

HEINONLINE

Citation: 93 Cong. Rec. 4682 1947



Content downloaded/printed from
HeinOnline (<http://heinonline.org>)
Tue Sep 1 09:01:47 2015

- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <http://heinonline.org/HOL/License>
- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

you are available, please wire collect as to the time most convenient for you.

LELAND HAZARD,
Vice President and General Counsel,
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., 2000
Grant Building.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, because of an engagement which I made some time ago, it will be necessary for me to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may absent myself from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 7 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America:

From Foreign Service officers of class 4 to Foreign Service officers of class 3:

William K. Ailshie, of Idaho.
E. Tomlin Bailey, of New Jersey.
Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Niles W. Bond, of Massachusetts.
Charles R. Burrows, of Ohio.
Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia.
John Willard Carrigan, of California.
Norris B. Chipman, of the District of Columbia.
Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia.
John K. Emmerson, of Colorado.
Andrew B. Foster, of Pennsylvania.
Norris S. Haselton, of New Jersey.
L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi.
Outerbridge Lorsey, of New York.
John D. Jernegan, of California.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
George Lewis Jones, Jr., of Maryland.
E. Allan Lightner, Jr., of New Jersey.
Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia.

Elbert G. Mathews, of California.
Gordon H. Mattison, of Ohio.
Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Newbegin, of Massachusetts.
J. Graham Parsons, of New York.
Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., of New York.
G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.
Livingston Satterthwaite, of Pennsylvania.
George F. Scherer, of New York.
Donald W. Smith, of Maryland.
William P. Snow, of Maine.
Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
Clare H. Timberlake, of Michigan.
Ivan B. White, of Oregon.
Evan M. Wilson, of Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

William E. Warne, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Warner W. Gardner.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Alexander Sharp, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Father William Kailer Dunn, assistant pastor, St. Edward's Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the hearts of men which Thou hast made, and made for Thyself alone, allow only those desires to arise which are holy and pleasing to Thee. In the minds of these, our national leaders, place right counsels and let their efforts at lawmaking result in just works, for in their hands lie the destinies of millions of American souls, precious beyond words in Thy sight and designed by Thee to be such good citizens in this life that they may be found worthy to be citizens of Thy world to come.

Give, O Lord, to them and to us whom they represent that peace which this world has striven for by standards other than Thine and which the world, in its earthy way, cannot attain. Help their minds to the conviction that obedience to Thy commandments alone will light up the path for which we seek, will protect us from fear of all enemies, and will merit for our times that peace which is the tranquillity of order, the order of creature under Creator, making of us a nation secure because we are worthy of Thy protection.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 328. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the farmers' irrigation district, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized num-

ber of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy; H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 193. An act to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 191), as amended;

H. R. 450. An act providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use;

H. R. 1584. An act authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; and

H. R. 2123. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following

titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 278. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton;

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan;

S. 534. An act to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes;

S. 583. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes;

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census);

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin;

S. 629. An act concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto;

S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan;

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhardt;

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho;

S. 800. An act to make additional funds available for access roads to standing timber;

S. 874. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; and

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and with profound sorrow that I announce the death of

William J. Fitzgerald, former Member of this House from the Second District of Connecticut, who served here in Washington from 1938 through 1942.

As former mayor of the city of Norwich, Conn., as deputy State labor commissioner and war manpower commissioner, as a prominent leader in the labor movement in Connecticut, he was always faithful to his trust and to his many associates. Although of different political faith, I was always pleased to call him one of my friends. I know his former colleagues here in the House join me in extending our deepest sympathy to his family and many friends.

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my distinguished friend from Connecticut in the splendid tribute that he has paid to our late colleague, as we called him and knew him, Bill Fitzgerald. His passing is a matter of keen regret to me personally, as I enjoyed a very close relationship of real friendship with him. Bill Fitzgerald was one of the most sincere Members of the House that I have ever had the honor of serving with in this body. He was a man of outstanding courage, of strong and sound convictions, and was possessed of a nobility of character which was an example and an inspiration for all to observe and follow. I feel keenly his passing, and I know that my colleagues who served with him share that feeling of regret. Again, I join with my friend from Connecticut in the splendid tribute that he has so eloquently paid to the memory of a great man and a great legislator.

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I, too, would like to join in the splendid tribute that has been paid to our late colleague, Bill Fitzgerald, of Norwich, Conn. It was my privilege to have served with him in this Congress in 1941 and 1942. I knew him to be a man of great character. He had a tremendous amount of energy. He was a great Congressman for the people of his district in those days. He was a great leader and a great friend of the common people, not only in Connecticut, but throughout the entire country.

I know that the Members of the House of Representatives sympathize with his family in their bereavement on his passing.

ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention not to have any 1-minute speeches?

The SPEAKER. Not until this bill is out of the way. We want to get through with the general debate on the bill today and commence the reading of the bill for amendment on tomorrow.

Mr. BENDER. Will the same situation prevail tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UTILITIES, INSURANCE, AND BANKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. EATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Utilities, Insurance, and Banking of the House Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include therein two editorials concerning the International Information and Cultural Office.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include part of a radio address and four letters.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Charles Holman.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a circular entitled "The Iron and Steel Scrap Situation."

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

AMERICAN HEROES' DAY

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point on a resolution which I introduced making May 7 a national holiday named American Heroes' Day.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, May 7 is a day set apart by destiny on which all Americans everywhere are bound by the dictates of their hearts to honor the

brave men who successfully preserved our Nation by giving unstintingly of themselves to achieve victory in World War II.

May 7 is American Heroes' Day because it binds together those who fought in Europe and those who fought in the far reaches of the Pacific. May 7 is American Heroes' Day because it unites in its observance the honoring of courage in triumph with the honoring of courage in tragedy. On May 8, 1945, Hitler's minions surrendered. On May 6, 1942, after the most brilliant and sacrificial defense since the Alamo, the Stars and Stripes were hauled down from the Fortress of Corregidor.

Sacrifice, whether in sorrow or success, should be justly venerated. The accident of time has given us the means of veneration. On May 7 Americans can look back on suffering and look ahead to success. I know not how this day ought to be observed. But I do know that this is the day.

The authority for American Heroes' Day goes back beyond the Congress and the President who were created by the Constitution. It goes back to the very creators of the Constitution themselves—the American people.

To paraphrase President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this day. The brave men, living and dead, who gave us this day have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what I say here, but it can never forget what they did to save the light of liberty for all mankind. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated on American Heroes' Day to the unfinished work which they who fought to save the things we love have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated on this day to the great task remaining before us—that from those who died that we might live and from those who are here with us now we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave and are giving the full measure of devotion; that we on this day are highly resolved that these dead shall not have died in vain or that these living shall not have lived in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

In the sincere hope that Members of the Eightieth Congress will concur in the suggestion to establish this day of national observance, I have today introduced a resolution asking that in future years May 7 be set apart as American Heroes' Day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject How the Northwest Projects Pay Their Way, and include two editorials.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief speech by the president of the University of California.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to congratulate the students of Western High School for lifting the little iron curtain and showing the American people the Communist program of poisoning the minds of the students of this Nation in our public schools and colleges.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Freeport Journal entitled "Home Demonstration Work Week" and in the other a speech on soil conservation in Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, at the thirty-seventh convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, May 2, 1947.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a telegram received from the merchants of the city of Peabody in their determination to keep prices down and to reduce prices; second, to include a newspaper article; and, third, a radio address.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain articles.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on the Greece-Turkey assistance legislation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair previously announced that no 1-minute speeches would be allowed today or tomorrow. The gentleman may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, if he desires.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would, of course, prefer to make my remarks on the floor, but under the circumstances I ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

GREECE-TURKEY ASSISTANCE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the debate that has taken place thus far

on the Greece-Turkey assistance bill clearly reveals the fact that the American people are strongly opposed to it. It reveals another important fact—namely, a determination on the part of Congress to ignore the will of the people and to launch the Nation upon another program of lend-lease that promises well to lead the Nation into World War III. If the Congress passes this bill, it will have demonstrated to all those who have eyes to see and ears to hear that constitutional and representative government have been suspended, if not abolished, and dictatorship is in the saddle.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Murray, Tenn.
Bland	Fellows	O'Toole
Bonner	Fisher	Patman
Boykin	Fuller	Pfeiffer
Bulwinkle	Gifford	Powell
Camp	Gregory	Reeves
Canfield	Hart	Scoblick
Carson	Hartley	Sikes
Chapman	Hinshaw	Smith, Maine
Clark	Jennings	Somers
Clements	Jensen	Taylor
Colmer	Kefauver	Thomas, N. J.
Cox	McDowell	Towe
Crawford	Madden	Trimble
Dawson, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Vinson
Domengeaux	Mitchell	West
Douglas	Morrison	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 373 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a factual statement on the car situation by the car service division of the American Railway Association.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a concurrent resolution which he introduced today.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HORAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of April 29, 1947.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that when the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] had 2 hours and 22 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], 2 hours and 45 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to yield time at the moment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending proposal to furnish financial assistance to Greece and Turkey.

I want to preface my remarks by saying I am as much concerned as any citizen in this country over the dangers of Russian expansion. Actually, I have been deeply concerned about it for many years. In fact, long before many of our present leaders felt much apprehension about it.

I can best summarize my basic reasons for opposing the measure as follows: A man who cannot gauge his starting point certainly cannot accurately predict his destination. Our present dilemma is premised on that fact. We have not stopped long enough since the end of the war to reestablish our bearings. Actually, we have not even taken time to catch our breath. Our war-time and postwar foreign policy has consisted of one makeshift arrangement after another. It has continually been a "heads you win, tails I lose" proposition from our standpoint. It has ignored every principle of basic justice. Expediency has led to one emergency after another—each one more acute than the one which preceded it. The Atlantic Charter, our basic document for a just peace, died in mortal agony on the rocks of compromise, conciliation, appeasement and despair.

Briefly, that is the record up to now.

Those who have made that record are now reversing their field. The hands which fed the soothing syrup have now reached for the sword. I concede, Mr. Chairman, that it is noble to admit a costly mistake and to take measures to remedy it. But those who have made the errors ought not object to close

scrutiny of the remedy they suggest or to a full scale and careful objective analysis of its merits. The pending proposal, I submit, will not stand such a test.

I propose to show that our so-called bipartisan foreign policy has been so inconsistent, so misleading and so utterly devoid of straight thinking that it completely defies description. I propose to show that those responsible for it are as confused and bewildered in their thinking today as they were 3 years ago. I propose to show that the pending measure is born of futility and despair, and is a \$400,000,000 adventure in diplomatic intrigue. That it is of hybrid origin—half belligerent and half benign. That it is half economic and half military. That it is half war-like and half conciliatory. That it is intervention in part and nonintervention in part. And that in sum, it is an unhappy conglomeration of contradictions in policy rolled together in the same ball of wax. Nevertheless, this flash bulb diplomacy generated by an alleged emergency is being handed the American people as the method by which to stop Russian aggression and establish world peace. We are told that our action must be immediate. It matters not if this may prove to be precipitous and unwise. It matters not if it superimposes a more unmanageable emergency upon the present alleged emergency. We must act now. Mr. Chairman, if it were not presumptuous on my part, I would assert that this thesis reaches a new zenith in stupidity. For more than 3 years, we have stumbled along with an unintelligible foreign policy now referred to as bipartisan. This alleged policy, although baffling and confusing to the American people, has been consistent in its over-all operation—it has constantly subordinated the interests of a just and decent peace to the appeasement of Russian communism.

No one, I think, will seriously dispute the fact that even before the end of the war we inaugurated a policy of leaning over backward to understand Stalin and his government. We have alternately compromised, conciliated, and appeased in order to be sure that he understood our willingness to cooperate with him. It is now past history that in our desire to overdo ourselves in this direction, we succeeded in compromising the rights and liberties of millions of people around the globe, and in addition, caused many governments entitled to be free to be subjugated under the iron heel of Russian communism.

The policy pattern which brought about this situation and which created the almost intolerable circumstances in which we find ourselves today, can be divided in two parts which I shall discuss in order.

First. The so-called Big Three meetings conducted during and after the war and their resultant agreements and understandings.

Second. The creation of the United Nations Organization which was inspired, directed, and brought into existence under the bipartisan guidance of our foreign-policy leadership.

Each of these courses of action generated and sparked the over-all bipartisan plan of letting the Russians do exactly as they pleased. The record shows the plan succeeded well.

I make no criticism of the meetings held by the heads of the major Allied Governments to discuss war strategy and thus bring about better cooperation and assist in the expeditious winning of the war. But the Big Three meetings went much further than that. They discussed and decided postwar questions involving the settlement of peace. Irrevocable commitments were made at these meetings affecting peacetime problems. There was compromise and appeasement—mostly on our side—affecting the rights and liberties of people and governments who were not even present or parties to such agreements.

All of these meetings are of too recent origin to require extensive review. There was Yalta and Teheran and Potsdam where the heads of the major governments, including our own, reached understandings between themselves which made possible the eventual enslavement of millions of people by Russia and destroyed the integrity of governments which we had declared we would make free. In spite of the previous meetings, we had one last chance at Potsdam to lay the groundwork for a respectable peace. But we did not avail ourselves of it.

Instead of steadfastly and forthrightly insisting that the Russians respect the provisions of the Atlantic Charter which they had previously agreed to, we permitted them to ravish and plunder the nations of Europe which had already been devastated by the war. We failed utterly to uphold one single principle for which we said our boys were fighting. Then we left Europe and its people prostrated and in the clutches of a dictator equally as ruthless as the one we had just conquered. The American people had nothing to say on this subject. Like the previous Big Three arrangements, it was never subject to ratification by the people. The fact was accomplished; the deed was done—it remained only for the American people to pour their money into this stricken area for relief supplies which actually got into the hands of the Russian conqueror. That in sum was our contribution at Potsdam toward the establishment of a decent peace.

While the President and his advisers were in Europe thus engaged in acquiescing to the demands of the Russians, our statesmen at home were engaged at San Francisco in formulating a contemporary arrangement to enforce peace which helped aggravate our difficulties.

Bear in mind that at the time of the San Francisco Conference, no final peace treaty had yet been attempted. Nor was it intended that the San Francisco Conference should write the peace. It was intended rather to create a peace-enforcing organization which would from then on maintain peace. It did not matter to our statesmen that their labors were directed toward creating an organization to enforce a peace which had not been written. They made us partners in that organization without

knowing whether we would have a good peace or a bad peace to enforce. No one in this country would want to pledge us to enforce an unjust peace yet we were at great pains to create the San Francisco Organization with our eyes completely blindfolded.

Moreover, many months were wasted on this United Nations organization which could well have been devoted to the main problem of writing a treaty of peace. So it is fair to say that we got the cart before the horse at San Francisco, because while we now have a peace enforcing organization—we still do not have any peace.

It must be apparent also by now the time wasted at the San Francisco Conference played directly into the hands of the Russians. It helped becloud the issues. It gave the Russians time to further extend their zones of aggression, and thus, place all of the Allies in a disadvantageous position when they finally got around to talking final peace.

Nevertheless, those who opposed the ratification of the San Francisco agreement and alleged that it should wait until a peace was written, were brushed aside. It was said it was a great contribution to world peace. Speaking at San Francisco at the closing session of the conference on June 26, 1945, President Truman said:

What you have accomplished in San Francisco shows how well these lessons of military and economic cooperation have been learned. You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world. The world must now use it. If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it. If we seek to use it selfishly—for the advantage of any one nation or any small group of nations—we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.

By their own example the strong nations of the world should lead the way to international justice. That principle of justice is the foundation stone of this Charter. That principle is the guiding spirit by which it must be carried out—not by words alone but by continued concrete acts of good will.

It (the UN Charter) has set up machinery of international cooperation which men and nations of good will can use to help correct the economic and social causes for conflict. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 5, p. 6979.)

In an address to Congress on the presentation of the Charter for ratification on June 2, 1945, the President further stated:

In your deliberations, I hope you will consider not only the words of the Charter but also the spirit which gives it meaning and life. The objectives of the Charter are clear. It seeks to prevent future wars. It seeks to settle international disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with principles of justice. * * * It seeks to remove the economic and social causes of international conflict and unrest. * * * This Charter points down the only road to enduring peace. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 5, p. 7119.)

It is clearly evident from these statements the extraordinary faith and confidence that was placed in this peace-enforcing agency less than 2 years ago. But it is an incontrovertible fact that the same nations who created this peace-enforcing organization 2 years ago have

as yet been unable to write the peace which this Charter would enforce.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, its proponents asserted that although the peace-enforcing agency was created before the peace was written, disputes might arise in the interim which could properly be settled by this agency. Now we have such a dispute in the Greek-Turkey situation but we are told that UN is not prepared to meet it. So in spite of what has been claimed, it is obvious that UN cannot or will not function as of today.

Based upon the foregoing, I assert that two conclusions are inescapable:

First, we have not been able to write a final peace because under our bipartisan foreign policy we have permitted Russian aggression to extend over such widespread areas that Stalin will not even discuss peace except upon his own terms. We cannot agree to Russia's terms even though we are largely to blame for Communist expansion; and, second, the United Nations organization will not function because there is no peace written which it can enforce and it cannot function in other respects because the Russians will prevent it through the use of their veto.

Therefore, it is clear that our present difficulties cannot be resolved within the framework of the United Nations organization. Neither can they be resolved within the framework of a treaty of peace which has not yet been written. So we are left with about three alternatives:

First. We may withdraw in frustration from further peace discussions as we did following World War I; or

Second. We may proceed unilaterally as contemplated by the pending resolution; or

Third. We may join with other peace-loving nations of the world and meet directly the issue of a Russian expansion in all parts of the world, and treat it as we find it—one big inseparable problem—which cannot be settled by piecemeal procedure.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with the assertion that we ought to let the American people decide which of these courses we should follow. Regardless of protestations to the contrary, this problem is too big and too vital to be decided by the bewildering and baffling process which has characterized our bipartisan foreign policy during the past 2 years. I think the people have had enough of our adventures in foreign policy by the expedient and makeshift method. I think they have had enough diplomacy by trial and error. I think the people are tired of crisis after crisis and emergency following emergency which have prostrated our peace efforts. I think the time has come when the people are entitled to a forthright, honest statement of aims. They ought to know where we are going and when we expect to get there. They ought to be fully advised of the burdens we intend to place upon them—both present and prospective.

The pending proposal does not give our people that kind of information. It is another expedient by piecemeal procedure. It has no definite limitations. It is another strike in the dark.

Why should the American people be led to believe that you can stop the spread of communism or Russian expansion by stopping it in Greece and Turkey—when we are presently confronted with the same situation in at least a dozen other countries of the world. Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to tell the American people the whole story. We ought to tell them that our bipartisan foreign policy has been utterly ineffective, and needs complete revision. We ought to tell them that there is only one real way of stopping Russian aggression and that is to meet it head on. We ought to tell them that it will cost more than \$400,000,000 to stop the Russian tide. We ought to tell them that it may cost four billion or forty billion and maybe another war.

After we have honestly and frankly informed the American people of the situation which confronts them, we should let them make the final decision.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude with this final point. The Russians are where they are today because they have had one clear objective from the outset and have pursued it vigorously and relentlessly and without deviation. Contrast this to our policy. We started out with high principles and objectives—often enunciated but seldom followed. We gave in to the Russians at every turn of the road. Each time we gave in, they fitted a new cog in their plan. We have talked—the Russians have acted. Now we have reached the crossroads and our statesmen propose that we cure the dilemma by giving the patient Castoria when he should be given castor oil.

Our problem is to stop expanding Communist domination on a dozen fronts. We propose to stop it by a half-hearted attack on one front.

There is only one way to meet this problem, Mr. Chairman, and that is to assess it in its entirety and attack it in its entirety. If we do that, I think we will come to the inevitable conclusion that the only way to stop Russian aggression is to move Stalin back to his pre-war boundaries and that any other sporadic action will merely prolong the day when we have to meet this problem squarely. Moving Stalin back may be a big order. But if it is a big order today, it will be a much bigger one 5 years from today.

I repeat again that we ought not move until we make this reassessment of all the facts. Let us make one decision to meet one issue and then pursue our course irrevocably.

If we adopt the present diplomatic monstrosity we are merely adding another blunder to an already colossal list of failures in bipartisan foreign policy.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us for consideration is the legislation necessary to implement the message given the joint session of the Congress in this chamber on March 12

by the President of the United States. This message presented to the American people and to us who represent them a new view of our place among the nations which, whether we desire it or not, we are called upon to occupy. It is a place of great responsibility which will require a new form of courage, of vision, of wisdom and of faith. So far reaching do I believe the results of our deliberations to be that I should be doing less than my part did I not say to you in utmost solemnity that upon our decision in these next days hangs the future not alone of our Nation, but of our civilization and possibly even of man upon the earth.

