the people of Free China will play a major role in the triumph over communism. This is the message of truth of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, President Dwight D. Eisenhower became the first Chief Executive to issue a proclamation expressing this country's concern over the political captivity of the people living under Communist domination in Eastern and Central Europe.

This week, President Nixon has formally declared to be Captive Nations Week in recognition of the continuing plight of those persons now enslaved by Communist totalitarianism in Europe. The President said:

Ten years have passed and there have been many changes in international affairs, but one thing that has not changed is the desire for national independence in Eastern Europe.

The hard fact remains that the U.S.S.R. has imposed its control over the lives of the people of Eastern and Central Europe by sheer military force. Last year's invasion of Czechoslovakia brought this point home even to those who had begun to believe that the Russians were truly the "good guys" of international relations.

The hard fact remains that the Iron Curtain is not merely a post-World War II phenomenon, but a contemporary reality in Europe today. The hundreds of Germans who have been machine-gunned to death in their desperate flight from East Berlin to freedom in the West are hardly testimony to the "liberalizing influence" we hear so much about.

I realize that those who espouse anti-communism in the United States today are termed either "unfashionable" or, even worse, "McCarthyesque." I would hope, however, that this week will serve to remind all Americans how very precious our freedom is, and to revitalize our opposition to that system which denies the most basic of human rights to over 100 million Europeans as well as hundreds of millions of other people throughout the world.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the 11th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Between July 13 and 19, the American people again dedicate themselves in support of the aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for freedom and self-determination.

In the last 20 years, the emergence of many new nations in Asia and Africa has dramatically attested to the desire of men to be free and govern themselves. But, during this same period the desire for freedom has been frustrated and repressed in Eastern Europe. The enunciation of the Brezhnev doctrine, and the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, once again regretfully brings into focus the continuance of this repression.

But even in despair the people of Czechoslovakia manifested such courage

and valor that we are again reminded of the tenacity of the desire of men to be free. We must attempt to match the courage of those in Czechoslovakia and other captive nations, by reaffirming our Nation's devotion to the principle of self-determination for all men.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to include in the RECORD the Captive Nations Week Manifesto, 1969, which was adopted by the American Friends of the Captive Nations and the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK MANIFESTO, 1969

The undersigned organizations, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the captive nations, call attention to Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted in 1959 by the Congress of the United States, by which the third week of July each year was designated as Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 and the subsequent enunciation of the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine have once again brought to the surface the entire issue of self-determination and fundamental freedoms for the one hundred million people of East-Central Europe. The tragedy of Czechoslovakia dramatizes the built-in instability of contemporary Europe rooted in the still unresolved problems bequeathed by the Second World War. The Brezhnev Doctrine brings into focus the sad fact of the perpetuation in power of unpopular Communist regimes—imposed by a foreign power—that are not responsible to the will of the peoples over whom they rule.

The record of over two decades of Communist rule shows that the legitimate aspirations of the captive European nations have long been thwarted by Soviet hegemony over the area. Now, with the advent of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the USSR has in fact tried to make this arbitrary arrangement accepted on a permanent basis.

In the light of this doctrine, which is a justification for aggressive imperialism, the Soviet Union has in effect placed its own interests over the inherent right to national sovereignty and fundamental human rights of the peoples living in the Communist orbit.

This doctrine can have a far-reaching impact on the future of not only the captive European nations, but also of the free world. If the doctrine remains unchallenged, it may turn the United Nations Charter into a shambles. As a result of this doctrine, all Communist parties are expected to follow automatically the dictates of the Kremlin. The acceptance by the Communist governments in East-Central Europe of the new Soviet doctrine is tantamount to complete abdication of the sovereign rights of these nations.

The Brezhnev Doctrine is against the vital interests of all captive European nations, the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the accepted norms of civilized nations. It is therefore deemed essential that the free world oppose the newly enunciated Soviet policy of aggressive imperialism and defend the traditional principles and norms of international law, in order to maintain world peace, security and freedom for all nations.

For the peoples of East-Central Europe, it is important to learn of the continued determination of the free governments of the world to lend their moral and political support to the rightful aspirations of their captive East-Central European brethren.

While commemorating this year's Captive Nations Week:

We stress that the Soviet Union has demonstrably violated its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the nine nations made captive during and after World War II—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia,

Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania;

We also stress that the Communist regimes in the East-Central European nations continue to be unresponsive to the will of the people by denying them the right to periodic and genuinely free elections.

We appeal to the free governments of the nations of the world:

1. To declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries, adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, their support of the right to self-determination of all peoples held captive by the Communists and, consequently, to make this issue the permanent concern of the United Nations;

2. To repudiate the intent and objectives of the Brezhnev Doctrine, including its implied recognition of the spheres of influence and of the status quo in East and Central Europe;

3. To bring to world attention the urgent need for a responsible attitude by the free nations of the world designed to help bolster the morale of the East-Central European peoples and thus create a climate favorable to their quest for full national independence and individual freedom.