In my study of world conditions and our relation to other countries during the less than 200 years of our national life, as a background for decision in my search for guidance in the records of our past, I found much that steadied me, much that gave me hope that even at this moment we will do what other Congresses have done: Lay aside our personal biases, our regional prejudices, and consider the problem before us from the broad view of what free men accept as their responsibility before Almighty God. This is not the first time a Congress has had to face decisions that have increased our influence in the world beyond our borders, nor is it the first time we have had to make decisions involving us with the people of these very same areas.

You will recall the widespread revolts of the early nineteenth century against the selfish domination of tyrants and kings. It was in 1823, only 8 years after the battle of Waterloo, that the countries to the south of us freed themselves from the bonds of the Spanish Empire. We were the first to recognize their independence. And we went still further—we issued a warning to all the world to keep hands off. It was in his address to the first session of the Eighteenth Congress convening on December 1, 1823, that President Monroe addressed his message containing the paragraphs that later became known as the Monroe Doctrine.

We were but a small country then scarce 50 years old, with a population of but 10,000,000. Mexico was still ruler over vast areas of our present land. We hadn't even inventoried our Louisiana Purchase. But, Mr. Chairman, we knew what we proposed to do. We laid down an American policy, and though the world of that day was incomparably stronger than were we, no one then or since has violated it.

It was in the turmoil of that long ago time when Greece was struggling to free herself from the bonds of the then powerful Ottoman Empire that Daniel Webster, a giant of his time, arose in the House of Representatives to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an agent or commissioner to Greece, whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment.

In defense of his resolution this farseeing legislator said—and I ask you to note how vividly it applies to this moment:

The age is a peculiar one—it has a marked and striking character, and the position and circumstances of our country are

no less so. * * * There has occurred no age that may be compared with the present, whether in the interest excited by what now is or the prospect it holds out as to what it shall be. The attitude of the United States, meanwhile, is solemn and impressive.

I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, if his words do not meet the conditions in which we now find ourselves. I suggest it would be well if, for a moment or two, we listen to this great American, remembering that the United States of which he spoke was a pygmy compared with the Great Britain and the Russia of his day.

The wise, sagacious, foresighted Mr.-Webster continued:

Ours is now the Great Republic of the earth; its free institutions are matured by the experiment of half a century. * * * As a free Government, as the freest Government, its growth and strength compel it, willing or unwilling, to stand forth to the contemplation of the world. We cannot obscure ourselves if we would: a part we must take, honorable or dishonorable, in all that is done in the civilized world.

Mr. Webster continues with a picture of the Holy Alliance that had been formed by Alexander I of Russia and the restored Bourbon monarchy of France to uphold the divine right of kings. Great Britain would have no truck with this. She looked upon the Holy Alliance as a device by which Russia might achieve military power over all Europe.

Spoke that great statesman one-hundred-and-twenty-odd years ago:

What was the natural tendency of such an alliance? It was to put an end to all nations as such. Extend the principles of that alliance and the nations are no more—there are only kings.

Developing his theme he continued:

Are we prepared to resist this doctrine? The timid shrink and succumb. If it is not resisted here, and in one other spot, it will be resisted nowhere. If there is no vigor in the Saxon race to withstand it, there is none to be looked for elsewhere. * * * The radical defeat of this system—

The Holy Alliance—

is that it divides civilization. * * * The harmony which has ever prevailed either in Europe or America has rested on the principle of the mutual interdependence of nations. * * * Take this away and there is nothing left but the sword.

Those words spoken in the Nation's Congress one-hundred-and-twenty-odd years ago can well be repeated in the very midst of this deliberation.

It was feared in 1823 by the United States and England that the Holy Alliance would intervene on behalf of Spain's efforts to regain her lost American colonies.

In referring to President Monroe's pronouncement, Mr. Webster said:

Whatever we do in this matter it behooves us to do on principle. If, on the subject of the rumored combination against South America, we take any stand, it must be on principle that that stand is taken. The near approach, or the remote distance of danger, may change policy but cannot touch principle, and the same reasons of an abstract kind that would lead us to protest in the case of the whole southern continent binds us to protest in the case of the smallest republic in Italy.

Some Members of the Eighteenth Congress expressed fear that Mr. Webster's

resolution might bring us into embroilment with Turkey or with the powerful Holy Alliance. To this, among other things, he says:

Shall we be withheld from an honest expression of liberal feeling in the cause of freedom for fear of giving umbrage to some member of the Holy Alliance? Surely we are not yet prepared to purchase their smiles by a sacrifice of every manly principle. * * *

Emphasizing the need of giving aid to Greece, Mr. Webster says:

They look to us as the great Republic of the earth * * * and they ask us by our common faith whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy? I cannot say, sir, that they will succeed; that rests with Heaven. But for myself, sir, if I should hear tomorrow that they have failed * * * I should still reflect, with the most heartfelt satisfaction that I have asked you, in the name of 7,000,000 of freemen, that you would give them at least the cheering of one friendly voice.

That was the Eighteenth Congress in 1823-24. But could any words be more adapted to the Eightieth Congress in 1947 than Mr. Webster's:

There has occurred no age that may be compared with the present?

If there is any difference, it is only in degree. In the 1820's only segments of the world were involved. Today there is no nook or cranny to which a man may go to escape the responsibility to the great future that is his.

The men and women who faced our Revolution and our Civil War felt themselves in the toils of events beyond all others. Certainly we who have experienced two cataclysmic world wars feel events have pyramided upon us—that now it is our turn. Yes, there are those among us who in fear would dissent, but our people are a strong and virile people, who will face responsibility with as great a courage and as sound a method as those of any age, once they understand clearly what that responsibility is. They cannot be expected to choose wisely if the issues are beclouded and confused. But if we give our people the picture as it really is fearlessly and with complete faith in their considered judgment, if we, as fearlessly and with unwavering faith, accept the responsibility that is America's for the continuance of freedom upon the earth, we need have no fear as to their courage, their vision, and their faith.

What is it that confronts us as a nation? What is the decision we must make? It is clearly this: Shall we accept a place of responsibility toward the continuance of freedom upon earth, or shall we let it go by default?

It was on March 12, 1947, that President Truman appeared before a joint session of this Eightieth Congress with a message which has been called by some the Truman doctrine. It differed most dramatically from President Monroe's in that while the earlier one was scarcely taken notice of at the time, President Truman electrified the world. Why? Because the most powerful nation on earth had spoken to the whole wide world. What did that message say? It did not lay down the law. It did not preach. It did not threaten. It claimed nothing for itself. It attempted to take

nothing from others. It simply reminded a sick, struggling, and fearful world that the belief held by the United States in the right of free choice is a vital, unselfish, and living belief. That to those whose desire for freedom is threatened, who wish to remain free, we, who believe in freedom, will give help as we are able and in such manner as may be decided upon.

Neither we, the Members of this Congress, nor the American people, can proceed intelligently without an understanding of the question that confronts us, the nature of our times, the vices and virtues not only of our principal opponent, but our own as well.

The immense complexity of today's world has been curiously reduced to the simple fact that unparalleled world wars and revolutions of a single generation have brought it about that there are left but two great powers: ourselves and the Soviet Union. Neither one of us is very well prepared to take responsibility for peace in the world, but whether we are ready or not, the responsibility is upon us.

Let us look at the situation objectively, fearlessly and above all hopefully. It is very apparent that we stand at the opposite poles of thought and we might as well face the fact so evident to anyone who reads no more than the simple little books Stalin has written about Lenin and about communism. We might as well face up to it and recognize that the Soviet is a proselytizing group bent upon converting all the nations of the world to the Communist way of life. We might better remember that nothing is more dangerous than the true fanatic. He is that most to be feared of all men—the man who would cut your throat not to do you harm, but to do you good! Such is the practice of the zealous Communist.

We, on the other hand, think quite differently. It is true that we believe in the spiritual and the material wisdom of "democracy" as we define it. We have not forced others to attempt it knowing that it is not a form of government but a state of mind, a state of being, into which certain peoples are not ready to enter because their inheritance and environment are such that they do not yet understand it. Is it not true that we have always felt that this world of ours could be a little like Heaven—a place of "many mansions"—in which the inhabitants of each went about the business of living in their own way, worshiping their own gods and setting up such governments as they desire. We did not admire Czarist Russia, but we got along with her. Unfortunately, Communist Russia makes that tolerance difficult if not impossible.

In considering further the situation in which we find ourselves side by side with the Soviet Union, it would be wise to remember that this other titan is two and one-half times larger than the United States with these added satellite countries beyond her borders. "Satellite," as it happens, is the precise word. Satellites, by a compulsion of physics which they cannot resist, move in the orbits of the greater stars. Her still undeveloped riches are fabulous though at the moment we are stronger than she is.

The United States' capacity for production is greater than the rest of the

world, and this although we have only 6 percent of the world population. Nor are we alone in the struggle—for others are with us. If the worst should come and the world be split asunder into two groups we would have an enormous advantage over Russia if our resources were combined with those of Britain. The United States News of May 2 just past gives this very interesting comparison of present resources on that basis:

Cropland: 67 percent of the world's cropland against Russia's 33 percent.

Coal: 84 percent against Russia's 16 percent.

Industrial production: 85 percent against Russia's 15 percent.

Steel: 85 percent against Russia's 15 percent.

Railroad mileage: 85 percent against Russia's 15 percent.

Electric power: 89 percent against Russia's 11 percent.

Petroleum: 90 percent against Russia's 10 percent.

Shipping: 97 percent against Russia's 3 percent.

It is my firm conviction that we can remain stronger if we invoke the use of our full strength. Whether the world stands with us or kneels to the Soviet is more a matter of our character than of our resources. It is a matter of our vision, our will, our understanding, our obstinacy—and, above all, our willingness less to die for our beliefs than to live for them! Without question, we are the most powerful people that inhabit the earth.

The Russian military and industrial potential is probably greater than our own, but not realizable for sometime to come. The key to Communist action is their passionately fanatic belief that the world must become wholly Communist. They do not propose to rest until that moment. No revolution, no infiltration is considered successful until it has set up a Communist state and started a revolution in another country. Whether we like it or not, that is the cold fact stated many times by their leaders.

At this moment all the world is not under the Russian heel, and there is ample evidence that all the world does not want to be under it and that it looks to us for leadership. With us they may survive; without us they are lost.

The only real weapon Russia has is communism. This weapon is effective only in the presence of hopelessness, despair, disease, and anarchy. True that the wars have conditioned the world in such wise as to make it ready for the virus of totalitarian controls. When a man is starving, and his wife and child with him, he will turn to anyone who promises him food. In a way one might say that communism is a system of receivership in bankruptcy, that it takes over when a state no longer serves its people's needs or when its rulers are so blind that they do not attempt to serve them. It is a negative system, largely made possible by default. It is the last alternative left the despairing. But this weapon of communism, this promise of bread, loses effectiveness if means are found so to strengthen the sick body so that it becomes resistant to infection.

What have we to give? Indeed, what is it that the President in his message asked us to make possible? A few of our soldiers especially qualified for assignment to training duty, technicians, specialists, trained men and trained women to go over to this strategically important area and prove that we so truly believe that freedom is an essential part of living, that we are willing and ready to give of our knowledge and our skills that the people of Greece and of Turkey may not only return to productivity of their own but that they may eat their bread in freedom and in peace.

Stalin does not believe that we have the will, the tenacity, the purposefulness, and the concrete faith in our own way of life to give ourselves to the spread of freedom in opposition to communism. He does not think that we are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to use such of our wealth as the task calls for. He believes that he can win by our default. He believes that because most of the people of the world are poor, sick, and hopeless he can win by doing little, while we can win only by doing a great deal. The Russians have an awesome respect for our military and industrial abilities, but they regard us as childish, a spoiled people unhardened by privation who, when not directly attacked militarily, will not shoulder the burdens of world leadership. They believe that we will not face up to the facts and that we will not act. If they are right we shall ultimately come into catastrophic conflict with them. If they are wrong we can perhaps prevent the conflict and play the part I believe we, as a Nation, were destined to play, leading the world out of despair toward a new era of happiness and prosperity. The task is almost superhuman—the costs will be high—but I would ask you, is any cost short of the loss of honor too high to prevent war?

Let me put it this way: What price would not the families of our war dead and of our brave wounded pay to have their men back alive and well? In our hearts we know that we must pay for everything we want and that in the bazaars of life ambition, fame, success, achievement, riches, war, peace—all have their price. Therefore, if we want a peaceful, orderly world we know we can have it only if we pay for it; otherwise we shall lose not only all possibility of peace but also our freedom and the freedom of the world.

I say to you with a deep sincerity that if we turn our faces away from the road that lies ahead so clearly outlined by the frantic determination of the greatest of all totalitarian states, we and all those who reach out to us in hope of freedom will have to see the world we have dreamed of tortured and destroyed by inches before our eyes. And the last that will succumb will be ourselves.

It is quite true what men have said from this well that only a strong America can lead the world. I am too practically minded not to agree wholeheartedly with this self-evident premise that unless we pull ourselves together and stop this utterly unworthy internal strife so that our farms and factories can produce to capacity and the results

be transported wherever there is need in accordance with such policies as we may decide upon, we are of little use to ourselves or to the world. And it takes strength to do this, not just a visible, tangible strength, but also strength of spirit, strength of determination, strength of integrity and honor, strength above all things in the matter of our faith and in the destiny we must hold inviolate. It takes strength to be willing to sacrifice comfort, ease, luxury. Have we lost confidence in ourselves? Have we become devitalized? Are we so confused that we can no longer see clearly the implications of these grave problems with which we are faced?

Granted that the world of Daniel Webster, when men traveled by slow stages, was externally a different world from ours. Why—now with a bit of a tailwind I can come back from my Ohio district to Washington in a little over an hour, and all else in proportion—but the same momentous questions face us.

I have said before that this is a complicated world but, in some respects, a simple one. This is certainly true of it in its strategical aspects. There are a few lands and islands that are the strategic keys to much of the world. Among them are Greece and Turkey. It is rather terrifying, even in retrospect, to realize that during the last war our national salvation depended, perhaps, upon two tiny bits of land whose combined area is less than that of a Texas county. If Malta and Gibraltar had fallen into the hands of Germany and Italy before we entered the war, it is unlikely that a war would have continued into which we might enter.

Definitely aware of the risks involved, but unafraid of them, I see this bill as one designed to accomplish a number of objects: First. To keep two of the most strategically important countries of the world in the free nations column rather than giving them over to totalitarian domination by default.

Second. To give Greece and Turkey a breathing spell in which to reorganize their economies and begin to move toward putting themselves on their own feet.

Third. To keep open the markets of the Mediterranean and the Near East for ourselves and all others who trade there and who trade with us directly and indirectly.

On all these counts, therefore, I am for aid and assistance to Greece and Turkey. Looking back over the last 30 years it is clear that twice within a generation we have been saved not by any wisdom or foresight of our own, but simply by the grace of God, in that others held the enemy until we could come upon the battlefield and turn the tide. Now there are no others.

The time has come when we must depend less upon good fortune, more upon our brains; when we must be forehanded instead of empty-headed; when we must lead and not follow. I am well aware that the task before us is of staggering dimensions and this bill but a beginning. But I am certain we can do nothing for ourselves or for the world by deceiving

ourselves into believing we can be saved by incantations or by libations to the gods. But since when have Americans faltered because a task was hard?

The world we share with other men who look to us challenges us with every new dawn to take hold of reality with all the old thrill of adventure, the certainty of attainment and the unshakable faith that the men and women who built the America we live in knew. Yes, these men fought when they had to with their women loading their muskets, but they won through with their farms, their schools, their churches, and their village stores. These same simple methods free men use are the best and most effective weapons with which the expansion of totalitarian domination can be stopped. Yes, it will cost to take them over there and show the people what free men do with such weapons, with such tools. But the question is not just how can we avoid war, or only how can we stop totalitarian expansion. The question is, in addition: How truly do we believe that freedom is worth whatever price life demands for it save only honor? How passionately do we want freedom and peace for ourselves and for the world? How ready are we to sacrifice our superficial comforts, our ease, our selfish greeds to the great future? How vividly aware are we that in very truth he who loveth his life overmuch shall lose it? Have we considered the results if we live up to Stalin's expectations and do nothing? Are we going to let freedom go by default or are we going to gird our souls for a battle with weapons that are an unshakable faith, mixed with bread, a few machines, a few military and other technicians and specialists, all bound together with integrity and the shining force of character and an unwavering belief that men can and will choose freedom if and when they have a choice?

Lincoln, with deep and simple wisdom, one day announced that this country could not exist half slave and half free. If we lift the veils of selfishness and fear from our eyes and look out across the present world we shall see without the shadow of a doubt that the world cannot exist half slave and half free. What sort of a people are we who prate of peace and whisper of more war—for the future of the whole wide world is in our hands?

Let us not minimize the greatness of this moment for us and for all mankind.

Above all, let us not turn away from the clearly defined road that lies before us, a stormy road, perhaps, but filled with the glory of struggle and of attainment. The moment of our choosing is upon us! Shall we turn off into the by-path to which so many beckon us, or shall we once again lift our eyes to the stars, and, putting our hand into the hand of God, step out upon the road of destiny?

Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest hope that this House may pass H. R. 2616 overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

In accordance with the gentlewoman's request, without objection, she may revise and extend her remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio on the very able and sincere address she has just made.

Mr. Chairman, the President, in his address before the Congress on March 12, called to our attention the grave situation confronting the world today, asserting that "the foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved."

The proposal before the House is the answer of the Foreign Affairs Committee to the President's appeal, and in the words of our report is "aimed at the establishment and maintenance of political and economic security" in the Mediterranean area.

This is not just another bill to provide relief for some foreign country. The sentimental attachment and admiration of our people for the Greek people and their legitimate aspirations, alone, would not, to my way of thinking, warrant the very serious step proposed here today.

There are some who have criticized the lack of firmness and forthrightness in our foreign policy in the past. Such a charge cannot be sustained against this bill, or against President Truman who proposed it, or against Secretary Marshall who has wholeheartedly endorsed it.

This country has stumbled into two world wars because foreign dictators and would-be dictators did not have a clear picture of where we stood. To say the least, they will not misunderstand us if we pass this legislation. It is supremely necessary that they do not misunderstand.

No man knows whether this aid program will prevent another world war. But it is my confident belief that it will help in that direction. The last war cost the United States, in addition to untold blood and suffering, \$400,000,000,000. My support of this bill, which provides for one-tenth of 1 percent of that outlay of the taxpayers' money, is predicated on my belief that the outlay will prove to be a good investment, a reasonable insurance premium against another war.

The United States is the most powerful nation on earth, but we will never escape another war unless we show a willingness to go to war if challenged. War will not come to us if we accept the idea of possible war and prepare for it.

War is certain to come if the United States fails to challenge Russia in her policy of expansion and aggression. If we appease and back away as Russia expands, communism will finally become so strong that we must fight for our way of life and our national existence. The issue here is whether or not we are going to fold our tents and silently slip away to our own hemisphere and let the slow, deadly cancer of dictatorship and

the superstate eat the vitals out of weak nations on the other side of the world and finally spread to our own shores when it is too late.

No Congress could be faced with a greater challenge. The fate of our own people and free people everywhere may rest upon our decision.

It is a time-honored axiom that every national foreign policy is selfish and I would be less than frank if I did not admit that I support this bill mainly because I believe it is calculated to further the best interests of our country.

There is no obligation on our part to underwrite the British Empire. We are not obligated to step into Greece as Britain steps out. The fact remains, however, that if Britain is to continue her historic role in Greece, the United States must lend her the money to do the job, and we have already loaned her more than she can ever pay. It is better for us to spend the money, do this job, take the credit and the blame, and let the world know that from henceforth we are moving on our own power and not on the tail of the British kite.

The history of nations will not reveal more national unselfishness than has been exhibited by the United States during and since the last World War. We have generously carried on our shoulders three-fourths of the relief burden of the world.

There has been exhibited, too, clear realization by the President, by the Congress, and by all of the people of the United States that if the world is to have a just and lasting peace, it must come through international understanding and cooperation. This Nation laid the first stone in the formation of the United Nations. We have cooperated 100 percent to make that cooperative movement a success.

We had hoped all along that Russia would cooperate to bring world understanding through UN, but it is clear now that Russia never intended to cooperate. She has refused our invitations to join even one of the following movements for better understanding: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; World Bank and Monetary Fund; Food and Agricultural Organization; International Civil Aeronautical Organization; International Labor Organization; International Refugee Organization; World Health Organization.