4. As part of this effort, we call on the United States Government and on other members of the Atlantic Alliance to maintain, and where possible strengthen, NATO's defense forces. This alone will help counter any temptation of further Communist aggression—by force or threat of force.

We appeal to the People of the United States of America to manifest during Captive Nation's Week, July 13 to 19, 1969, their awareness of the importance of freedom for 100 million peoples in the Communist-dominated lands to the establishment of a valid European settlement and world peace.

CHRISTOPHER EMMET,

Chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

JOZEF LETTRICH,

Chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

NO ROOM FOR ACCOMMODATION WITH CHINESE COMMUNISTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, recent proposals of flexibility and accommodation with the Chinese Communists emanating from small but articulate segments in the United States may not seem to have any relevance to the larger and more vital aspects of American foreign policy and the U.S. global position. This new orientation, or new concept of "open door," is intended to be gradual and not all out, to be sure; nevertheless, it helps to give the initiative to Peking, which is very likely to call a tune discordant with our basic interest and our relations with the Soviet Union.

The accommodation with Peking school generally aims at small but uncertain benefits. It rarely has gone into such matters as the power structure of the world, our leadership in the free world and our position as a Pacific power, which was fully established two decades before we gained recognition as a world power. A brief analysis of this line of thinking will reveal its flaws.

Immediately after World War II the United States had acquired a clear po-

sition of predominance in the global balance of power, but circumstances soon changed. Today, the power structure of the world is essentially bipolar. There are in the international community two powerful states in terms of military might and other extent and potential factors, and the rest of its members constitute what may be called the "Third World," parts of which are gravitated toward one or the other of these two poles, creating an uneasy balance between them.

To most thoughtful Americans, the concept of "Pax Americana" is repugnant. Whether such a role is distasteful to us from the standpoint of our political philosophy, it is actually beyond our material resources. Conscious of our limitations and the enormous demands on our resources at home, and frustrated on account of war weariness and disunity among our allies, there is even doubt among some that there is sufficient will left to maintain our position of leadership in the non-Communist world. Even the natural desire on the part of some of our people to maintain predominance over the existing Communist world may have little chance of success.

However, whatever our difficulties, we must maintain our national security and preserve our political system and democratic way of life. This overriding objective dictates that we are in no position to make this country a bastion which excludes other countries friendly to us. We have to seek fulfillment of this objective in the existing bipolar system and, in cooperation with friendly countries, selectively chosen, maintain as favorable a balance as possible.

There is a broad area of agreement among thoughtful Americans that the first order of business in U.S. foreign relations is to seek a *détente* or a measure of understanding with the Soviet Union to lessen the friction between the two countries and to prevent eventual nuclear proliferation and confrontation. Should the general climate be improved, and indications are that it can improve, an area of reasonable agreement may be possible. The ultimate aim would be a mutual understanding on arms control to stop the heavy drain on both national budgets. This, of course, is not easy. But as long as this dominant purpose has a hope of success, it would be bad politics or even a diplomatic blunder to introduce any element extraneous to this main effort which might make its success more difficult to attain. To wave an olive branch to the Chinese Communists—who have shown not the slightest interest in such a move—is incongruous with our endeavor to establish a *détente* with the Soviet Union. The press reports that two of our NATO allies are thinking of according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime. Even this is something inconsonant with the interests of the United States.

While the rift between Moscow and Peking is still wide and the polemics go on unabated, the leaders of the Kremlin will not be indifferent to any friendly gesture toward Peking, no matter whether it emanates from a country of the free world or of the Communist camp. Any action that gives comfort or

material support to the Chinese Communists, or enhances their prestige, would have such an effect. It could interfere with the prospects for accord between the United States and Soviet Russia—whatever those chances may be, and in view of Red China's attitude toward cooperation with other powers, it would gain nothing.

Proposals of rapprochement with Peking at this juncture are also inopportune in view of the present situation in Communist China. Its failures, deficiencies, and the general dejection of its people seem sufficiently well known to warrant acceptance. During 2½ years of convulsive upheavals and a ruthless general purge under the purposed misnomer of the "Great Cultural Revolution of the Proletariat," the Chinese Communist Party and the Peking regime have had serious differences. The orders of the central authority could hardly be carried out beyond the walls of Peking. There are signs of a general state of anarchy. The end of the regime may in fact be approaching. On this it would be well to read Prof. Allan S. Whiting's report on Red China in the February 21, 1966, issue of *Life* magazine. Professor Whiting, before his retirement, was our Deputy Consul General in Hong Kong.