Secretary of State Marshall has just returned empty-handed from the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Moscow. He has been unable to secure Russian agreement to a peace treaty with Austria, without which the foundation for economic recovery in Europe cannot be built. At every point he has been balked by Russia. His patience has been sorely taxed and the patience of the American people has worn thin. One can come to no other conclusion but that the Soviets prefer economic chaos in Europe in order that communism may spread by means of political chaos which is sure to follow.

Charges have been preferred against the President that, through his proposal

for aid for Greece and Turkey, he bypassed the United Nations. It may have been better for form's sake to submit the proposition first to the United Nations, but, in any event, such action would have only been an empty gesture. Whether we had first gone to UN or not, the need for our doing the thing proposed here would have remained.

The important question is not whether the United States should consult the United Nations before dealing with the Mediterranean emergency in its own way. The important query is: What is wrong within the world organization which makes it necessary to do so?

The pretense that Communist Russia and capitalist United States can be good friends is now ended. That's what Lenin and Stalin have taught all along but we've just begun to realize it.

The sooner we realize that Russia did not join the United Nations in good faith, the better.

Suppose we had put this proposal for a halt to Soviet aggression before the Security Council. Does any Member of this Congress for 1 minute think that Russia would have agreed to any remedial action by the Council? The rotten pillar in the UN edifice is that any one of the five great powers can prevent, by the veto, whatever the majority wants to do. The single nation veto power was the price the world had to pay for Russian participation in UN.

The testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee shows further that the United Nations set-up is not equipped to handle the situation in Greece and Turkey. First, thanks to Russia, UN has no police force yet which could be used for bringing order in Greece. Neither is the World Bank able to handle the situation through loans at the present time. Even if funds were available through the Bank, Greece could not meet its collateral requirements for a loan.

It is plain as day that the United States is going to have to meet this challenge alone and provide this aid for Greece and Turkey or nothing is going to be done. Russia hopes that nothing will be done. The result would be to force Greece and Turkey into the arms of communism. Russia would then be free to push across the Dardanelles for the second phase of her drive for world revolution.

It is not necessary to call to the attention of this Congress again the consistent policy of territorial aggression on the part of Russia since World War II. Figures speak for themselves. First Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland were swallowed up. Finland was reduced in size and then dominated. Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria are tools in her hands. Hungary is prostrate. Germany, Austria, and Italy would have been overrun had it not been for American troops there.

The Soviet Government since the recent war has extended its boundaries or sphere of influence continuously. The following figures showing countries and populations either annexed or controlled since World War II by the action of the

Soviet Government are provided by Mr. Bullitt in his book, *The Great Globe Itself*:

Europe:	
Poland.....	35,000,000
Eastern Germany.....	25,000,000
Rumania.....	20,000,000
Yugoslavia.....	15,700,000
Hungary.....	10,000,000
Bulgaria.....	6,300,000
Lithuania.....	2,000,000
Latvia.....	2,000,000
Estonia.....	1,000,000
Albania.....	1,000,000
Total.....	118,000,000

Asia:	
North China (area held by Chinese Soviet Red Army).....	75,000,000
Manchuria.....	45,000,000
North Korea.....	10,000,000
Total.....	130,000,000

In addition, the following European countries are today under partial control by the Soviet Government, and threatened with complete control by the Soviet Government:

Czechoslovakia.....	15,000,000
Austria.....	7,000,000
Finland.....	3,800,000
Total.....	25,800,000

If the Soviet Government should be permitted to consolidate its control over these 118,000,000 Europeans and 130,000,000 Asiatics—leaving aside the other 25,000,000 Europeans it now controls partially—the manpower in the hands of the Soviet dictator would be far more than doubled. He would rule 418,000,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, we fought and won a great war with Russia as an ally. We had hoped that our common bond of suffering and sacrifice might make it possible for us to live in the same world with Russia in a spirit of understanding of each other's problems. The world should know, though, that if the United Nations is dead, it is Stalin and communism that delivered the fatal stroke, and not the United States.

We recognize the right of Russians to choose their own form of government, but we do not recognize the right of Russia to undermine our own. Neither do we recognize Russia's right to defeat the principle of self-determination for all nations, large or small, in matters of self-government.

President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill fully understood the probability that the communistic ideology would conflict with free democratic institutions during the postwar period so they sought to evade trouble by seeking to get Stalin's adherence to certain principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. The first three points of this charter read:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of govern-

ment under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

In 1933, when the United States first recognized the present Russian Government, Litvinov, the Soviet Ambassador, signed the following pledge in the White House:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States.

We have been disillusioned. This House has had evidence on numerous occasions, brought out by the Committee on Un-American Activities, that the Communist Party of Russia has an agency and disciples here in the United States trying to overthrow our Government by subversive means.

We might just as well recognize the purposes of the dictator in the Kremlin now. We have read of the philosophy of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. We know of their avowed purpose to bring world revolution regardless of the means used. We had hoped, however, that the revolution in Russia having attained its purpose, would not seek to force its doctrine on other nations.

It all adds up to this: We have got to stop Russia now or fight her later on. I do not say that war with Russia is inevitable but I do say that war is sure to come with Russia later on unless we show a firm hand and a stout heart now. To understand communism and its ultimate goal, we may well study the writings and teachings of Lenin and Stalin themselves. We will then know why it is so vital not only to our own security, but to the people of the world as well, that this bill be passed and aid be sent to Greece and Turkey now.

Here are some direct quotations from the pens of the master architects of the world communistic state:

A morality taken from outside of human society does not exist for us; it is a fraud. For us, morality is subordinated to the interests of the workers' class struggle. * * * It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of the truth. (Lenin, Religion, New York edition, 195; In The Infantile Sickness of Leftism or Communism.)

No dictatorship of the proletariat is to be thought of without terror and violence. (Lenin.)

Religion is the opium of the people. (Lenin.)

We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should con-

tinue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. (Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 24, p. 122.)

From the time a Socialist government is established in any one country, questions must be determined * * * solely from the point of view of what is best for the development and the consolidation of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun. The question whether it is possible to undertake at once a revolutionary war must be answered solely from the point of view of actual conditions and the interest of the Socialist Revolution which has already begun. (Lenin, Twenty-one Theses, January 20, 1918.)

It is not enough to be a revolutionary and an adherent of Socialism or of communism in general. What is needed is the ability to find at any moment that particular link in the chain which must be grasped with all one's might to gain control of the whole chain and pass without a hitch to the next link. (Collected Works of Lenin, first Russian edition, vol. 18, pt. 1, p. 379.)

Dictatorship means nothing more or less than the power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules. (Stalin, Problems of Leninism.)

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a domination that is untrammelled by law and based on violence and enjoys the sympathy of the toiling and exploited masses. (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 50.)

The revolutionist will accept a reform in order to use it as a means wherewith to link legal work with illegal work, in order to use it as a screen behind which his illegal activities for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie may be intensified. (Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, p. 101.)

To me, it is set forth clearly in the writings of Lenin and Stalin that they believe that war is inevitable between the Soviet Union and the non-Communist states.

Mr. Chairman, the march of communism must be checked now. Strategically the Mediterranean area is well suited to the establishment of our new defense line.

From a political and sentimental standpoint, the Greek people are well worth our aid. The history of the Greek people is a glorious one. This little nation is the cradle of freedom.

For 2,500 years Greece has been the focal point of clashing international interests. As far back as the fifth century B. C., she repulsed the Persians under Xerxes and ushered in the great age of Greek culture.

Phillip and Alexander conquered her and spread Hellenic culture into Africa and Asia.

From time to time she was overrun by Vandals, Ostrogoths, Huns, Avars, Slavic tribes, Sicilians, Franks, and Turks. She was raided, sacked, and burned.

By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman Turks had dispossessed their remaining rivals and held all Greece for over two centuries.

Thereafter for a century, in her exhaustion, she was exploited in turn by the Russians, French, British, and Germans.

In the recent World War she fought and was winning against Italian invasion when the Germans came in and overwhelmed her.

Through the travail of centuries, the evidence is overwhelming that the Greek people clung to their love of liberty and from time to time recaptured their birthright of democracy.

Greece has again become the focal point of world interest. Recent Russian foreign policy in this area appears to seek dominance over both Turkey and Greece. The United States now proposes to counteract the Russian advance by taking over British responsibilities in the area. As the British step out, either Russia or the United States will step in.

The issue is much greater than a mere border dispute among the Balkan states, or the type of government Greece shall have. The issue is the last analysis whether Russia and communism are to control the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

As to Turkey, the same sentimental considerations do not obtain, it is true, as in the case of Greece. The plain unvarnished fact is that considerations of our own national self-interest should induce us to bolster Turkey's military establishment.

On account of Turkey's hesitancy about entering the late war on our side, American sympathy is not so pronounced in her case. Neither is her serious plight fully understood. As a matter of fact, both Greece and Turkey face the same danger and from the standpoint of military strategy are part of the same picture. The Russians seek bases on Turkish territory. They have demanded an agreement which would in effect place the Dardanelles under Russian control. It would be folly to bolster Greece with a weak and vulnerable Turkey on her flank, or vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, the United States wants peace. The question now uppermost in the minds of our people is whether this bill is the road to peace or the road to war. Only God can read the future and only God can answer that question. In our circumscribed finite minds, the future can only be judged by the past.

I clearly remember the year 1914 when it was not dreamed that the United States could be drawn into the First World War, then raging. But in 1917 when it appeared that Germany would win and liberty die, we went in with flags flying, though unprepared. We won that conflict after terrible cost of blood and money. When I returned home from France, confused and disgusted, I was resolved to do what I could to see that this Nation be never again involved in the quarrels, jealousies, and hates of nations on the other side of the world. My thoughts growing out of disillusionment then were the thoughts of the vast majority of our people.

The United States drew into her shell again and sought to insulate herself from future world conflicts. I myself supported that policy. Nevertheless, when Hitler threatened to dominate the world and wreck our way of life once again this

Nation rose up in arms, and we were victorious again at a cost far greater than in the first instance.

By now we should have learned our lesson. The only way to prevent our involvement in another World War, with communism on one side and democracy as we know it on the other, is to prevent that war from coming about. And we will never prevent that war from coming about by a cowardly shrinking policy now.

Many, many years ago, in the infancy of our Republic, it was in this same Mediterranean area that a great American leader challenged the Barbary pirates with these words, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." Today, when we are strong, it is our bounden duty to repeat that slogan to the masters of the Kremlin. We have appeased and we have sought to please Russia, only to find that each new concession called for another. Today calls for more courageous action. We must either go into the Mediterranean or get out of Europe. And if we get out of Europe now, we will not be able to stay out. We will have to go back as we have done before and pay the cost of our folly.

Mr. Chairman, the courageous step proposed here to implement our foreign policy may not prevent war. God grant that it may. Another world war in this atomic age would be the supreme tragedy for America and all mankind.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I know the gentleman feels as I do about the United Nations. I am wondering, however, if the gentleman does not agree that even though we concede that it cannot function in this instance there is still in this country a considerable bloc of public opinion that feels that notwithstanding that chance we should at least make the effort.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would not dispute the gentleman's statement. I think we have by the Vandenberg amendment provided for that. We say in this bill that we are willing to step out of this thing if the United Nations will take hold and handle the problem. There is no doubt about that.

This is a serious matter, and I can readily understand how Members could be troubled about this legislation. I am not one who would doubt the honesty, integrity, and patriotism of the gentleman who has just questioned me, just because we disagree.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I use as my text the text that I heard the gentleman from New Jersey use on occasion, although perhaps not exactly in these words: "Destroy not the ancient landmarks thy fathers have set."

You know, we have quoted the Bible here on the one hand and carried machine guns in the other so much during this debate that I am sure you will pardon me for quoting a verse of Scripture.

The gentleman who preceded me referred to stabbing the United Nations in the back. The Cleveland Plain Dealer in a paragraph the other day said:

As we understand it, after we get our passport visa, travelers' checks, and pistol permit for Greece, we are to stop by and tell the United Nations we are on our way.

The gentleman who preceded me also referred to the Vandenberg proposal. The Vandenberg proposal merely emphasizes our disdain for the United Nations, which we will permit to function only if it does what we want when we want it done for us. It is not so much a foreign policy as indulgence in a highly expensive prejudice.

Mr. Chairman, the apologists for the Truman doctrine, which the Truman administration wants the House of Representatives to rubber stamp, try to make it appear that it does not bypass the United Nations. Everybody who has bothered to read the bill which the Truman administration is trying to steamroller through Congress with cries of "crisis" knows that of course the bill bypasses the United Nations. It is obvious on the face of it. It is obvious to everybody in the United States, and it is obvious to the United Nations. What the United Nations membership thinks about it was made clear in a poll conducted by the United Nations World magazine. The magazine questioned 83 diplomats from 38 countries. Eighty-two percent of the diplomats replied that the Truman policy hurt the prestige of the United Nations. The magazine reported:

Sixty-eight regretted, as a matter of principle, that the United States did not come before the United Nations with the Greek and Turkish problems. They considered the prestige of the United Nations seriously threatened, and expressed hope that the United States would make more than a token gesture in the very near future to bring the whole Greek and Turkish matter before the United Nations.

Of course, the prestige of the United Nations is seriously threatened by the Truman doctrine. If the Congress approves the Truman doctrine it will be dealing a blow to the United Nations which may well be fatal. The United Nations is our best chance for peace. It is my considered opinion that the Truman doctrine points straight down the road to war.

Mr. Chairman, the House has been forced by President Truman to come to a decision on the basic foundation principles of our Nation's foreign policy. In the proposed Greek-Turkish military alliance bill, we have presented to us a radical departure in our foreign policy because that bill calls for a system of military alliances throughout the world. For this reason the bill before the House is in direct contradiction to the entire history of American foreign policy.

Some people have suggested that President Truman is using the so-called Truman doctrine as a 1948 Presidential platform. While this may be one of the motives, Mr. Chairman, which prompted President Truman, it by no means comprehends the vast implications of the Truman doctrine itself. Not

only does this doctrine propose a system of military alliances throughout the world, but it proposes that our financial and economic strength shall be mobilized to back up that system of military alliances. We are being asked, Mr. Chairman, to pour the taxpayers' money at the rate of \$20,000,000,000 a year down every international rat hole from London to Manila on the completely false premise that by so doing we will be stopping communism. Actually, the results of such a system of military alliances sustained by American wealth means higher prices and higher taxes and financial bankruptcy and an unlimited inflation in America itself. The Truman policy is not only an undeclared declaration of war, but it is also the death knell of American capitalism if it is carried out, because it means the bankruptcy of America itself.

The Members of the House might well read the article by Stewart Alsop, entitled "Matter of Fact," in the Washington Post of May 5, in which he points out that Great Britain will shortly be demanding another loan from the United States. Alsop demonstrates that the British cannot export sufficiently to meet their import needs. He states that they will need another loan. Permit me to quote:

The other way of filling the gap is almost equally unpleasant for it depends on the United States. It does not necessarily presuppose another Government loan, with the bitter feelings such a loan would surely arouse. The British reaction to the loan is interesting. What was considered in the United States a gesture of rather fatheaded generosity is regarded here as the closest and most merciless Yankee horse trading.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask that Mr. Alsop's column appear in my remarks:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Stewart Alsop)

THE GAP

LONDON, May 4.—Any one of the hundreds of thousands of American soldiers who came to know London well during the war years would probably be surprised by the aspect of the London of 1947. He would be surprised, not because London is different, but because it is so much the same. Here are the same bombed-out buildings; the same drably dressed people, who seem, in their monotone clothes, to fade into the background of the monotone buildings; the same inedible bread sausages and the same muddy thick soup (always the same, although called by an infinite variety of French names); the same unwashed windows and unheated houses and curious people, so many of whom seem to have stepped right out of a bad Hollywood comedy about English types. There are no more sirens, no more hordes of GI's in Eisenhower Plaatz, but for the rest the London of 1947 is in all outward aspects the London of 1943 or 1944.

Yet there is a difference. The bombed buildings during the war had a slightly sinister air of courage and defiance. Now, with weeds sprouting in the mud, they are just messy. The dull clothes of the people then seemed a badge of their dogged endurance. Now they are just dreary. The spirit of durable gaiety which made London, despite the bombings and whisky at \$16 a bottle, the best leave town in the world, is gone. London is dull, dull and infinitely sad.

All this has its political significance, of real importance to the United States. The

first instinct of any American who makes for the first time the dreary bus ride from the airport at Heathrow to the center of London, is to ask himself how long these people are going to be able to carry on like this. How long are they going to be able to live this miserably monotonous existence, and still bear the heavy weight of remaining a great world power? The answer to that question may spell the difference between success and failure in the new determined American effort to contain Soviet expansion.

The economic situation which lies behind the drabness of postwar England is in its essence simple enough. After the war, with heavy debts replacing foreign investments, the only way the British people could survive was to export finished goods for food. But they could not instantly convert their industries and begin exporting. Therefore, the United States—essentially because the United States could not afford to see England cease to become a great power; not at all because Shakespeare was born here—lent England close to \$4,000,000,000 to bridge the gap between the end of the war and the time when the export program would begin to take up the slack.

The sad fact which is now staring England in the face (and will soon confront America) is simply that the loan is not going to bridge the gap. Aside from a small fringe of fervent optimists, that is the opinion of the vast majority of economists and other observers with whom this reporter has talked.

Some alarmists doubt that the loan will last much more than a year. Optimists hope for two more years. The best estimate seems to be that the end of sterling exchange restrictions, plus the fact that there is now more to buy with the dollars, will increase the rate of expenditure so that the last dollar will have been spent sometime in the autumn of 1948. Barring a miracle, very few observers believe that by that time England will be exporting enough to pay for what she needs.

The reason is not far to seek. This country's economy simply could not survive another crisis like that of this winter, when the coal ran out and industry came to a standstill. Therefore, to save coal for next winter, industries are being limited to 65 percent of their coal needs for this summer. In other words, there will be a partial stoppage this summer to guard against a total stoppage next winter. This stoppage will further slow down the lagging export drive. Estimates vary, but there seems to be good reason to believe that by the time the last dollar is spent, there will be a gap between exports and imports of more than a billion dollars.

This gap can be filled in either of two ways. The British can tighten their belts to the backbone, and proceed to lead a sort of cave-man life, which will make their present drab existence seem like lush times. An inevitable corollary is an almost total withdrawal from British world commitments, with disastrous implications for the whole American foreign policy.

The other way of filling the gap is almost equally unpleasant, for it depends on the United States. It does not necessarily presuppose another Government loan, with the bitter feelings such a loan would surely arouse. (The British reaction to the loan is interesting. What was considered in the United States a gesture of rather fat-headed generosity is regarded here as the closest and most merciless Yankee horse-trading.) But it does presuppose the untying of some of the strings attached to the loan, probably American backing for credit to England through the international bank, and above all a firm partnership agreement on foreign policy, in which the United States would agree to support some of the heavy economic commitments which Great Britain cannot afford until her economy is again on its feet.

Such measures will be attacked in the United States as the bolstering of the deca-

dent British Empire. They will be attacked here as the hiring out of Britain as a paid mercenary to America. It is possible that either American or British opposition will make such a partnership impossible. If that happens, the future of the western effort to contain Russian expansion looks very dark indeed.

Mr. Chairman, let the Members of the House note that on Monday, the 5th, Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the British Board of Trade, warned the British people that the American and Canadian loans were running out in a much shorter period than was originally expected. Mr. Chairman, the naked, brutal fact is that the British Empire is falling apart, and before this year is out the Congress of the United States will have before it another proposal to lend the British Empire another four or five billions of dollars. That is what the Truman Policy means in regard to the British Empire.

Mr. Chairman, France today is caught in the middle of a great political crisis, and what do we find our newspapers reporting? The Washington Post of yesterday, May 6; on page 14, has a headline: "United States may boost aid to France if Ramadier keeps Reds out":

UNITED STATES MAY BOOST AID TO FRANCE IF RAMADIER KEEPS REDS OUT

PARIS, May 5.—A high American official source said tonight the United States was preparing for possible increased aid to the tattered French economy, provided Premier Paul Ramadier can hold together his new non-Communist coalition government.

This statement was made after a French cabinet minister asserted President Truman's program for aiding democracies under threat of Communist domination prompted Ramadier to oust the five Communists in the cabinet yesterday.

The American source said the embassy was drawing up a detailed report on what sort of assistance the French regime will need and how much could be expected. He said the information would be relayed to Washington in anticipation of fresh requests from the French to solve their food, fuel, and industrial problems.

The source added that a decisive factor may be whether the French Socialists, Ramadier's party, want to become a vehicle for a new implementation of the so-called Truman doctrine.

The informant said that if the Socialists consent to head an anti-Communist coalition, then Washington may be expected to lend a sympathetic ear to requests for help in maintaining Ramadier's economic policy of freezing wages, holding down prices, and increasing production.

French officials said their immediate need was for wheat to maintain the current daily bread ration of 250 grams. America has promised some wheat in June, but the French say larger shipments will be needed.

The cabinet minister, who refused to be quoted by name, said the United States held the answer to whether Ramadier's government could survive since the Communists dominate French organized labor and hold the largest number of seats in the Assembly.

He said the Communists might call out 6,000,000 workers in a general strike unless the United States rushes badly needed food and financial aid to France.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to quote this Associated Press dispatch from Paris. It reads:

High American official sources said tonight that the United States was preparing for possible increased aid to the tattered French

economy provided Premier Paul Ramadier can hold together his non-Communist coalition government. This statement was made after a French Cabinet Minister asserted Truman's program for aiding democracies under threat of Communist domination prompted Ramadier to oust the five Communists in the Cabinet yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, in God's holy name, what is happening in France today? We have a French Cabinet Minister stating that President Truman's policy prompted a change in the French Cabinet, and that the present French Government can only remain in power if the United States rushes badly needed food and financial aid to France.

What will the Truman doctrine cost us in France? Perhaps another five billion?

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that William C. Bullitt, the Ambassador to France at the time of Nazi invasion, who advised the French Government to cease resistance to the Nazi troops and not to make a fight for Paris—this same William C. Bullitt reviewed the May Day parade in Paris from the balcony of the American Embassy standing side by side with Jefferson Caffery, our present Ambassador to France. What, Mr. Speaker, is William C. Bullitt doing in France? Is he attempting to assist De Gaulle in the organization of a civil war in France, with promises that in the event of such a civil war the United States Army will furnish the equipment, men, and materials, and the United States Congress will vote the financial aid and assistance needed to conduct civil war in France? Is that what the Truman policy means for France?

Mr. Chairman, Italy today is caught in a great political crisis. Permit me to quote the headline from Monday's Washington Post, page 3: "Italy Cabinet raises wages as millions threaten strike." The Italian Government is in the middle of a political crisis—and what do we find to be the answer to that crisis? The Government of Italy is demanding more and more financial and economic assistance from the United States. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the article appearing in the Washington Post be included in my remarks at this point:

ITALIAN CABINET RAISES WAGES AS MILLIONS THREATEN STRIKE

ROME, ITALY, May 4.—Left-wing denunciation of American aid to Italy, new hints of the possibility of civil war, and criticism of Government policy by right-wing elements combined today to head Premier Alcide de Gasperi and his cabinet toward a crisis.

In a desperate attempt to head off unrest, the cabinet, at a meeting which ended at 1:30 a. m., decided to give a 15-percent wage increase to 1,000,000 government employees and to raise the sugar tax by 50 percent to pay it.

This action was taken in hope of averting a nation-wide half-day strike called for tomorrow by state employees.

Under heavy attack by the left wing, Gasperi was further embarrassed by new criticism within the executive committee of his own middle-of-the-road Christian Democrat Party.

De Gasperi was criticized for failing to see that Communists and Socialists shared the blame for the present economic crisis. Members demanded the party withdraw from its coalition with the leftists and join the right wing.

The powerful Catholic Action Committee, a keystone of Gasperi's party, sent the meeting a virtual ultimatum to "defend religion," against the leftists—a criticism of the compromises Gasperi had made with Communists to get a recognition of religion in the constitution.

There is bitter discouragement among Italians over delay in promised American aid, which some regard as the sole hope of preventing eventual collapse of democratic government.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote the last paragraph of this article:

There is bitter discouragement among Italians over delay in promised American aid, which some regard as the sole hope of preventing eventual collapse of democratic government.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the New York Times carried a story that there is a very real possibility of open civil war in Italy in the near future, and who, Mr. Speaker, is going to pay for that civil war?

Mr. Chairman, we confront critical economic conditions in France and Italy, and the Truman doctrine is being employed as a guarantee that the United States Government will back up with its economic, political, financial, and military strength the most reactionary forces in these nations. As Walter Lippmann pointed out in his column several weeks ago, the Truman doctrine gives encouragement to every group everywhere in the world who want to organize civil war against existing governments.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we consider the financial and military demands that the British Empire, the French and Italian Governments are making today upon us, we have just begun to draw up the lists of financial commitments and military commitments to which our President would bind America.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times yesterday in its leading editorial had this to say:

We can't pursue one policy in Greece and Turkey and another in China or Latin America.

The prime intent of the Truman doctrine and this vicious Greek-Turkish military alliance bill is to encompass the whole world, the seven seas, and the five continents in a new international system of military alliances and economic dependencies.

Ever since President Truman made his fateful speech to the Congress, intense pressure has been placed upon our State Department by Chinese diplomats in this country demanding that the \$500,000,000 export-import loan be released for use by the present Chinese Government. I charge here on the floor of the House that the Chinese Embassy has had the arrogance to invade our State Department and attempt to tell our State Department that the Truman doctrine has committed our Government and this Congress to all-out support of the present Fascist Chinese government.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I insert in my remarks an article appearing in the New York Times of yesterday in which it is reported from Nanking

that China is asking for additional financial assistance from the United States:

CHINA TO ASK LOAN FOR BUILDING ONLY—UNITED STATES AID HELD ESSENTIAL FOR RECONVERSION—"SELF-HELP" ADVOCATED FOR BUDGET

(By Tillman Durdin)

NANKING, May 4.—An American loan is essential for the economic rehabilitation and reconstruction of China, Gen. Chang Chun, the new premier, declared in a statement today. He simultaneously proclaimed a policy of "self-help" in dealing with the budget deficit.

Premier Chang's statement was made to the press and was released as a clarification of his remarks on Friday before the legislature delivered on Friday before the legislative Yuan. This statement is the first formal declaration made by the new premier specifically defining his new government's attitude toward American financial assistance.

The statement said:

"The problem of how to meet the budget deficit of the Chinese Government is certainly a difficult one, but the government should not depend on foreign assistance to meet that deficit. We must endeavor to meet it by a gradual increase of revenues, by stringency in nonproductive expenditures, and by domestic loans. In other words, we must adopt and carry out a policy of self-help.

"On the other hand, there are vast areas where immediately economic rehabilitation and reconstruction are urgently needed and feasible.

"Expenditures for such constructive productive projects, when they are to be undertaken, will be beyond the present capacity of our National Treasury. In this connection an American loan will be essential.

"There is no need for me to emphasize that the Government will strictly follow the principle laid down in the common political program of all the parties now participating in the Government, namely, that foreign loans will be 'used only for productive and constructive purposes and for stabilization and improvement of the people's livelihood.'"

This pronouncement says in effect that China intends to try to deal with her budgetary problem alone, but must have outside financial aid to undertake any major projects for reconstruction. In part the statement is an answer to some arguments now being put forward that China should seek a currency stabilization loan from the United States. It is believed that the Government does not plan to make a formal request for a loan just now, although tentative approaches are possible. The government has noted Washington reports indicating that the United States' view at the moment is that the present time is premature for formally negotiating a loan since United States financial aid now would look like an endorsement of the new government before it has demonstrated its capabilities.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, when we begin to look around the world and see what is happening to us today, we discover that President Truman has already deeply involved us financially and in a military way in many trouble spots throughout the world. He has made these decisions and he is asking us to rubber stamp them. His decisions are in direct violation of every commitment that the United States has made to the UN. And those acts of President Truman have no authority in law—no appropriations have been voted for such a policy, and the American people have never had an opportunity to cast their ballots for such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, when we add up the costs of these mad, insane adventures in the organization and support of civil wars throughout the world, we discover that it will come to at least \$20,000,000,000 a year and perhaps much more.

Mr. Chairman, I charge that a sinister conspiracy exists in America today. A sinister conspiracy exists to draw us into open warfare on the side of every reactionary and Fascist element and in every civil war everywhere in the world.

What is the fountainhead of that conspiracy? Who is there in America that wants another war—World War III? Who is it that formulated this Truman policy? Who is it that is throwing the force of our State Department into these interminable financially exhausting conflicts?

Mr. Chairman, what is going on in the State Department? The House of Representatives has a right to know. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that a conspiracy exists in our State Department to organize World War III, and to establish a system of military alliances in direct contradiction to the entire American foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make certain suggestions to the House. I would like for the Members of the House to consider certain things—first, that Admiral Leahy for a year and a half fought to force Jimmy Byrnes' resignation as Secretary of State. I wish to point out that William C. Bullitt is in Paris today—for what purpose? I wish to point out that Admiral Hillenkoetter has just been made Chief of Central Intelligence of the United States Government. Admiral Hillenkoetter was the naval attaché in Paris and in Vichy, and has been associated with Leahy and Bullitt. I wish to point out, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. George Kennan, who went with Bullitt to Moscow in 1933, has been made the head of the policy committee of the Department of State.

What did Admiral Leahy have to do with the formulating of the Truman Doctrine? Mr. Chairman, is the State Department being taken over by the French gang, by the associates of Bullitt and Leahy, who did business with the Vichy-Nazi collaboration government? Is our State Department being taken over by people who advised the French Government not to resist the Nazis? Why did Admiral Leahy fight the foreign policy developed by Jimmy Byrnes for 1½ years?

Mr. Chairman, these questions need answers. They cry out for answers.

We want to know what commitments are being made in our names in China, in England, in France, in Italy, in Turkey—all over the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are, in my opinion, absolutely and completely opposed to the foreign policy proposed in the Truman doctrine. They know now that this doctrine means bankruptcy, that it means higher prices, that it means higher taxes, that it means military alliance with corrupt, venal dictators and monarchies, that its costs are unlimited.

The American people want peace—they want the UN to grow—to prosper. They demand that our commitments to the UN—given and received in good faith—be kept. The American people, Mr. Chairman, are determined that collective security against aggression shall be maintained. In their determination, I join. I shall cast my vote against this iniquitous, monstrous, hypocritical, and diabolical departure from traditional American foreign policy.

The isles of Greece! The isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung—
Where we may break uneasy peace,
And once more immolate our young.
Fill high the bowl with U. S. dough
And fill another with our blood—
The propagandists seem to know
Just how to fill your eyes with mud.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have 10 minutes allotted to me. I should like to yield my 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman from Utah very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from New York. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] cares to yield the 10 minutes, then, of course, the gentleman from Ohio would be further recognized.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BREHM. May not the gentleman from Utah ask unanimous consent to yield his time to the gentleman from Ohio?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the time has been fixed by the rule adopted by the House of Representatives. The committee may not change that rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Under the rules of parliamentary procedure, the gentleman from Utah in using his time may take the floor and then yield to the gentleman from Ohio to say what he pleases. Is not that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] is, of course, stating a hypothetical situation. The gentleman from Utah has not been recognized. Should the gentleman from Utah be recognized he then may yield to anyone asking him to yield if he so desires.

The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Johnson].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the wise and eloquent statement made by the gentlewoman from Ohio and I think it well to repeat the quotation she gave us from that giant of his day, Webster, who said that we must not "purchase their smiles by the sacrifice of manly principles." It is with a great deal of satisfaction that

I embrace the viewpoint enunciated on the floor yesterday by one of the giants of our time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] when he said that he believed this bill would be a deterrent to war.

All of us are aware of the gravity of the decision this Nation is now called upon, through its Congress, to make. We live in a dangerous age. The question for decision is how we are to meet danger. We must face it with our heads up and with no fear in our hearts. We must meet this issue in accordance with our great traditions. Courage is better than fear, faith is better than doubt. We will be false to our traditions, false to the American people, and false to ourselves if we falter because of fear—fear of either cost or consequences.

We all want to avoid war. If we could clearly foresee the future and know with certainty that defeat of this measure would, in the words of one great appeaser, mean "peace in our time," or that its passage would mean war in this generation, our votes would be unanimous. No one wants war. The tongues of our dead still enforce our attention. We all want peace. The issue, then, is one of calculated risks.

PEACE IN THIS DAY IS NOT CHEAP

That issue cannot be resolved by an appeal to fear, to sentiment, or to any other prejudice. Each must determine for himself and within his own conscience the path he thinks this country, in dignity and responsibility, must follow to lead the world in the ways of peace. The passage of this bill and the policy it embraces is costly. Once we so act, we are committed to a course we must see through. And none should indulge in the self-deception that it will not be expensive. Peace in this day is not cheap.

Neither should we be oblivious to the possibility that whenever this Nation engages in a program of halting totalitarian aggression, be it Communist or Fascist, some risk of war may be involved.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have an issue of alternatives. Does this policy lead to war or does it promote peace? If our action is to be governed by fear or the cost in dollars, there are many arguments for voting against the bill. But is that the issue? When did the citizens of this country ever modify their resistance to aggressive tyranny because we were fearful of the outcome or lacked faith in our ability to meet the cost? Pioneer Americans were not timid when, as 13 struggling Colonies, they agreed with Patrick Henry that no price was too high to pay for liberty. The signers of the Declaration of Independence knew the calculated risks when they wrote in our charter of liberty the immortal sentence:

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

MONROE AND JACKSON DID NOT FLINCH

President Monroe proclaimed our famous American doctrine when this

Nation was a first-rate power only because of its unflinching courage. We were then less able to resist aggression on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico from one of the weaker of the major powers of that day, than we are to resist aggression today anywhere on the face of this globe. The people knew then what the Monroe Doctrine might cost, and they were not afraid of its risks. Then a courageous stand on principle by a people unafraid frustrated the designs of any aggressor who might have considered a challenge.

History discredits France's strategy of attempting an early war of nerves. Her challenge was met by Andrew Jackson. A solvent France contemptuously refused payment of the debt she owed the United States. But when Jackson announced that he would seize and impound French shipping, she understood democratic power properly applied. Her wounded honor was satisfied, and the treaty she had made with us was carried out.

Mr. Chairman, whether Communist or Fascist, or simply a pistol-packing racketeer, the one thing a bully understands is force, and the one thing he fears is courage. In making this assertion, I disavow the demagogery of a jingo. I repudiate the tactics of a warmonger. I want peace. But human experience teaches me that if I let a bully of my community make me travel back streets to avoid a fight, I merely postpone the evil day. Soon he will try to chase me out of my house.

THEY DID NOT BELIEVE WE WOULD FIGHT

We have fought two world wars because of our failure to take a position in time. When the first war began Germany did not believe we would fight. Well-meaning pacifists sincerely desired peace. The Great Commoner resigned from the highest position in the Cabinet because he thought President Wilson's foreign policy too aggressive. Thus the Kaiser was led to believe that we were complacent and lacked courage. Unrestricted submarine warfare began, and so we went to war.

During the earlier stages of World War II, President Roosevelt at Chicago enunciated the doctrine of quarantining aggressors. Then, as in the past, there were protests. The America Firsters, led by Colonel Lindbergh, a hero of earlier days, exploited the hesitancy of many of our citizens to prepare for adequate national defense. The tactics of these ostriches and their fellow travelers encouraged, indeed if they did not induce, Hitler to ignore us and the Japs to attack us.

France could have stopped Hitler when he started into the Saar. France and England combined could have prevented the occupation of Austria or even later stopped the Nazis at Czechoslovakia. The United States, England, and France could have prevented the rape of Poland if only there had been a common determination to call a halt to aggression. Japan could have been checked before she got into Manchuria; and certainly she

would have been stopped when she declared war on defenseless China. But the siren songs of appeasers convinced us it was none of our business what happened in Europe or the world, and thus France was sacrificed to Fascist ambitions, and England's destiny was fought out in the skies over London. We refused to listen to Secretary Stimson and others with vision who saw the path on which Japan had embarked so we suffered the humiliation of Pearl Harbor and sacrificed lives which could have been spared if we had acted in time.

CARE NOT WHETHER AGGRESSOR IS COMMUNIST OR FASCIST

In view of this history, it is amazing that we are tolerant toward those who counsel fear and count the cost of human liberty and internal security in dollars. A former Vice President is crying out against the course charted by President Truman in his message to Congress in louder language than Colonel Lindbergh protested the policy proclaimed by President Roosevelt in his historic Chicago speech. Can it be that this former Vice President believes it right to quarantine the aggressors if they are Fascists, but wrong if they are Communists; and does Colonel Lindbergh reason conversely? As for myself, I care not whether an aggressor be Communist or Fascist. Whenever security of this country is involved, we are willing to draw the quarantine line—and we would rather have it on the shores of the Mediterranean than on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay or the Gulf of Mexico.

Perhaps I should seek pardon for mentioning a man who has sought and attained such notoriety by going abroad and denouncing his own country as being on the road to ruthless imperialism. I defend the right of Mr. Wallace to speak, just as I defend my right to criticize what he says, and in this case the privilege to criticize this individual for campaigning against the foreign policy of his own country among the Socialists of England and the Communists of France. I particularly denounce his suggestion that we solve the whole problem with a \$15,000,000,000 bribe to Russia. But his error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

FARMER PLANTING STRANGE SEEDS

The Honorable Mr. Wallace has announced a speaking date in my State and district and my home town on the 17th day of May. If he expects to play politics with an issue affecting the security of our people, his choice of Texas as a forum is no tribute to his knowledge of people and geography. The forum for Wallace and his appeasement doctrine is not before the clear-eyed, stout-hearted Texans. Rather, it is before the sallow, deluded fringe that bores and scavenges like termites eating away the foundations of a strong building. I challenge his false and dangerous counsel. I say he is a farmer planting strange seeds in our soil, seeds of fear, seeds of false hope, dragon seeds of ultimate destruction. I know Texans and I know the people of my district. Although we have our faults like other people—and we like to believe that they are fewer than the failings

of others—I warn this false apostle that Texans have characteristics which prevent us from responding to the wiles of an appeaser. Texans may disagree and fight a little among themselves, but we present a united front on any issue that may involve our national security. If we disagree with policies of our Government, we settle these differences within the framework of our democratic processes.

The argument that Russia does not want war and that we might force a war by going into Greece and Turkey simply seems absurd to me. If Russia does not want war; if she is not an aggressor nation; if she wants to live in peace and cooperate in bringing peace to a war-torn world, then our aid to Greece and Turkey will be understood and can provoke no hostilities. Who among us or among the Russians believes that Greece and Turkey plan an invasion of Russia? If, on the other hand, Russia is not willing to stop with the land she has taken away from Poland, Finland, and Czechoslovakia; if not willing to get out of Austria, but insists on a foothold in the Mediterranean now, then now is the time for us to decide whether we will meet her there and meet her now. This penetration system by which the Communists are taking over one European government after another to me smacks very much of the Hitler method. It was by that method that Hitler was able to take over Austria—but I will not further review the past. If Russia has peaceful intentions now, she will have them after this measure shall have been passed. If her intentions are otherwise, if she proposes a program of conquest, then no bribe, disguised as a loan of \$15,000,000,000 or any other sum, will stop her. It will only bolster up her strength and weaken us.

ADMINISTRATION MUST NOT TOLERATE CORRUPTION—MUST NOT PERMIT PROGRAM TO BECOME A JOY RIDE FOR PROFITTEERS

Yes; I am for the Truman doctrine. But it will not be enough to appropriate money to be poured into Greece and Turkey. No program, however well conceived, can rise above the level of the people who must carry it into execution. I am one who believes that competent men are available to serve their country on this job. I believe that the best brains and the stoutest hearts in this country are needed for this great work. I believe that they must and can be found if failure is to be avoided. The heights are not for the mediocre, but for the strong, the true, and the wise. I believe and trust President Truman will keep faith with the Congress and the people by staffing our mission with men who will not tolerate corruption in administering these funds and will see that it does not become a joy ride for profiteers.

WE WILL STAND UP TO RUSSIA

In voting for this bill, I do so with the hope that Russia has peaceful intentions; that she desires to live at peace with other nations; that she will cooperate in the restoration of a war-torn world; but, if it be otherwise, then I am certain as I stand here that the passage of this measure is the only course that

this country can in decency take, and the only course which may avoid war.

This is one world; yes. It is one world in terms of distances and in terms of my actions affecting my neighbor whether he be on the banks of the Potomac or on the banks of the Ganges. But it is not one united world. Nor is it one world in public enlightenment.