It appears that the Mao Tse-tung regime has been accorded by its protagonists in Europe and in the Western Hemisphere an importance far exceeding its capabilities and material and technological resources. On the human side, such assets as leadership, discipline, cohesion, authority, skill, and technical know-how are grossly exaggerated. Red China's enormous population has been erroneously equated with power. The continuous failure of that country to improve living standards for the great bulk of its population places people assets on the debit side of its ledger. We did not think of Norway as pro-Hitler when Quisling was at the head of the Norwegian Government during World War II. Nor did we think the French people were for Nazi Germany when Pétain and Laval were head of Vichy. If all the relevant facts are carefully analyzed, much of the Chinese Communist charismatic appeal will vanish. There is no convincing reason to hold that the mainland Chinese people are converts to communism because they are under Communist guns. While formidable to the Chinese people, the guns of the Peking regime actually make Red China but a small military power—a power strong enough to play havoc among its neighbors if no restraint is put on it, but too deficient to challenge either of the command centers of the present bipolar system. It is well to note, that situation could quickly cease to exist if the United States should neglect its own security or its leadership position in the free world.

There is one essential fact that we should not lose sight of. During the first part of the history of American-Soviet relations, the difference of political philosophies or ideologies was the chief cause of discord. After World War II, the chief fear of the United States and the NATO countries was Russian imperialism. That fear has lessened to the

point that it appears sensible at this time to establish some form of *modus vivendi* with the Soviet Union, especially in matters relating to nuclear nonproliferation. At the same time, the schism between Moscow and Peking shows incontrovertibly that the United States is confronted with a Communist ideology in which a strong cohesive force exists in theory only. In practice, it fragments and factionizes when Moscow tries to impose its will on the Chinese Communist regime and vice versa. In fact, the Kremlin has not done too well in requiring compliance in the case of Yugoslavia and Rumania. In recent years there has been growing decline in the show of Communist unity, with the Soviet Union trying to reverse the trend. It simply is not in accord with the long-term interests of this country for comfort or support to be given to the Chinese Communists.

A survey of the rift between Peking and Moscow has revealed some interesting facts and implications. Throughout the course of their disputes thus far, there is no sign that either entertains any doubt about the future of its own brand of communism. Both hold fast to tenets of communism usually referred to as "the general line of Marxism-Leninism" which is euphemistically called world revolution but in practice is a hegemony of the master state controlling the puppet states. This is nothing more or less than the Communist form of imperialism. Both nations are committed to the ideology of world revolution and the destruction of individual private enterprise. Neither is a friend of capitalism or of the United States which they consider its chief and most successful exponent. But their explicit disputes over the course for world communism has revealed differences which are deep and growing. Russia has shown at least a modicum of interest in establishing accord with the West. Red China has not. In this situation, friendly gestures towards Peking are not in line with the basic interests of this country. And at the present time, ironically enough any dialogue or help rendered to the Chinese Communists is taking Red China's side against the U.S.S.R. Most of us would say a plague on both their houses, but we have stated that we wish to come to an accord with Russia on nuclear nonproliferation. We will do well to hoe one row at a time.

DRUG ABUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTAIN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 12894, legislation to establish a 5-year, \$380 million program of research, education, training, prevention, and treatment of narcotics addiction and drug abuse. This bill is a companion measure to one introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH.

Because New York City has almost half of all the drug addicts in the country, it should have a major role in the formulation of a national drug abuse program.

Any program developed should be tailored to meet the needs of New York City with a large part of the Federal funding made available for city programs.

The drug problem in New York City has reached almost epidemic proportions. The New York City Department of Narcotics estimates that there are today over 150,000 addicts in the city, with direct criminal costs to the taxpayers of one-half billion dollars per year.

This legislation does not deal with the problem of addiction by knocking the addict into the ground with the hope that this will cure his affliction, which appears to be the attitude adopted by the administration. It deals with the problem squarely by providing the kind of facilities such as the Phoenix type of facility needed to treat and medically cure the addict.

New York City has the most advanced drug treatment program in the country. There are currently in operation 24 inpatient—Phoenix—treatment facilities and 17 outpatient facilities, many of them in my district. Yet, these few are drastically underfinanced. The legislation will alleviate this situation as well as provide Federal grants for the establishment of research and training facilities to reduce the shortage of skilled personnel to work in this critical area.

The bill will also provide for a major prevention and education effort designed to reach a wide audience, particularly those youngsters who are most prone to use drugs.

What follows is a discussion of the magnitude of the drug problem prepared by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs:

STATEMENT BY BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

The following statistics are based on an analysis of known active narcotic addicts reported to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and should not be construed as the Nation's total narcotic addict population.

ACTIVE ADDICTS

The number of active addicts recorded by the Bureau as of December 31, 1968 was 64,011, an increase of 1,966 compared with December 31, 1967. The number of active addicts under 21 years of age as of December 31, 1968 was 2,688, an increase of 471 compared with December 31, 1967.