I am persuaded that the people of the world have no grievances, one against the other. The hopes and desires of a man who tills the soil are about the same whether he lives on the banks of the Colorado or on the banks of the Danube. But there is this difference. My words today, for whatever meaning they may have, will be accessible to every man, woman, and child on this continent. But as we progress from west to east, the mists form; and the light of freedom shines through them with more and more difficulty.

To say that we will stand up to Russia, to say that we will pit the ideals of democracy against the ideals of communism does not mean that we are unmindful of our debt to her. As one American, I am humbly grateful for Stalingrad, and I revere the memory of the men who fought there and died there, for me and for you. For my part, I ask no more of them than they ask of me. To Soviet Russia and to every other nation, I would see the golden rule applied. I think we have tried to apply it. And a defense of democracy is not necessarily ipso facto an attack against Russia. I shall be the last to say that; but I shall be the first to say that when democracy lays down before any other ideology, there is no more democracy. Freedom walks upright, her head back, chin high.

Decisions must be made in times of danger, and I hope your decision will be mine. In terms of dollars the Truman doctrine will be costly. But I pray that we are still a young and courageous Nation; that we have not grown so old and fat and prosperous that all we can think about is to sit back with our arms around our money bags. If we choose to do that, I have no doubt that the smoldering fires will burst into flame and consume us—dollars and all.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? If the gentleman is bullied by another person, do you not think it would be more courageous to strike right out and hit him than to go into his neighbor's window and thumb his nose at him until he might strike at you?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman is not one who accepts the unqualified statement that we are being bullied, but the gentleman does say if that statement is true the time to meet that situation is right now and the way to meet it is head on.

Mr. OWENS. But we are not doing that.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EATON. If I make a statement as to the disposition of time, will that come out of the time allotted to this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Any time that the gentleman consumes will be charged to his time.

Mr. EATON. I will have to do it. First of all, let me say that I have been wrestling with the multiplication table. In common with every human being who has ever done that, I have been thrown.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is apparent the gag is in order so far as the opposition is concerned. I was instructed to submit a list of those in opposition to the bill to both the majority and minority leaders. The minority leader informs me that I have no time. Those members who have been allocated time by me please take notice.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, is this coming out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is coming out of the time of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EATON. I would rather that the gentleman from New York use his own time to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has the floor. Does the gentleman desire to consume any additional time?

Mr. EATON. It will only take me a minute to break the sad news. I have 207 minutes of time asked for by 18 Members, and I have 95 minutes to divide among them. I have turned the matter over to my associates here, the senior members of my committee, and they have worked out a plan by cutting down. I am very sorry to say, to very small limits the time allowed to the various Members. That is, of course, in addition to the 51 minutes reserved for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. GAVIN. Yesterday you had no hesitancy in giving the proponents of the bill an additional 5 minutes, an additional 5 minutes, and an additional 5 minutes. But when I came, representing a great State with 28 delegates and 10,000,000 of people, all I could get was 5 minutes because I am an opponent of the bill.

Mr. EATON. May I have the privilege of saying, before everybody gets mad, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] was granted time under Mr. SMITH's schedule. I did not fix the time for him.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. No; I will not yield. You ask too many questions.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this measure and have been ready to vote "yes" on the proposition for several weeks. In fact, before the President of the United States delivered his message to the Congress, in several statements on the floor I advocated firm, resolute action in the Mediterranean area. I hope that this measure will be adopted without crippling amendments and that the House will go on record in favor of this firm and realistic action in connection with Greece and Turkey.

We must keep in mind that the world has grown exceedingly small within the last few years, and whether or not we like it, we are in international affairs to stay. As has been stated again and again during this debate, we have participated in two great wars during the past 30 years. After the First World War we followed the policy of isolationism. In fact, we followed that policy into the 1930's. It seems as though we ought to learn something from history, particularly recent history, and not pursue the same course after the Second World War as we followed after the first.

As I have listened to some of the arguments against this measure, I am fearful that many would have us embark upon the disastrous course of isolationism which will lead us to untold trouble in the future. Mr. John Foster Dulles, reporting on the Moscow Conference, for instance, pointed out that the Soviet leaders would heave a great sigh of relief if we were to move out of Europe. Certainly we must not do this. If we had passed this resolution immediately after it had been presented to us, perhaps the Moscow Conference would not have ended in a deadlock.

During this debate we have been considering the foreign policy of the United States. I want to point out that when I was in the Old World in 1945 the question that was most often discussed was the foreign policy of the United States, and the comment that was most frequently made was that the United States does not have a foreign policy. After returning, I said on the floor of this House several times that if there was one thing we ought to do in this country, it is to develop a firm, realistic, resolute foreign policy in this postwar period. I take this opportunity to congratulate the State Department and the President of the United States upon this fine show of realism. It is, indeed, refreshing to see this realistic approach to foreign affairs in the Mediterranean area.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DORN. I have been trying for 2 days to get some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to tell me why we did not give the Spanish Government, which has always fought communism, at least an ambassador here in Washington. They were neutral during the war the same as Turkey, and prevented the Germans from rolling into north Africa when we were making landings. I have not had anybody answer that yet.

Mr. MERROW. That is another question outside of this Greek-Turkish situation; but I will say to the gentleman this, that if action is necessary in con-

nection with Spain to stop communism in the Mediterranean basin, I would favor it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman has made some reference to isolationism. Does the gentleman apply that term to those who support the United Nations who last week voted for the relief bill?

Mr. MERROW. The gentleman has coupled two questions. He asked if I would apply that term to those who support the United Nations?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MERROW. No; I think those who support the United Nations have the international point of view. Personally I would say that the vote to cut the relief bill indicates a movement toward an isolationist program.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and may be able to clear up a quandary which has been bothering me during the debate. One of the objections raised by certain Members to this bill is that this problem should be turned over to the United Nations for settlement, this whole question. In the gentleman's opinion, is it not true that in such event it would be possible for any one of the five great powers to exercise the veto on the consideration of the question?

Mr. MERROW. That is true. I believe the question of the United Nations has been adequately and ably discussed during the course of this debate. The United Nations has neither the resources nor the ability to handle this problem. Furthermore, to be absolutely realistic about it, we are playing power politics outside the United Nations. The security of the United States is at stake. The United States is the only country that has the power, the prestige, and the ability to stop the Soviet march toward world domination, and to refer this matter to the United Nations would simply weaken the United Nations, and finally imperil our own security.

General Marshall should be congratulated on the realism that he showed at the Moscow Conference. He did not give in to the Russians, he stood firm on reparations, the western boundary of Poland, and other matters. Because of that firm stand we are at last beginning to be realistic; and although Mr. Stalin hopes that by exhaustion he will be able to reach compromises I feel at least we have a Secretary of State who will stay as long as Mr. Stalin can stay and will refuse to become exhausted. We will at last by holding our ground be able to resolve our differences.

We should keep in mind that there are two basic principles in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. They have been discussed here. One is expansion and the other is the spread of communism wherever and whenever possible. The Soviet Union has annexed much territory and has extended her domination over

no less than 12 countries by puppet governments. These countries have a population of 165,000,000. She has done all this since 1939, and is trying by the practice of infiltration to spread communism all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the action proposed to be taken by the United States Government under the measure now being considered, the following questions are pertinent and should be answered:

First. What are the situations in Greece and Turkey, respectively, which call for the relief proposed by the pending measure?

Second. Why should the United States alone supply the aid required?

Third. What do we hope to accomplish by acting, and what will be the probable result if we fail to act?

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on the pending bill held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, extending over a period of several weeks, the above questions were, in my opinion, fully, clearly, and repeatedly answered by competent and well-informed authorities. As frequently happens, however, when we hold extended hearings on a measure and explore all of its possibilities and implications, we often find the answers to our most important queries buried under a mass of verbiage more or less non-germane or inconsequential. Within the 387-page report of the hearings it will be found that the above questions are answered not only by competent and qualified witnesses, speaking from an intimate knowledge of the subject, but also by documentary proof. Unless, however, the hearings are given more than a hasty perusal there is every chance that important evidence will be overlooked. May I, within the time at my disposal, give to this body not only my personal reply to the three queries, but also some of the answers appearing in the record.

First, there is a difference in the situations in Greece and Turkey, and quite a difference in the problems confronting the respective countries. And yet, each situation requires the same corrective measures and the same character of aid and assistance, which, if not received from some quarter, will be followed by the same result in both countries, to-wit, economic disaster, collapse of each government and an imposition upon their peoples of a totalitarian regime.

May I first discuss conditions in Greece? The evidence taken before our committee shows that Greece's trouble started even before World War II, and became starkly tragic during and following the years of conflict. First invaded and despoiled by the Italians, the country not only suffered a second invasion by the German armies, with resultant devastation and ruin, but also groaned under 4 years of enemy occupation, followed by the cruel and deliberate destruction by the Nazis of everything in or near the pathway of their retreating armies. It

is probable that no other country in the world suffered a devastation so complete. From all this the country has never recovered; indeed, it has not even had a chance to recover.

It is further shown that during the war there went on within the Greek boundaries a continuous fight for Greek liberation. This warfare against the invaders was carried on by bands of Greek guerrillas whose arms and equipment were supplied by the Allied armies. After liberation, however, many of these guerrillas failed or refused to surrender their weapons, and coming under influences inimical to the present regime in Greece, the guerrillas are now using the same arms to defy the authority of the Government. It is also charged that these armed bands not only have the backing and encouragement of certain adjoining governments but that their numbers are augmented from time to time by bands of men from beyond the Greek border who join in raids, burnings, pillage, and killings, and then retire across the border when pursued by the Greek Army.

The nature of the influences to which these armed bands are subject and under which they operate is well known. To be absolutely plain and direct, it is the influence of the Communist and the communistic doctrine. It is known that continuous pressure is being exerted against the Greek Government and that this pressure is growing heavier day by day; that the sphere of operations of the various communistic bands is widening; and that without aid and assistance in equipping and advising the Greek Army it will not be able to long control the situation. If these bands continue to gain strength—and all evidence is to the effect that they are doing just that—they will take over the Greek Government and substitute a Soviet-controlled Communist totalitarian regime. If this is accomplished, a great hope of the world will have perished and once again the dream of the poet Byron that the isles of Greece would again be free will have been shattered.

It must be understood that this problem is not one of merely supporting the Greek Government as against a few bands of malcontents. On the contrary, it is one of keeping Greece in the ranks of the world's democracy, of keeping open and free the great seaways to the East, and of insuring freedom and the democratic way of life to the peoples of the eastern world.

I have endeavored to explain briefly the situation in Greece because of which our aid has been earnestly entreated. Let me now turn to Turkey, the other country whose calls for assistance we are asking you to heed. Here, as I have stated, we have a situation substantially different from that obtaining in Greece, and yet, should we turn a deaf ear to the appeal of Turkey, the results to that country would be exactly the same as would similar lack of action be to Greece.

While Greece is in dire need of food and clothing, as well as the training and equipment of her army for the protection of her border and use against internal disorder, Turkey is not confronted by such a problem. Turkey has no internal disorders and so far has not been

troubled by ravages of armed bands, either within or from outside her boundaries. To this date also the country has remained free from any invasion of communism or Communistic doctrine. It is not, however, free from other dangers. On the contrary, never before—not even throughout the war when it had a long and desperate struggle to preserve its neutrality—has Turkey faced a graver danger than it does at this moment. Regardless of all differences between the internal condition in Greece and Turkey, the dangers to each country from external sources are identical. As Acting Secretary of State Acheson stated to our committee, and I quote:

The inexorable facts of geography link the future of Greece and Turkey. Should the integrity and independence of Greece be lost or compromised, the effect upon Turkey is inevitable.

Is it not significant that this call for help comes to us from Greece and Turkey at the same instant; that both nations, one untroubled by internal conditions or by lack of food or other necessities of life, and the other facing all these problems, as well as actual rebellion, should both suddenly call for aid to meet the same threat from external sources. It is not only significant, but it points directly to the fact that both of these countries so linked together by and in their strategic importance have awakened to the fact that they are both facing a problem which threatens their individual liberty, their way of life and their free government; and each of the governments has determined that it cannot solve the problem alone. They feel that unless aid comes to them in this crisis, they will be in imminent danger of a complete collapse with a consequent assumption of power by a totalitarian government under the domination of the Russian Soviet. It was said by Mr. Acheson, and I quote:

I need not emphasize to you what would more than likely be the effect on the nations in the Middle East of a collapse in Greece and Turkey, and the installation of totalitarian regimes there. Both from the point of view of economics and morals, the effects upon countries to the east would be enormous, especially if the failure in Greece and Turkey should come about as the result of the failure of this great democracy to come to their aid. On the other hand, I ask you to consider the effects on their morals and their internal development should Greece and Turkey receive a helping hand from the United States, the country with which they closely associate the principles of freedom. It is not too much to say that the outcome in Greece and Turkey will be watched with deep concern throughout the vast area from the Dardanelles to the China Sea.

Mr. Chairman, I find that it will be necessary for me to put in the RECORD the further answers to the question I propounded. And this will be done.

The question is often asked, How and why was the United States drawn into a situation apparently affecting only the nations of Greece and Turkey?

As a matter of fact, this problem came to us suddenly and with but little warning. On or about March 20, 1947, the British Government notified the United States Government that as of March 31 it would be obliged to discontinue the

financial, economic, and advisory assistance which it had heretofore been giving to Greece and Turkey. This meant, of course, that the British government intended to withdraw from Greece the military force which it had been maintaining in that country since the close of hostilities and likewise intended to withdraw from both Greece and Turkey all further economic aid and advisory assistance.

A few days after the notice from the British Government, our Government received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial, economic, and expert advisory assistance. This was not the first time such a request had been made to us by the Greek Government, similar requests having been previously made. The same is true in respect to Turkey. The number of the various requests made by both Governments to the United States and the dates of such requests are fully set out in the report of the hearings. Also, in covering this matter broadly, Acting Secretary of State Acheson, in answer to a question by Representative Jarman, shown on page 13 of the hearings, stated that everything proposed to be done under the bill now being considered was requested by the Governments of Turkey and Greece. Therefore, the charge that we are, without authority, interfering in the affairs of the two countries, is baseless.

May I now discuss for a few moments the second question I posed in my opening statement, to wit, "Why should the United States alone supply the aid required by Greece and Turkey?"

In this connection, the question may be and, in fact, has been frequently asked, "Why did not the two countries make their request for aid to the United Nations, and why should not this entire problem of Greece and Turkey not be handled by the United Nations?"

This question has been repeatedly answered, and particularly by officials of the State Department as will appear on pages 341 to 344 of the record of the hearings. It also appears that as to one part of its problem, Greece did present its case to the United Nations. Charging that armed bands, operating within her territory along her northern border, were being partly supplied, trained, and given refuge in neighboring countries and were constantly shifting back and forth across the border in their hostile and pillaging expeditions, the Greek Government asked the United Nations for assistance in dealing with the situation.

This was a problem with which the United Nations had authority to deal, and supported by the United States, the Security Council proceeded to deal with the problem effectively. But as to the other, and perhaps more serious problems, namely the need of Greece for food and other supplies and funds to restore order throughout the country, to meet internal difficulties and to avert economic collapse, and the need of both Greece and Turkey for funds and expert advice in re-forming and equipping their military forces for the protection of their borders, the United Nations is not only lacking in jurisdiction, but is also with-

out funds necessary to extend the required help.

So far as Greece is concerned, its request to the United States for assistance was urged by a Commission sent to that country last fall by the Food and Agricultural Organization. This Commission, reporting in November 1946, recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council and the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to aid it in securing funds for essential food and other imports until, I quote, "Expanding exports, international development loans, and expanding production enable Greece to balance its international account without special aid."

As stated by Secretary Acheson, this is exactly the course Greece has followed. The country has repeatedly asked Great Britain for assistance, but this assistance Great Britain is no longer able or willing to supply. The aid cannot be supplied by the Economic and Social Council, therefore the Government of the United States is the only source to which the Greek Government can turn.

While, as I have stated, the situation in Turkey, especially with reference to internal economic affairs, is different from that of Greece, the need is just as great, the danger of collapse is just as imminent and the result certain to follow such a collapse is just as inevitable. This result would be the installation of totalitarian regimes in both countries. In fact, we are at this moment facing the danger of being particeps criminis to the denial of free democratic governments to the entire eastern world.

The consequences following collapse of the Greek and Turkish Governments and the moving in of a Soviet-dominated communistic regime in both countries would be far reaching and tragic. We in America have heretofore not worried about the control of the Mediterranean, the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and the other sea lanes of the Near East which for centuries have been followed by ships of the world. Only once, and that in the early days of our Republic, did we act to insure the freedom of these lanes. Our action then against the piratical states of the Barbary Coast was prompt, drastic, and effective. Since that time in the distant past we have more or less trusted to Great Britain's interest and power to keep the seaways open. If Britain is no longer able to perform her task, are we going to try to resolve the impending issue now and by peaceful means, or shall we wait until a grimmer duty is forced upon us? Think it over.

Again, the issues before us at this moment are not only the preservation of the freedom of the Greek and Turkish peoples, and the sovereignty of their respective Governments, and not only the maintenance of the historic freedom of the seas, but there is yet another issue, one of more vital importance to this and to every other democratic government in the world of today. This bill poses to us the question, Is this Republic of ours—the greatest of all in recorded history and the pattern upon which all others have been erected—going to adopt and follow

a do-nothing policy with reference to the inoculation by intimidation and force of the peoples of other countries with germs of an ideology diametrically opposed to every principle of human freedom and justice? On the other hand, are we going to show to the world that we have the courage of our conviction and intend to demonstrate our faith in the democratic way of life by standing shoulder to shoulder with all peoples who are willing to combat the spread of a poisonous doctrine?

We can do the right thing and do it now by the passage of this measure. If, however, we fail Greece and Turkey in this hour of their need, and the two nations come under the domination of another power, as they undoubtedly will, we will have lost not only all of our prestige in the eastern world, but that world itself will have been lost to democracy. With Greece and Turkey under communistic control, there will be nothing to stop the spread of the insidious disease throughout all lands from the Straits of Gibraltar to the China Sea. This is not mere dicta, it is not just a statement of my personal opinion, but it is a statement based upon views expressed before our committee by men who speak out of a wealth of knowledge, wisdom, and experience.

Mr. Chairman, I want to announce, without reservation or equivocation, that I am in favor of the pending measure as it has been reported out of committee, without any change in text and without amendment. And, at this point, may I express the earnest hope that the pending measure will not meet with the same treatment and the same fate accorded to the Greek relief bill recently passed by this House. That bill, as is the one now before us, was not a measure for the mere expenditure of money; on the contrary, it was a measure involving questions of the gravest import to our country, questions calling for the exercise of fine diplomacy, questions of foreign policy to be answered only after intensive study and critical consideration.

This was the character of the study given to that measure by your Foreign Affairs Committee; for many weeks and through many hearings, each provision of the measure was analyzed and all its implications considered. Changes were made only after the most critical study and discussion and in light of the evidence we had before us. It was not hours only that we gave to our consideration of the measure, but we devoted days and weeks to the difficult task. And yet, when our work was accomplished and the bill reported to this floor—a finished product of a committee, many members of which have had from 15 to 25 years of experience in foreign affairs—what was its fate?

Here is what happened. Under the 5-minute rule there was made a concerted attack upon every section of the measure. In a wild scramble to be in at the death, amendment after amendment, many of which had been denied after hours of consideration by the committee, were offered and adopted on the House floor after but a few moments of

extemporaneous discussion. Bitter attacks on the measure were made by at least some men who evidently were wholly unfamiliar with its intent and purpose and uninformed with respect to the critical situation it was designed to meet. The regrettable part of the entire matter was the fact that some members of the Foreign Affairs Committee took an active part in this confused attempt to write a new bill on the floor. It was a spectacle to cause one to stand in awe and to exclaim in wonder as was once said of liberty, "Oh, economy, how many crimes have been committed in thy name?"

Mr. Chairman, may I remind the Members of the Congress that the passage of the pending measure is not only recommended, but requested by your Government. Your President, your Secretary of State and his assistants, your Secretary of War, your Secretary of the Navy, as well as other officials in whom you should have faith and confidence, have all joined in appealing to you for the passage of this legislation. Your ambassadors to Greece and Turkey, both of whom have an intimate knowledge of the situation in the countries to which they are respectively accredited, came across the seas to advise us to take this action. The head of this Government's nine-man commissior sent to Greece for the express purpose of making a survey of conditions in that unhappy country, and who, with his associates, spent two full months in making a complete study of the situation there, returned to his homeland to endorse this action with his approval.

Have you no confidence in the men at the head of your Government? Have you no faith in the ambassadors who represent you in foreign lands? Have you no trust in the men who head your Army and your Navy? Against these men will you accept the dicta of others who may be actuated by either unknown motives or political expediency, or will you at this fateful moment set aside all political or other prejudices and give your support to this measure and to your President, to your Government, and to your country—and mine?

Mr. ROBSON. Mr. Chairman, I arise to speak in opposition to the bill 2616 which proposes to provide \$400,000,000 in aid to Turkey and Greece and also to provide military and naval aid and instruction to these countries and authority to train and supervise their military and naval establishments.

This bill arose out of the message of the President delivered to the House and Senate on March 12, 1947. The President stated, in his message urging immediate granting of this money and military and naval aid to Turkey and Greece, that the future foreign policy of this Nation should be changed so as to commit this Nation to go to the relief of any nation or a party or group in any nation that was threatened by Communists or other totalitarian groups in any country, and he stated that he would call upon the Congress from time to time for any additional financial aid and powers to carry out this world-wide foreign policy. Our colleague, Dr. EATON, in charge of this bill, in his speech to the

House yesterday, stated that this was the most far-reaching and carried with it the most fateful decision perhaps of any measure that had been presented and considered by the Congress in the last 100 years. That is a strong statement from the author of the bill. There have been many bills of tremendous import and many fateful decisions made by Congress within the last 100 years. The Congress has been called upon to carry on the Mexican War, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. Our distinguished Democrat colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] was fair enough to say in his speech that this was not a relief bill for the hungry people of Greece or Turkey, but it is a military bill, a war measure. About all of those who have spoken in favor of the bill have been fair enough to say in so many words or by implication that this is a military measure and that it may lead us into another war. Of the score or more who have spoken in favor of this bill, not one has assured us that it would keep our country out of war.

The rule provides for 9 hours of general debate but under parliamentary maneuvering, those who favor the bill will have six or more hours while those who are opposing it will be limited to 3 hours or less. If this bill involves issues fraught with such tremendous potentialities for war and other dangers to our country as admitted by its sponsors, it seems to me that those who are opposed to it should have at least the same amount of time as its sponsors. The sponsors do not pretend to assure us that this new foreign policy of the President and the provisions of this bill will keep us out of war. They admit we are embarking upon a most fateful program. They do not give us any information from which we might have assurance of benefit to our own country. There is no clear chart of direction as to where it may lead us, the amount of blood it might cause to be shed, or the billions that may be required to follow this program through. They propose for us to sail an uncharted ship anywhere and everywhere in the world where there may be a war, a rebellion or an uprising. It is a lead in the dark; no one tells us how long or where it may lead.

I am unwilling to take such a fateful step as those who chart the ship and know not the destination or what may happen to our country. Everything is veiled in doubt and uncertainty. Through my years of service in the House and Senate, in case of doubt, I have always resolved that doubt in favor of the United States of America which I am sworn to protect and defend and not in favor of some other country or some group in some other country, and that is the course I am taking now. I am speaking against this proposal as presented and unless it is very materially amended I shall vote against it.

The gentleman from West Virginia who preceded me in favor of this bill, said: "Will our country sit here and rattle our money bags"? May I point out to our colleague from West Virginia that we no longer have money bags to rattle. We owe in admitted debts amounting to approximately \$260,000,-

000,000. These are I O U's but not money bags. We can rattle our I O U's but not our money bags. We must be careful not to add any more I O U's. In the last war we greatly depleted the iron, coal, timber, the soil and other natural resources in this country. We have gone through an era of squandering, spending, and wasting for the last 15 years. We already have the largest per capita indebtedness and the largest per capita tax burden of any country in the world. The American people are demanding that we reduce and not increase the debts and taxes and other burdens of this Nation. As we continue to strip this country of its resources and use them in wars and in sending them to foreign countries, we intensify scarcity in our country and this increases the cost of living and millions of our people are denied many of the necessities of life. They have demanded economy in government; they voted to put out the spenders and the wasters, and this Congress is trying to economize. In doing so we have reduced and cut out many of the desirable services to the American people.

We are having very little trouble with our enemies in the late war, Germany, Japan, and Italy. Those for whom we sacrificed so much in blood and treasure and to whom we have poured out billions of dollars in relief since the war have stirred up more wars, rebellions, and insurrections. I have urged before, and I again urge, that the President and his administration call upon these people to cease fighting, go to work and provide something for themselves, but they refuse to be pacified, they refuse to again take up peaceful and lawful pursuits. We have coddled them so much and so long that they believe as some of our statesmen seem to think, that there is no end to Uncle Sam's resources and bounty. Why should they not go to work?

The millions of workers on the farms, in the shops, mills, and factories must have a large part of their earnings taken from them and their products taken from them in order to take care of the people in these countries who refuse to again enter peaceful pursuits and produce for themselves.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT TRUMAN

This bill also provides that an army of civilian employees will go to Turkey and Greece. Under the demand of the American people, a great army of useless officeholders are being released. Hon. Paul Porter, who saw the demise of the OPA and his army of officeholders, was sent to Greece some time ago to set up an organization to operate in Turkey and Greece. If this bill is passed, it will find these New Deal officeholders, at higher salaries and with high expense accounts, transferred to Turkey and Greece.

Mr. Truman and his administration have fought every step taken by the Republicans in the House and Senate to reduce the cost of government for the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1947, below thirty-seven billion five hundred million asked for in his budget. I wonder how much confidence the proponents

of this bill have in the President, although they give him a blank check for \$400,000,000 and tremendous authority to spend that money as he may direct, and of course under Paul Porter, of the OPA. This bill provides that no civilian personnel should be assigned to Turkey and Greece to administer this four hundred million until such person or persons have been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation—the FBI. It seems to me that if the proponents of this bill are willing to adopt the new and fateful foreign policy of the President, which likely will involve us within a year in the wars, revolutions, and insurrections in any part of the world, they would have had enough faith in the President to permit him to pass upon the loyalty of the persons he might name to carry out his policies, but, no, this bill provides that he can only appoint persons that have been approved by the FBI. I do not recall any such provision in any bill that has been considered by Congress during my service.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION. I cannot. I only have a brief time and cannot yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. ROBSION. I do not yield. You are one of the gentlemen supporting this measure with others who insisted upon taking up more than 6 hours of the debating time, with the opposition receiving less than 3 hours. Then you ask me, with only a short time to speak, to yield.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE OPPOSED TO THIS BILL

During the recent Easter recess I visited nearly all the counties of my district and met hundreds of my constituents, Republicans and Democrats, and without exception all who expressed themselves were against this bill. I received a great many letters expressing opposition, and today, for the first time, I received a letter from a constituent of mine favoring the bill. He is a fine citizen, and I am sure that if he understood the dangers involved in this new foreign policy of the President that he would not, in my opinion, favor it. In my opinion, an overwhelming majority of those who are really informed believe as I do, that it will lead us into war and we will be called upon to make great sacrifices in blood and treasure.

Opinionaire, a forum of public opinion carried April 9, 1947, by the full network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, brought in 8,144 votes which opposed the idea of the bill. One thousand seven hundred and seventy-two favored it. This question was before America's Town Meeting of the Air April 24. The returns showed that 3½ to 1 were against this Truman doctrine. This, as you know, is a network program of the American Broadcasting Co. The Forum, a single broadcast of WINX here in the Nation's Capital March 24, brought a 4-to-1 response against the armed-assistance program. The Gallup poll of April 24 showed that 7 out of every 10 voters polled think that this will bring the United States to war.

I have talked with many of my colleagues, and they claim that their mail,

like mine, is running strong against this measure. I am definitely of the opinion that if the American people understood fully and clearly the far-reaching implications of this new doctrine an overwhelming majority would oppose it.

OPPOSED TO COMMUNISM

It is needless for me to say that I now and have always vigorously opposed not only communism but fascism and any other totalitarian form of government. No word or vote of mine could be construed as favoring in the slightest degree any one of these groups, their ideals or ideologies. I have never hesitated to speak and vote in favor of any measure that would protect our country from these. I thank God that there is not a Communist living within the borders of the 17 counties of my congressional district. No; not one. There are no Red flags or sympathizers of the Red flag in the Ninth Kentucky District. We know but one flag and that is the Stars and Stripes. We know just one loyalty and that is the loyalty to the United States of America.

Quite a lot of folks have changed their views and opinions here in the National Capital. The Bolsheviks, or Communists, took charge of Russia about the time I came to Congress, March 4, 1919. President Wilson would not recognize their Government. Neither would Presidents Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover. These American Presidents regarded communism as dangerous to the welfare of this country. Then came another President, Mr. Roosevelt. He insisted on recognizing the communistic Government of Russia. He insisted that our country take these Communists to our bosoms.

Before we got into World War II, the Russians put on a great ball at the Russian Embassy. Many of those, and some of them in our Government, attended that great function of the Russian Ambassador. Champagne flowed freely. Caviar was served in abundance, and when it was over there was laid on a silver platter a billion-dollar credit from our Government to Russia and the Communists. Yes; a billion-dollar present. Now, what were the Russian, communistic officials celebrating at this great ball and feast? They were celebrating the twenty-fourth anniversary of the birth of communism in Russia, and some of those who are denouncing communism today, and were in high public office, attended that party. Was not President Truman there, as well as practically all of our high public officials who were in harmony with the policy of recognizing communistic Russia, when we have all known for years that the fundamental purpose of communism is to overthrow this Government, as well as other governments, by force and violence?

When did President Truman get stirred up about communism? It was only a brief period of time before President Truman delivered his message to Congress on Turkey and Greece that former Gov. George H. Earle, of Pennsylvania, a Democrat, and who had held important positions under our Government in Europe, wrote a letter to Presi-

dent Truman, pointing out the dangers of communism in this country. President Truman, in replying to Governor Earle's letter, said:

People are very much wrought up about the Communist "bugaboo," but I am of the opinion that this country is perfectly safe so far as communism is concerned. We have too many sane people.

It is needless to say that many of us were greatly surprised when a few days thereafter President Truman delivered this world-rocking message that we must embark on a policy to interfere in the quarrels, revolutions, and insurrections anywhere in the world if there was any threat from the Communists, and he put upon the ground that it was necessary for the safety and protection of the United States. We have wondered what brought about such a profound change in such a brief period of time.

There is no claim that there is any appreciable number of Communists in Turkey, and I wish also to venture to say that there are more Communists in the United States than there are in Greece, and several times more. The President in his message fixes the number of Communists in Greece at "only a few thousand." We have had several thousand Communists holding important jobs in our Government and receiving their pay out of the tax and bond money of the American people.

The President and his advisers no doubt took note of the results of the last November election. It might help to restore them in the confidence of the American people if they start a campaign against the Communists. The President has asked Congress for \$50,000,000 to fight communism in this country and \$400,000,000 to fight it over in Greece and Turkey. These Communists in this country were built up and encouraged by administrations of which Mr. Truman was a part, and those administrations blocked many efforts on the part of Congress to rid this country of Communists and communism. Is this so-called emergency a build-up for the Presidential and congressional elections of 1948? If we embark upon this policy, in my opinion, there will be many emergencies under this new world foreign policy. Let us direct our efforts first and effectively in eliminating and driving Communists and other subversive persons from public office in this country.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Many persons have claimed that the Republican Party kept our Nation out of the League of Nations and that this brought on World War II. We did not go into the League of Nations. President Wilson called upon his Democratic friends in the Senate to vote against the Covenant. It had to receive two-thirds of the Senate vote. It never received more than 49 votes and that was on a reservation put in the Covenant by Republicans and some Democrats. Before the close of this war, there was a great deal of talk about having some sort of United Nations organization so that all nations who were opposed to aggression could unite and stop aggression. The first movement in this respect is what is

known as the Fulbright resolution. I voted for that resolution looking to the creation of the association of nations. The San Francisco Conference was called. It met in the summer of 1945. All of the nations of the earth except our recent enemies were invited to attend. Fifty nations responded. Out of that came the so-called United Nations organization. Its chief purpose was in case of any threatened aggression for these United Nations to take immediate steps to stop such aggression and to refer disputes between nations to the U. N. and settle these disputes by peaceful means. If that could not be done, then for these nations to unite together and stop the aggression. That has been organized for nearly 2 years.

The President says that there is threat of aggression on the part of Russia or some other country. If this be the case the matter should be referred to the U. N. and either by force or public opinion stop the aggression, but neither Greece, Turkey, United States, Great Britain, nor any other country has called upon the United Nations to handle this matter. Some people say it is too weak. It was strong enough to stop any aggression of Russia into Iran or Iraq. The United States has really ignored and bypassed the U. N. We propose to play a lone hand. An amendment is to be offered to refer this Turkey-Greece matter to the U. N. I shall vote for that amendment. The United States cannot provide the men or the money to take care of all of these problems in all parts of the world as requested by the President's message. It cost us a lot of money to help develop the U. N. We have given billions, we have altered our financial and commercial policies to encourage that organization. We have paid about 72 percent for its upkeep and maintenance and that runs into millions and now we bypass the whole thing and start out to play a lone hand. This will likely mean the death of the United Nations organization.

The President says that we must intervene wherever there is any communist threat. There is such a threat in France. The Communist Party was the largest party in France about a year ago when we turned over to France about a billion and three hundred million dollars in cash and in goods and supplies. Korea says there is a threat of communism in that country. This is also true in China, India, Iran, Iraq, and demands will likely come thick and fast within the next year. These are some of the burdens and dangers that will confront our country if we adopt the Truman policy of interfering in all the wars, quarrels and insurrections throughout the world. I just cannot see it that way. We must not play alone; let us cooperate with other nations and insist on these matters being settled by the U. N. and let each nation share its responsibility. The lone-hand will end up in us incurring the ill will and envy of nations throughout the world.

TROUBLE IN GREECE

There are some who say, Will we vote against this bill and deny relief to needy people in Greece? Greece has a population of about 7,500,000 people. Since the war, other countries and the United

States have poured into Greece over a billion dollars in the way of relief of many kinds. Last week the House passed a bill providing \$200,000,000 more of aid for needy people in Greece and some other countries in Europe. The President asked for only \$100,000,000 in his budget for aid, but some folks, very generous of the American taxpayers' money, wanted to make it \$350,000,000. I voted for the \$200,000,000 bill. It was strictly a relief measure. The bill before us is not for the relief of needy people in Greece.

It has been admitted that this is a military measure. We have an American fleet now off the coast of Greece and Turkey of destroyers, cruisers, battleships, and aircraft carrier. The Balkans have always been regarded as the "powder keg" of Europe. I wonder how long it may be until one of these ships is blown up and we have another *Maine* disaster which event projected us into the Spanish-American War. It is admitted that Turkey is not in need of any relief. Turkey looked alone to the welfare of Turkey during World War II. She played both ends against the middle. She whispered meaningless words to the British and American diplomats. Britain and the United States poured into Turkey about \$1,000,000,000 of relief. She did not fire a gun to aid us; she milked us and Britain and at the same time she was furnishing supplies and consorting with Hitler and his gang. Turkey grew rich and fat. She has an army of 1,000,000 men. She wants us to support that army and no Russian, Communist, or other person has entered her territory. Of course, Turkey is not a democracy. It is a totalitarian government, and her country is ruled by dictators. It has been a nation of deceit and intrigue and cruelty for more than a century. As a boy and a young man I remember how the American people from time to time were stirred to the very depths because of the massacre of the Armenian Christians and the abduction of Christian missionaries with demands for heavy ransom. Turkey has drawn the iron curtain around Armenia. In World War I she joined with our enemies and did her best to help destroy this country. She used more discretion in World War II and worked both sides. They claim we must go over there and meddle in the domestic affairs of Turkey to keep Russia from swallowing up Turkey. No one yet has been smart enough to swallow Turkey and whatever we might do, if she got in a tight place, she would swap us out. Of course, many Turks are opposed to our country meddling in the affairs of their country.

The big trouble in Greece is that they have had imposed upon them kings and dictators to which they are opposed. Millions of Greek people love liberty, freedom, and democracy. Many years ago Great Britain and other countries insisted upon putting King Constantine on the Greek throne. Neither he nor his wife had a drop of Greek blood in them and they were not natives of Greece. He was forced to abdicate. His son, George, a young man, was forced upon the Greek people. He was not a Greek or native of Greece. He was forced to abdicate twice. During World War II

he was able to leave Greece and locate in a more safe and congenial place. After World War II Great Britain urged our country to help place King George back on the throne of Greece. During King George's reign Greece had one of the most arbitrary dictators that ever ruled any people. His ascension to the throne created at once great discord in Greece. No doubt some Communists took a hand in that opposition. The things to which the common people of Greece had been subjected, no doubt, caused some Greeks to become Communists. Perhaps 100,000 people were killed in the clashes that followed. American tanks were used. I am not defending a Communist in Greece or anywhere. King George died the other day and his brother Paul, by virtue of birth, not because he was a Greek or entitled to it, became King of Greece. We now propose to send aid to keep him on the moth-eaten throne of Greece and to support and maintain the expensive group that he has around him. I am advised that King George did and this King Paul receives a salary equivalent to \$200,000 in American money per year while our President only receives \$75,000 per year. The big ship-owners in Greece and many of the wealthy people in Greece by foul means escape paying their taxes to support the Greek Government. The President was not able to apologize for the Greek Government or for the right or left groups.

I was willing to vote for some relief for Greece but I am not willing to help keep on the throne a Greek King who is opposed by many of the Greek people that are not Communists. I wonder what we would think if some other nation should try to impose upon our Nation an expensive king and his followers. We would not submit to it tamely. It is urged that the people of the hills and mountains of Greece are the most numerous objectors. The hill and mountain people of no country, as I recall, are Communists because they do believe in God and in freedom. Why did not Britain and the United States insist on giving to Greece a democratic form of government? I do not propose to vote for a measure that helps to uphold and keep in office kings and dictators in any country of the world and I shall vote against this bill.

I am not overlooking the fact that this policy will likely involve us in another World War. World War I started in a little country right in the Balkans—the powder keg of Europe. If we are to have a war, let it be to help establish and maintain a democratic form of government, honestly elected and not to maintain kings and queens, dukes and lords.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, several hundreds of years ago in a far-off province of China, word came in that a strange malady and disease had begun to strike down the people who lived in its remote regions. Just what this disease was nobody knew or was able to find out. Reports continued to come into the capital of the province that this dread ailment was spreading into other areas. Upon receipt of this information

several members of the ruling group went before what could be compared to our United States Congress, and asked that the governing body appropriate money from the central treasury which would be used to find out what this dread disease was, whether it was contagious, and how it could be stopped. There were other representatives; however, who, because the disease was far away and had not yet particularly affected them, opposed this suggestion that any money be spent. They cried out, "Why should we spend this money when already our people can hardly pay the tax load, and when we are not certain just what the money will be used for? Some more pressing emergency may arise, and so we should keep the money on hand. Furthermore, if we give money on occasions like this, we will soon bankrupt this government."

On the strength of these negative arguments, the rulers did not appropriate the money, and within 2 years thereafter the disease of cholera swept over that province, killing over 60 percent of the people and practically all of the rulers. Today, many hundreds of years later, that province still lies prostrate and bankrupt.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we Members of Congress are in much the same situation as were those rulers in the province of China about which I have just spoken. Today we know that there is an infectious and dangerous mental disease which is attacking the people of Asia and Europe, and that many people in many countries are succumbing to this mental disease. We also know that it amounts to a plague which is the antithesis of democracy, of liberty, of freedom as we know it. We also know that if it continues its march unchecked, it will in time threaten our very existence.

We have been asked by the farsighted and courageous President of the United States to appropriate \$400,000,000, the real purpose of which is to check the spread of this mental infection, which we call communism, and thereby to determine at this point in our history just how serious that mental disease is. We should learn now how far its proponents will go, what is in store for us who believe in democracy as opposed to those who believe in communism. If we turn down President Truman's proposal, the chances are that our history will be similar to that of the far-off province of China and that in a few years this mental malady will spread all over the rest of the world and eventually overrun us.

We have heard men say on the floor of this House that this money should not be given to Greece and Turkey because if we give it in this instance we will have to give it in other instances and to other countries that may be jeopardized by communism. That is true, but who in this House would not give all of his money or, in fact, sacrifice his life in order that our country and our system of government might survive? It has been said that no one knows with certainty just where this program of aid to Greece and Turkey will lead, and I must admit that we all have to agree to that assertion. When General Eisenhower took the armies of the

United States across the English Channel, he did not know for a certainty what the outcome was going to be. He could not have given you a schedule of where those armies would be stopped or even state with finality that they would win. The only thing that he and the men who went across that Channel knew was that over on the other side there was an evil which threatened the future of the United States and freedom and liberty everywhere. Eisenhower did not know how many lives it would cost. No one knew how much of the treasure of the United States would be expended in order to overcome that evil, but we were committed to a policy of preserving democracy and freedom, and those evil forces had to be eliminated in order to do that. Thousands of good American soldiers died in that battle. They died for the ideals of freedom and democracy, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we all know that even though the war has been ended, the battle between democracy and freedom as opposed to tyranny and totalitarianism still goes on. If we do not continue to support those ideals for which our soldiers died by opposing totalitarianism and tyranny wherever we find it, we will be making a mockery of the lives of those young men.

Four hundred million dollars in such an instance as this, Mr. Chairman, is inconsequential, when we understand that with that \$400,000,000 we might be able to stop the march of this Red disease, or discover just what is in the minds of the leaders of those forces. The right kind of information now might help us work out a practical basis of peace and avert a future war.

It has been charged by Members of Congress today, that if we adopt the program as proposed by President Truman, we will be embarking upon an imperialistic policy from which there is no retreat. I disagree with those assertions and state that they are not supported by the facts. How can anyone logically maintain that the United States is imperialistic in action or intent, when we recall that at the end of World War II we were the most powerful Nation on earth and could have crushed any nation, taken any desired possession, but by our own volition we decreased our military forces to a point where they are less than those of the Russian Nation today. We have the atomic bomb, but instead of using that for imperialistic purposes we have gone so far as to offer its secret to the other nations of the world if they will merely cooperate in peaceful pursuits and make full disclosures of the development of fissionable material in their own countries. We spent over \$150,000,000,000 in order to win World War II, but unlike the other countries we have not asked for any reparations. We have not asked for any money back. Since World War II we have given freedom to the Philippine Islands, one of the richest island groups in the world. We have asked the other countries to do the same thing to their possessions. We have given up our rights in China and by every act and deed we have indicated that we are not imperialistically inclined but that the only thing we seek is the chance for people who

want to live under a system of freedom and democracy to have the opportunity to do so.

It has been charged that we are bypassing the United Nations, yet I would like to point out that it was a commission of the United Nations, the FAO, which recommended that Greece seek assistance from a member nation, which is just what Greece has done by asking us for assistance. Everyone knows that if this matter were today taken to the United Nations organization, Russia would veto the proposed action. What, then, would be our course? If we went ahead with our assistance to Greece and Turkey we would with finality and with certainty scuttle the United Nations, because we would then be placed in a position of going contrary to its rulings. If we recognized Russia's veto and did nothing, we would be playing into the hands of the Communists, because they want, as Secretary of State Marshall said, "the doctors to deliberate while the patient dies."

To those who shout that we are bypassing the United Nations—where were their voices when Russia recently made a pact with Poland and agreed to send Poland economic assistance and implements of war? Does anyone doubt that Russia has been giving such aid to Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and others? Yet where is the cry that Russia is bypassing the United Nations? Two rights do not make a wrong, but does an act committed by a democracy constitute a bypass of the United Nations when the same act on the part of a Communist-controlled government is not considered a bypass?

The United Nations is unable to cope with this problem today. It has no resources, no enforcing weapons, and one of the reasons it is in such a weak condition is because of the delaying and dilatory tactics of the Communist-controlled governments. Finally, this bill, H. R. 2616, has in it a provision calling for the United States to cease this program in Greece and Turkey whenever the Security Council of the United Nations or the General Assembly finds that the program is unnecessary and undesirable.

We would be appeasing once again if we permit these negative delaying arguments to prevail, and it is a known fact that nothing is gained from appeasement. Daladier tried to appease Hitler, and France was overrun. Chamberlain tried to appease Hitler, and England was devastated. Even Stalin tried to appease Hitler, and Russia was overrun. We tried to appease the Japanese, and we were attacked. Appeasement has proven a futile, worthless tactic in the fight against totalitarianism and aggression.

We must meet the problems which might lead to future wars directly and as quickly as is possible. We must meet the responsibility of leadership for world peace and freedom for individuals.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to this significant fact, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs itself is badly confused about the purpose of this bill. I know the members of this

committee are honorable men, are patriotic and able men, but it only goes to show that when we become so steeped in prejudice we are at the point where we cannot think straight.

On page 10 of the report the committee states that it asked the State Department to set out the purpose of this bill and whether or not we intend to interfere with the government of Greece. According to this report the State Department replied as follows:

Whatever we may do to assist Greece and Turkey, we propose scrupulously to respect the sovereignty of those countries with respect to the conduct of their internal as well as their external affairs.

That is what the Department of State told the committee. The committee follows that expression with its own statement and said:

The Greek and Turkish Governments have themselves requested the assistance proposed in this bill. Government witnesses testified that the greatest care will be exercised to avoid any action which could be regarded as an infringement on the sovereignty of either country.

Earlier in the report, however, on page 8, the statement of the committee is as follows:

The committee has been given assurance that our Government will insist that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in such matters as fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, strict husbanding and control of the foreign exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These are all essential to the establishment of stability in Greece.

The military programs in Greece and Turkey will be administered through small groups of United States military and naval personnel sent to those countries for that purpose. They would screen requirements and advise in the best application and use of the materials and equipment made available to Greece and Turkey.

In other words, what we will do is take over Greece and run its government. We will tell them what kind of taxes to levy, we will control their exports, and tell them what kind of imports they can have. You say that is not imperialism? It is imperialism and you cannot escape it.

We say in one instance that we will scrupulously avoid interfering with their autonomy and their integrity as a nation, and in the next breath we say we will take it over. The committee is confused and you who advocate this kind of a program are confused, in my judgment. It is going to lead our great Nation, I am afraid, into destruction. From deep down in my heart I beg you to consider this matter. It is a most serious step.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I have confidence in the integrity, ability, and patriotism of the Members of this House generally, and God knows from the bottom of my heart I respect their views. I have been taught all of my life to respect the views of any honest sincere person, even though he might disagree with me, and I believe that you are just as honest, just as sincere, and just as patriotic as I am. So I do not

impugn your motives, but I do believe your judgment is very, very bad.

It is said that communism is on the march. I say to you that communism is on the retreat. The world is gradually recovering from the most devastating war in the annals of history. Communism is gradually retreating, and it will continue to retreat if that recovery continues. We will definitely defeat communism if we will just make democracy work in this grand old country of ours.

Russia is not as large today as it was a hundred years ago, it is not as large as it was 30 years ago. It used to contain all of Poland and all of Finland, as well as most of what it contains now. Russia defeated little Finland, but it did not take Finland over. Why? It is hard for any nation to take over another nation even though it is small. I say to you that communism and Russia cannot accomplish what you say they can.

I have never in my life been in a group of people who are as easily scared as you gentlemen are—never in my life. I fought in a number of actual battles, some of the bloodiest that were fought in the First World War; I fought a number of legal battles in the court room, and I have fought a number of political battles, but never have I seen anybody scared as badly as you are. You are a whole lot more scared of Russia than the people of this country are.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and he is eloquent, spoke of Mother's Day. He said that pretty soon Mother's Day would be here and he had something beautiful to say about mothers. All of our hearts responded to that. I am wondering what the mothers of our Nation will say. We have taken their lads twice, and even some of their lassies, into bloody wars. For God's sake, let us not do that again. I know your purpose will not be that. God knows I know your purpose is good; but let us think, my friends.

If I were hanged on highest hill,
 Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
 I know whose love would follow still;
 Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
 If I were drowned in deepest sea,
 Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
 I know whose tears would come down to me;
 Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.
 If I were cursed of body and soul,
 Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine
 I know whose prayers would make me whole,
 Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.

I think it would be a pretty good idea for those of us whose mothers are still living to ask them what they are thinking. They are away from the turmoil and the confusion here and maybe their thoughts would be a little clearer than ours; and to those who are not fortunate enough to have a mother living, I respectfully suggest that you ask yourselves this question: What would your mother have done under these circumstances? Or what would your father have done?

The remarks I have just made were extemporaneous and since my time has expired I wish to extend in the Record just this one other thought at this time. Tomorrow I hope to be given some more

time to speak on the floor on this bill H. R. 2616. The other thought is this:

So much needs to be done in our own country to make it strong so that neither communism nor any other ism except good Americanism will ever thrive here. For instance, I am reliably informed that the approximately 2,200,000 old-age pensioners receive an average of \$35.39 per month. Does it not seem logical and reasonable to you that it would be far better to use these millions of dollars we will spend in giving military aid to Greece and Turkey in furtherance of a better old-age pension program? It does to me. And, of course, there are many other worthy programs, here at home, crying out for just as much needed help. If we impoverish ourselves by spending lavishly abroad, do we not endanger our own way of life here at home?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, probably nobody will dispute the statement that whether or not a World War develops usually depends not on what happens in the last few frantic months before it actually breaks out, but on what happens in the 1, 2, or, at most, 3 years after the preceding war. Whether, the United States of America, God forbid, is to have another World War will in my judgment depend very largely on how the United States has handled its affairs since VJ-day and on how well or how badly it handles its affairs now and in the next one or two years.

Doubtless we will also agree that only the shooting part of the World War II is over. Throughout the world today a fierce political and ideological war is being waged, a war to determine who really won the shooting war. We know who defeated the Germans and the Japanese, but nobody can really know who won World War II until it is clear what ideas, whose ideas are going to dominate in the reconstruction of the world.

This fierce ideological and political warfare is particularly crucial, it seems to me, in four main areas, because the outcome in those areas will determine our own future and that of mankind.

The first is Germany. Almost everybody agrees that as Germany goes, so will go Europe. First, because the Germans occupy a strategically advantageous position in the center of Europe; second, because they have enormous resources of the key minerals, especially coal and iron, necessary for great industrial development and production; and third, because they have more than 65,000,000 strong people, people with a real genius for organization, people who have demonstrated an extraordinary capacity for scientific invention and mechanical skills, people who have proved twice within our lifetime that they have the ability to commit themselves to an idea, and whether it is good or bad, pursue it with singleness of purpose, efficiency, and unbelievable devotion.

We know who defeated the Germans. The crucial question is: Who is going to

win the Germans—win their minds and hearts? That is why Mr. Molotov has made so many speeches on his side, trying to persuade the Germans to take over the new totalitarianism from the East as a substitute for Hitler's which was overthrown from the outside, but apparently not generally repudiated from the inside.

That is why Secretary Byrnes, General Marshall, Senator Vandenberg, Mr. Bevin, and the others have made their speeches, trying to get the German people to see that there is more for them to gain in the long run by abandoning all totalitarianisms and coming along with the western democracies. I do not think anybody can predict confidently today just what the outcome is to be. Which way will Germany go?

Much of the answer will depend on what happens in the second of the crucial areas, the Middle East, the one we are discussing in this bill to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey. Let me reduce it to a few sentences as one has to in only 10 minutes. If we do not pass this bill, every bit of the testimony indicates that Greece as a free nation will go down tomorrow. The people will have to give in to the pressures from organized Communist-directed minorities, subservient to Russia through her satellites, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania to the north. There is no use resisting what is inevitable if Greece stands alone. All she can do is try to make the best terms obtainable.

And if Greece goes down, Turkey is hopelessly outflanked. Turkey could and probably would hold on alone for a while because the Turks are tough. But they could not resist for long. There would be little point in trying. They might just as well get the best terms possible and avoid the useless murder and destruction. I do not think anyone can escape the conclusion that within a very few weeks or months Turkey would have to succumb to the inexorable, irresistible pressure from her northwest and northeast.

Then what happens? Italy goes down almost the next week. They are just hanging on by their fingernails now, hoping that there are still people in the world who believe in freedom enough to stand by those who are fighting for it. But if there are not enough people who are willing to hold up their hands, they might just as well, first as last, capitulate to the strong, disciplined, Communist fifth column within and Tito's divisions on the border.

Then France goes down within the next few months. What else can she do, I ask you? A lot of you were over there fighting. You know what condition she is in. And her largest party and most of her organized workers are controlled from Moscow, waiting for the signal. Millions of Frenchmen love freedom, but what can they do without help, moral and material? They, too, must come to terms with the Soviet.

Then Germany is effectively encircled by Soviet-dominated countries, and Germany, too, is in the Russian bag. Under such circumstances, why should Russia be expected to agree with us at this re-

cent Moscow Conference? Why should she enter into agreements with the United States, Britain, and France with respect to Germany, agreements which would limit her in any way, if within a few months Germany is to be wholly hers, in her lap, given to her by default?

Then England would be neutralized by rocket bombs alone. She could not move by herself or even be a base again as in the last two wars.

Then there would be a so-called revolution in Spain, supported and supplied from France, not because the Communists are interested in the people of Spain but because they are interested in getting Gibraltar, which controls the inlet and outlet of the Mediterranean.

If Russia controls the Mediterranean and north Africa—read yesterday's papers regarding the Communist-inspired revolts there—then a look at the map shows that they are only half as far away from the bulge of South America as we in the United States are.

So in this bill we are not dealing with just a few little peninsulas off the southern border of the Balkans, we are dealing with the fate of Germany, which means of Europe. We are dealing with the fate of north Africa, the fate of South America, the security of the United States.

Our action here may well determine whether the 250,000 Americans who died in the last war died in vain, their sacrifice thrown away within 2 years of their death, or whether, please God, we are going to give the freedom for which they fought a chance to live and grow in the western world.

That brings me to the third of the areas where the political struggle is so crucial—China. I wish I had a long time to discuss that. Maybe I can get some time for it someday. Because as China goes so will go Asia. China, like Germany in Europe, occupies a strategically advantageous central position in Asia. China has great natural resources. China has 450,000,000 extraordinarily tough people—a weak, exhausted Government, but a strong people.

I am willing to venture the prediction that historians will eventually agree that World War II all along was a war more than anything else to determine who is going to control the development of the manpower, the materials, and the markets of Asia.

Hitler understood that. He said once that if Germany conquered all of Europe that would not solve her problem. Of course it would not. There are no undeveloped areas in Europe. He had to get Europe as the springboard from which to seize control of the undeveloped areas of the world which are in South America, Africa, and Asia. South America and Africa have great natural resources, but only Asia has great natural resources and great manpower, a billion and a quarter people, more than half the population of the world. Who is going to control the development of those resources and that manpower? What ideas are going to dominate in Asia? That is the crucial question of the next century.

The Japanese have understood that fact. That was why they fought so long and so hard to try to conquer China and then Asia.

The Russians have understood it. They poured more money and effort into the Communist movement in China beginning in 1922 than into all the other countries in the world except the United States, because they rightly perceived that, second only to the United States of America, the strategically most important country in the world to win for communism, if possible, is China. As China goes so will go Asia.

Let me approach it this way: Why did we get into World War II, or how? We got into World War II because when it came to a show-down we finally realized down in our bones what we never should have forgotten in our brains, that we did not dare let Japan, a great, expanding, militaristic nation, get control of the manpower, materials, and potential markets of Asia. Our own security would be too seriously jeopardized. So after having spent 10 years building Japan up until she was strong enough to attack us, we then belatedly said, "We will resist your further expansion. We will not sell you any more supplies." And, of course, she did attack us.

Now, when the United States of America has fought for almost 4 years at such terrible cost in men and wealth to keep one expanding, totalitarian, militaristic nation, Japan, from getting control of the gigantic manpower, materials, and markets of Asia, is it not almost incredible to witness, as we have in the last 2 years or so, a group of Americans insisting on our presenting control of the manpower, materials, and markets of Asia to another expanding, totalitarian, militaristic power, Russia? If we are to do that, I ask you why did we fight World War II?

To abandon China now can mean only that we defeated Japan, and Russia won the war. I can see why Russia and her devotees should urge it. But why should Americans urge it? How could it possibly serve our interests? It would mean that our fighting Japan was not only in vain, it was criminal—because, to be brutally frank, if Russia is to have control of Europe and some militaristic power is to have control of Asia, then it would be less dangerous to us to have Japan in control of Asia than to have Russia in control of both Europe and Asia.

How can anyone look our dead in the face and then turn around and say, "It is none of our business whether our allies in Asia are enslaved or free."

Some people advocate abandoning Asia as they advocate abandoning Greece and Turkey, because they assume the only way we can avoid war with Russia is by always yielding to her. But surely we have learned something about this business of getting peace by yielding. We tried hard for 10 years to get peace with Japan by yielding. Did it lead to peace? No. It led straight to war.

Daladier and Chamberlain tried to get peace with Hitler by yielding, by appeasement. Did it lead to peace? No. It led straight to war.

Stalin tried to get peace with Hitler by appeasement. Did it lead to peace? No. It led straight to war.

I have three little children who sometimes wear me out by their pressure for this or that. I think, "Oh, it does not make much difference. This is only a minor matter. After all, they are nice little youngsters—why not give in this once?" Does it lead to peace? No. It leads straight to war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, look for a moment at what we have done in our desire to get good relations with Russia. A year and a half ago we had incomparably the greatest military machine that the world has ever seen—in the air, on the land, on the sea and under the sea. If we had had a single grain of imperialism in our souls, a single design on Russia, we could have imposed our will on her, or on anyone else. What did we do with that superiority? We threw it away in 6 months. How can anybody so misrepresent our actions as to say that we are "getting tough with Russia"? Look not at anyone's words. Look at the deed. There was never anything like it in history.

But someone will argue that we could afford to disarm on land and sea because we have the atomic bomb, the super-weapon. Well, what did we do with that? We told Russia we would give that to her too, subject only to the condition that any use she makes of atomic energy be under the full inspection and control of a real international commission, without any vetoes, the same as any use we make of atomic energy, our own invention, our own Oak Ridge, be under the full inspection and control of that same international commission, without any vetoes by us either. Actually that was the most radical—in the true sense of the word—the most far-reaching proposal any strong, sovereign, victorious nation ever made in all history. And it was made by so-called reactionary, capitalistic Uncle Sam, I am proud to say.

If Russia is afraid of our atomic bomb as some claim, then she knows exactly how she can get it and have it under precisely the same conditions as we ourselves have it.

We went further to try to get good relations. We looked in the other direction while Russia destroyed the independence of a half dozen countries in eastern Europe.

We accepted her thesis that in order to be secure she must impose her will on about 70 or 80 million non-Russians in eastern Europe.

We offered to work for modification of the Montreux Convention so she could have free access to the Mediterranean through the Dardanelles, in war as in peace.

We promised her effective control of the ports and key railroads of Manchuria—which means control of Manchuria, even though we had just solemnly promised the Chinese at Cairo that Manchuria would be returned to China.

Yes; we went still further. In order to reassure Russia that we would not

interfere with what she was doing in flagrant violation of her pledges in the Atlantic Charter, one of its two authors publicly repudiated the Charter.

Pray tell, what more could we do to try to show our friendship for and good will toward Russia? But did it lead to better relations? No, they got steadily worse.

It is not because I want war with Russia; it is precisely because I don't want war with Russia that I beg us not to pursue further the fallacious notion that we can get peace with her by sacrificing our principles and other people's territory.

The outcome in Asia depends in no small degree on what happens in Greece and Turkey. If they go down, then, of course, Iran, Iraq, Arabia, Afghanistan go down like ninepins, and Russia's agents stand at the door of India, which is so divided she cannot offer either ideological or material resistance. She falls into the Russian lap like a ripe plum. The powerful Communist movement in Indo-China takes over. No one in Malaya can long resist. The long 20-year struggle of the Chinese Government against Communist imperialism will be lost. Let us not naively imagine that the tip of Korea, or Japan, or even the Philippines can long remain free and democratic with Russia dominant on the mainland of Asia.

That brings me to the last of the four areas where the struggle between the forces of freedom and of slavery is most crucial—the United States. Which way are we to go?

As Germany goes, so goes Europe.

As China goes, so goes Asia.

As Greece and Turkey and the Middle East go, so are likely to go both Europe and Asia.

Mr. Chairman, we are determining here and now in this historic Chamber whether the people of Greece and Turkey are to have a chance to go the way of freedom, as they have, proved they want to. That will have the greatest influence, I think probably be decisive, in determining whether the people of Europe and of Asia are to have a chance to go the way of freedom. It will ultimately determine whether we ourselves are to be a safe and solvent and free people.

We, not Russia, are the question mark to millions and millions of men and women who love freedom and will fight and die for it, if they have hope. They look not to the Kremlin but to Washington, because they know that the decisions in the Kremlin still depend, thank God, on the decisions in Washington, the decisions in this House of the Representatives of the free men and women of the one strong citadel of liberty remaining on the earth.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to what is undoubtedly the most crucial and far-reaching debate that has been heard in this session of Congress. I shall not attempt to repeat, or try to summarize the very able arguments presented so far, in opposition to this measure.

In the limited time which I have I would like to concern myself with the human angle that I do not believe has been covered in this debate.

Charges of outside interference which have been brought here in connection with this problem have been very vague. I would like to show what will be the actual effect should this measure be passed by the Congress. We hear talk of outside aggression, of outside interference. Unquestionably there is some. I should like very much to know the nature and source of that aggression, and I would be the first of those to have the spotlight placed on that, and have it brought before the United Nations and have it stopped as it was in Iran. But if we send military aid to the present Greek Government, against whom is it going to be used? Against some foreign or alien people in Greece? No. It is going to be used against the Greek people themselves—to kill Greek people. I should like to say a word about those people. I know from personal experience what the life of the guerrilla is like. These men and women are in the hills of Greece today, ragged, hungry, tired, and beaten in body but not in spirit. Men and women who have seen 4, 5, or 6 years of a type of hell on earth that is beyond the wildest imagination of man unless you have seen it and experienced it yourself. For every man and woman surviving in the hills today there are 20 or 30 of their friends, relatives, or family people who have died in these last 6 years. I think the line which should be drawn is this: In time of war, when the whole world was in peril and we were opposed to the Nazi and Fascist forces, the might and courage of those people were on our side. There are American boys living back home today, and I include myself as one of them, because of the help of those people. Their rifles were pointed in the same direction as ours. Their attacks and their energies were directed against our common enemy.

We had also at that time in that country certain Greek people who walked as free men in Athens and other villages under the domination of the Germans; men who walked free then, under German control, who are free today, and who are in responsible positions in the Greek Government; men whom we propose today to back up against the rest of the good people of Greece. If we had lost this war, and those of us who had been overseas would have remained there as slave labor in the hands of the Germans, and God knows what would have happened to you at home—yet these men would be walking free under the Germans in Greece. Now we propose to uphold their hands, in exterminating and killing the real patriots. I am not talking in favor of any leftist or Communist elements. I am talking about the rank and file, the middle of the road, the democratic, the good people in Greece. For instance, we had at that time a man named Napoleon Zervas, a hated and despised man, who collaborated with the Germans. He is today Minister of Public Security. He is the man who today can go around and say, "I don't like what you are saying or what you are writing," and in 24

hours send you to one of their deportation camps and have you thrown into prison.

The chief of police in Athens today, named Evert, is the same man who was the chief of police in Athens when the Germans were in there.

So I caution you now, let us not go there in the name of democracy and commit the fatal error of aiding men such as Napoleon Zervas, Minister of Public Security, and Evert, the chief of police, in their ruthless, rightist terrorism and brutality and hold that up to the people of the world as a sample of what we mean by democracy.

Let us support the real democratic groups, the people of Greece; let us give them economic help and relief. Let us aid them in a program of relief and economic reconstruction. Let us extend to these people, who are battered, beaten, and down on their knees, a helping hand. Let us help them rise to their feet, and let us give them strength so they can carry on, on their own.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman taking the position that the present government of Greece is not approved by the people of Greece but that the people of Greece really believe in the guerrillas who are now in the hills and about whom the gentleman has just spoken?

Mr. BLATNIK. My opinion is there is serious question as to the present so-called representative government in Greece.

Mr. COOLEY. I was a member of a committee of Congress which within the last 2 weeks was in Greece. While we were there we did not permit ourselves to be interviewed, we interviewed the press and the people of Greece; and I for one came away convinced that King Paul and his government today represent generally the people of Greece. I am surprised to hear the gentleman plead that we give aid to the guerrillas who apparently are unwilling to cooperate with the government now in power.

Mr. BLATNIK. May I ask the gentleman if he asked King Paul to explain his role as being head of the Fascist youth organization run by the Germans in Greece, and what he did that drove people to the hills of Greece, as far as the fight for democracy was concerned?

Mr. COOLEY. None of our party asked him any such question as that. Our own representatives make the statement that at least 85 percent of the people of Greece are back of the government now in power.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is strange that after 2 years of economic and military assistance by the British that there should be as much chaos and disruption in Greece if the present government has the majority support of the people today.

Let us not approach this problem in a negative way, and go in there and support the cause of the reactionary element who are no more democratic than the Communist element. Let us approach this problem in a positive way and help the freedom-loving, the good people, the majority of the people of Greece who want to have a true democ-

racy and a real representative government.

I take a stand in opposition to the proposal before us as the wrong way, the negative way to go about the matter. I feel it should be brought before the United Nations where this can be thrashed out before the whole world, where it can be shown who is interfering, who is the aggressor threatening the peace of the world. Let those who want peace and freedom stand up and join in putting an end to any such threat, and let those who will not cooperate, sit down and be condemned.

I say that by acting unilaterally in this case we are weakening ourselves in the eyes of the world. By the other course we could rally behind us the moral support not only of our own people but the freedom-loving peoples of the whole world. We can do that only by bringing this matter before and through the United Nations.

THE GOVERNMENT OF GREECE

Many Americans have been most disturbed regarding the direction that American foreign policy was taking ever since the President delivered his unprecedented speech to the Congress, in which he proposed military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey. Public doubt and misgivings are indicated by the Gallup and other public polls, and by the large amount of mail received by many Congressmen with respect to this issue.

One may ask: What are the sources of the doubts and misgivings on the part of the public? Surely it is not the \$400,000,000 loan in itself that has the people worried. There is nothing unusual about the United States making a loan or a gift to another country.

I am sure that the American people do not object to aiding the starving people of Greece. There can be no doubt that the Greek people are hungry and that they need food, clothing, and aid to rehabilitate their war-torn economy. No one can read the report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization without becoming aware of the tragic plight of the Greek people. They must be given help, and I am prepared to grant \$100,000,000, \$200,000,000, or even \$300,000,000 to Greece for relief purposes. We are the richest country in the world, and I am certain that the majority of the American people will agree with my claim that the giving of food, clothing, and aid to Greece is a Christian duty. If only Greek relief was involved in this proposal, there would be hardly a dissenting voice heard in the Congress.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS

What are the objections to this proposal on the part of the people of the United States? Such objections are twofold. One is the effect of this action upon the prestige and future of the United Nations. No amount of double talk can conceal the fact that this action does in effect bypass the United Nations—that it is a unilateral act taken without consultation with other powers, and in disregard to our obligations under the United Nations Charter. Many people recall that it was similar actions by great powers which reduced the League of Nations to a debating society

and destroyed it, and they fear that we now are doing the same to the UN before it even has a chance to prove itself.

A second source of misgivings about this proposal is the present extremist Royalist Government of Greece. The American people have no objections to giving aid to a free government, or to a people who are attempting to maintain their freedom. I, for one, am prepared to place the resources of the United States at the service of liberty and democracy anywhere at any time. But before I support a measure to help a foreign government, I would like to know whether it is a free government that we are aiding—one which respects the dignity of the individual and the rights of minorities, and protects and promotes the interests of the people. For it is one thing to support a free people and another thing to bolster reactionary and semi-Fascist governments which hold their people in bondage. Aid to democracy is logical to one who believes in democracy, but aid to prop up tottering governments which oppress their people is contrary to American ideals.

Before we take this step, therefore, we should determine beforehand whether such action will mean aid to a democratic Greece or a Fascist one. Before funds are granted, we should carefully consider the reliability of the present Greek Government, and ask ourselves whether we want to take the responsibility for its past and future actions—whether said Government will be an asset or a liability to world democracy, and whether it will be effective in checking political extremism.

To assert that we aid the cause of democracy by bolstering the present Government of Greece is misleading double-talk. Let me remind you that the Greeks are not a free people today. Their Government is semi-Fascist in nature—a monarchy which is based upon the dictatorial control of armed security battalions recruited from the Fascist collaborators, and headed up by the most notorious collaborator of all—one Napoleon Zervas. The record of this Government has been one of inefficiency, corruption, suppression of individual liberty, and a callous disregard for the well-being of the people.

Let us examine the record of the present Greek Government, and let the record speak. We can begin by determining the nature and record of the Greek monarch.

THE GREEK MONARCHY

The claim is often made that the Greek monarchy is a democratic institution—that it is a limited monarchy, possessing few powers, such as does the British monarchy, and hence is compatible with democratic government. Such a claim has no foundation in fact and cannot be supported on the basis of recent Greek political history.

The British monarchy has for the last 100 years remained out of British politics and has become nothing but a figure-head as a result of this long period of nonparticipation. This is not so of the Greek monarchy, which has been deeply involved in politics, and has always functioned in the antidemocratic camp.

Let me point out that in 1917 the Allies forced the abdication of King Constantine, of Greece, because of his pro-German sympathies—his wife was a sister of Kaiser Wilhelm. The late King George, who was then Prince George, was also considered pro-German, and he went with his father into exile. In 1920 George returned to Greece when his father, Constantine, was recalled, and succeeded him in 1922. But King George lasted only 1 year—he was exiled for certain pro-German intrigues which came to light, and because he was connected with an attempted rightest military coup in Greece aimed at overthrowing the constitutional Government.

In 1935 King George was recalled after a monarchist victory at the polls. In 1936, however, the elections went against the monarchists and in favor of the liberals. George's answer to this last free election in Greece was the appointment of John Metaxas as Premier, who in turn abolished Parliament, suspended the constitution, and ruled by decree until George fled the country at the time of the Nazi invasion. It is generally agreed that the Metaxas dictatorship was as brutal and as despotic as the Hitler government.

KING PAUL SUCCEEDS

The present King of Greece, King Paul, is of the same political type as the late King George. Their family name was Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Glucksburg, and there is not a drop of Greek blood in Paul's veins. He belongs to one of those professional royal families of Europe who follow the parasitic trade of governing unwilling people. During the Metaxas dictatorship, Prince Paul was head of the EOM, which was the Greek Fascist youth organization. This organization was the Greek counterpart of the Hitler Youth, complete with uniforms, salutes, and creeds. The creed of the EOM, to which Greek children had to subscribe, read as follows:

We believe in one divinely inspired and God-sent leader and savior and guide of the nation, creator of its present and future history, father of the Greek youth and outstanding fighter, John Metaxas.

Now the leader of the EOM is the head of the Greek state, and the man whom the United States is going to appoint to be the champion of democracy in Greece.

Thus we see that the Greek monarchy is something entirely different from the politically impotent British monarchy. The Greek kings have a tradition for, first, being active in politics; and, second, being antidemocratic and profascistic. Maybe our State Department considers the late King George a "great democrat," but the facts show that he was kicked out of Greece once for being pro-German; that he was exiled a second time for plotting to overthrow the constitutional government; and that he was directly responsible for the establishment of the Metaxas dictatorship.

THE GREEK ELECTIONS

It has been claimed that the present Greek Government was chosen in a free and democratic election, and that it rests upon the will of 85 percent of the Greek people. The claim that this Government

has the right to speak for the Greek people is based on the report of the Allied mission which held that the election of March 31, 1946, was an orderly one and apparently represented the fair expression of the public will. This report was rendered by a mission of which few of the members could speak Greek or knew much about Greek affairs. Furthermore, it was such a small group—about 600 members—that they could do nothing more than sample a few voting precincts in the cities, and were in no position to make a fair survey of the Greek elections.

Of course, the elections were orderly. They were well prepared in advance by a royalist reign of terror which equaled anything that the Nazis had to offer. There is plenty of evidence to support this charge. On December 29, 1945, Saturday Evening Post Correspondent Ernest O. Hauser reported:

Today, as a result of their victory, the right-wing forces are making hay while the sun shines. Conditions reminiscent of early Nazi Germany. * * * Armed vigilantes maintain order in the villages, and a private army of storm troopers, called Organization X, terrorize the city folk. * * * Neither the Greek Army nor the police object to right-wing excesses.

American Correspondent Leland Stowe reported prior to the March 31, 1946, elections:

If the Allies want free elections in Greece, they would have sent the present Greek Army and police forces to Egypt for a vacation * * * and perhaps send 70,000 or more British troops along with them. * * * Under present conditions elections in Greece cannot fall to be anything but a farce and a mockery of self-determination. The monarchists and reactionaries—all of those who never fought the Germans or who collaborated with them—are sure to win.

Prof. Jerzy Neyman, of the University of California, who was a member of the Allied mission observing Greek elections, made the following statement just recently:

The proposal of a loan to the Greek Government is based on the premise that the Greeks have a democratic government and that it was put in power by a majority of the Greek people in reasonably free elections. I am convinced that this premise is wrong. * * * While in Greece I witnessed fraud and terrorism on the part of the Royalist group surpassing anything I could imagine. To whoever chose not to close his eyes, it was clear that both the terrorism and the fraud were highly organized.

OSS TESTIMONY

Mr. Costa G. Couvaras, a former officer in the United States Army who headed an OSS mission in Greece for some 8 months behind the enemy lines during the occupation and for 9 months after liberation, has the following to say:

In my capacity as a secret agent, I made numerous reports to our military authorities and the United States Government citing the terror which started in January 1945 and was growing in strength when I left Greece in July of that year. * * * In June of 1945, I investigated the situation in northern Peloponesus, the Ionian Islands, the district of Epiras, and central Greece, and I saw government-condoned terror in its rawest form. The people who had taken part in the guerilla movement were being systematically exterminated by Royalist bands and former collaborators, and I would

like to state in the most categorical way, that most of the people were far from being Communists.

The Prime Minister of the Greek Government prior to March 31, 1946, M. Sophoulis, stated on March 18, 1946, that "the necessary prerequisites for fair election—law and order—do not exist in Greece today." He charged that "the extreme right is an organized violence and terrorism, supported by the tolerance as well as the active backing of the state organs."

Former Greek Foreign Minister John Sofianopoulos, Liberal Party, stated just prior to the election:

Without a radical change in the present political situation, the elections which are being hastened by the Government and the right, cannot mean anything but a falsification and suppression of the people's will.

Another Greek Moderate political leader, and former deputy premier, the late George Kafandaris, stated in March 1946 that it was a "mockery" to send Anglo-American observers to the elections, since their outcome had been determined in advance by the beatings and murders carried out by the Royalists.

MINISTERS PROTEST

I might also point out that 11 of 35 ministers in the Sofoulis government resigned just prior to the March 1946 elections in protest against holding the elections on March 31, asserting that elections at that time would be a farce and a mockery. These 11 ministers were: Kafandaris, Deputy Premier; Mercouris, Minister of Public Works; Novas, Minister of Education; Mylonas, Minister of Finance; Evripais, Minister of Air; Bourdaras, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs; Kartalis, Minister of Supply; Pappas, Under-Secretary of Supply; Georgakis, Governor of the Ionian Islands; Petmezias, Minister of Information; Sofianopoulos, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In addition three other ministers as well as the premier protested the holding of elections, but Winston Churchill and General Scobias insisted that the elections should be held, and so they were held.

The statistics found in the report of the allied mission to observe the Greek election are most interesting. The Greek Government announced that there were 2,211,000 Greeks who registered and eligible to vote; the allied mission stated that there were only 1,950,000 Greeks eligible to register and that only 1,850,000 were validly registered. In other words, the statistics of the allied mission reveal that the election lists were padded by 361,000 names. The allied mission admitted that only 71 percent of those registered were validly registered.

Prof. Jerzy Neyman, University of California, who was with the allied observers, states:

In one village I personally found that 30 voters out of a sample of 38 were fake. * * * On the upper level it was established that the number of registered voters—only males—exceeded the number of living Greek males by 50 percent.

The allied observers estimated that the number who voted equaled 60 percent of the validly registered, and that 40 percent abstained. But this estimate

is based on the premise that only the validly registered voted, that the padded names were not voted, and that no plural voting took place. We must remember, however, that voting booths were controlled by the rightist elements, and that no precautions were taken to prevent plural voting. The allied mission recommended that voters' hands be stained with indelible ink to prevent plural voting. It is logical, therefore, to assume that the padded names were voted, that plural voting did take place, and that these fraudulent votes were cast for the Royalist candidates. If this was true, then the number of validly registered votes cast was less than 50 percent of the total, and the number of abstentions was over 50 percent.

THOUSANDS IN PRISON

Let me remind you also that when this election took place the Greek Government admitted that some 16,000 people were in prison, and approximately 150,000 people were hiding in the mountains. Furthermore, only the Monarchist-Fascist Parties and the Sophoulis Liberals voted—the leftist and center parties boycotted the election. It has been claimed that only the leftists boycotted the election. But the record reveals the significant fact that besides the EAM, the election was boycotted by the left Liberals, the left Democratic Party led by ex-Foreign Minister John Sofianopoulos, the Progressive Party led by former Deputy Premier Kafandaris, and the Republican Associations led by Gen. Alexander Othoaios.

Thus we see that this so-called 85-percent plurality upon which the present Greek Government rests was obtained in an election which was preceded by a Royalist reign of terror lasting over a period of many months, where the registration lists were padded by 29 percent, where only the rightist parties, and one moderate party participated, and in which the total vote cast represented less than 50 percent of the validly registered voters. On the basis of such an election, I fail to see how anyone can claim that this was a free election, and that the present Greek Government rests on the will of the Greek people.

SECURITY BATTALIONS

No discussion of the present Greek Government is complete without mentioning the Security Battalions which are the most important props to Royalist authority in Greece. Just what are the origins of the Security Battalions? They were originally established under the old Metaxas dictatorship for maintaining the Government and for hounding and exiling democratic citizens and statesmen. This instrument of oppression was continued during the occupation by the Nazis and the Greek Quislings. After the liberation the Greek Government found that the British Army and the Royal Mountain Brigade, organized in Egypt from ardent Royalist sympathizers, were unable to put down the people and restore royal authority. So the members of the Security Battalions, who were then in prison awaiting trial as collaborators, were incorporated into the army. In May 5, 1946, the Security Battalions were formally reconstituted.

Prior to the election of March 1946, Premier Sophoulis admitted that former collaborators and Greek Fascists had control of four-fifths of the police apparatus of the Greek Government.

It is interesting to note just who is the leader of the security battalions in Greece today. As I mentioned earlier, it is the present Greek Minister of Public Security, Gen. Napoleon Zervas, a notorious Greek quisling who collaborated with the Germans throughout a greater part of the occupation. I have in my possession a translation of a German military report from the German Twenty-second Mountain Army Corps, which had its headquarters in northwestern Greece, which proves that Napoleon Zervas was a collaborator with the Nazis and a traitor to the Greek Nation. This copy was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Costa G. Couvaras, who is a former officer in the United States Army and chief of an OSS secret mission to Greece. Yet, this Zervas is the head of the entire police system in Greece today. I might mention also that the present head of the Athens police force is a Mr. Evert, who held the same job during the Nazi occupation.

Thus the make-up of the present Greek Government is a Fascist King, a parliament chosen in an undemocratic election, and a security police force recruited from the ranks of the collaborators and Fascists and headed up by the arch-collaborator, Napoleon Zervas.

RECORD OF THE GREEK GOVERNMENT

One can hardly expect the present Government of Greece to adopt enlightened policies. John Stuart Mill, the great English political philosopher of the nineteenth century, once set forth the proposition that the degree to which a government will promote the general welfare is in direct proportion to the percentage of the people who have had a voice in choosing the officials of said government. If the Mill hypothesis is valid, then one would expect the present Greek Government, resting not on the consent of the people but based upon a small clique of reactionaries and vested interests, to adopt policies which favor only the royalist minority and the vested interests.

Since the liberation of Greece, over \$850,000,000 in money and goods have been poured into Greece, furnished by UNRRA, Great Britain, and the United States. Yet the economic situation in Greece is getting steadily worse. The chief reason why this condition exists is the inefficiency and corruption of the present Greek Government which has shown an unwillingness and inability to adopt sound economic policies.

For example, the Government refused to make any effort to control inflation. According to the report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the general price level in Greece has increased by 145 times between 1939 and 1946. In 1939 cotton sold for 24 drachmas per unit—the 1946 price was 1,500 drachmas. The 1939 price for wheat was 10 drachmas per unit—in 1946 wheat sold for 1,300 drachmas. The exchange value of the drachma has fallen

to but a fraction of its prewar level. In 1939 the exchange rate of the drachma to the dollar was 120; in 1946 it was 5,000, or 41.7 times greater.

One result of this inflation has been the steady impoverishment of the people, especially the peasants who make up about two-thirds of the Greek population. Another result has been the enrichment of the speculators and black marketeers who took advantage of this inflation to amass fortunes.

LUXURIES IMPORTED

The Greek Government has refused to control the export and import of goods, with the result being that funds made available through British and American credits have been used for the purchase of luxury goods and not for necessities. Big cars, silks, perfumes, and other luxury items have been imported at the very time that food and clothing were needed by the population. Between