The estimated population for the United States as of December 1, 1968 was 202,110,000. With the active addict population at 64,011 at the end of the year, the ratio of addiction to population as of December 31, 1968 was 1 in 3,157 compared with 1 in 3,228 as of December 31, 1967. At the end of 1960, the ratio was 1 in 4,008.

Comparing December 31, 1967 to December 31, 1968, 30 States showed either an increase in active addicts or remained the same.

Nine States and the District of Columbia account for 91% of all active addicts recorded by the Bureau. They are as follows:

New York	32,240
California	8,207
Illinois	6,027
New Jersey	3,392
Maryland	1,940
Michigan	1,876
Pennsylvania	1,754
Texas	1,281
District of Columbia	1,162
Louisiana	561

The Bureau first published an "active addict" figure at the end of 1959, at which time, 3.8% were under 21 years of age. As of December 31, 1968, 4.2% were under 21. This is the first time in the survey that the active addict figure of persons under 21 years of age has exceeded 4%.

Of the total active addicts recorded, 53,402 were males and 10,609 females. Those under 21 totaled 2,688. The 21-30 group had 29,802; the 31-40 group had 22,831. The over 40 group totaled 8,890.

With 1,290 active addicts under 21 years of age as of December 31, 1968, New York accounted for 48% of all active addicts in this category, compared with 52% at the end of 1967 and 60% at the end of 1966.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.
- Mr. FARBERSTEIN, for 10 minutes, today.
- Mr. DERWINSKI, for 30 minutes, today, immediately following the special order of Mr. FLOOD, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) immediately following the approval of the Journal today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHERLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. CONTE.
- Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.
- Mr. CEDERBERG.
- Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.
- (The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter:)
- Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.
- Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.
- Mr. DENT.
- Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.
- Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
- Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.
- Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
- Mr. RARICK in three instances.
- Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
- Mr. WOLFF in two instances.
- Mr. LOWENSTEIN in four instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on July 15, 1969, pre-

sent to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 1828. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon James F. Wegener;
- H.R. 1948. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Class Joseph Anthony Smitko;
- H.R. 2224. An act for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio;
- H.R. 2536. An act for the relief of Francesca Adriana Millonzi;
- H.R. 2890. An act for the relief of Rueben Rosen;
- H.R. 3167. An act for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz; and
- H.R. 10060. An act for the relief of Lance Cpl. Peter M. Nee (2465662).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 17, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

970. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program administered by the White Earth Reservation Business Committee, White Earth, Minn., under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

971. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in St. Louis City and St. Louis County, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

972. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the administration and effectiveness of the work experience and training project in Jackson County, Mo., under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

973. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

974. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the management of the public debt by removing the interest rate ceilings on Government bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

975. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit charges for certain services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DADARIO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. OLSEN, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 12891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST ONGE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WATTS, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.R. 12892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL: (for himself and Mr. Moss):

H.R. 12893. A bill to restore the independence of Federal regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARBSTEN:

H.R. 12894. A bill to provide for the comprehensive control of narcotic addiction and drug abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 12895. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 12896. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MADDEN):

H.R. 12897. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FARBSTEN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. NIX, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 12898. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain airspace for use for housing purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. COWGER, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WINN, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. LUKENS, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 12899. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit Federal judges from receiving compensation other than for the performance of their judicial duties, except in certain instances, and to provide for the disclosure of certain financial information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12900. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 12901. A bill to provide for the better utilization of scarce medical personnel within, and to improve the efficiency of, the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12902. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL of Maryland:

H.R. 12903. A bill for the relief of Dr. Narciso A. deBorja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12904. A bill for the relief of Dr. Roldando F. Del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12905. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo De los Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 16, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of this universe and of the universes beyond, who from the dawn of time, and through the processes of all history has been creating from the formless void, the orbs and spheres in the unbounded immensity of space; and in whose wisdom Thou hast placed man as Thy highest creation to have dominion over all Thy works; we thank Thee that it is given to us to live this day when earthbound man, unfettered, soars to lunar lands and spaces.

We thank Thee for man, for the majesty of his intellect, the depth of his soul, and for the sense of wonder and adventure with which Thou hast endowed him. As we hear again the words of holy writ, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him? Thou crownest him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of Thy hands"; make us humble and thankful before Thy creation in man and in nature.

Be with us day by day in our labors. Teach us now and always that the true home of the soul is in Thee. Awaken us

to the splendors of the new age that we may be pioneers in the vast reaches of the human spirit, and partners with Thee in the emancipation of man from hate and fear, from poverty and disease, from injustice and war, that a better world may come, and Thy will be done in and through us. In Thy holy name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 15, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations,

which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 648) for the relief of Ernesto Alunday, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees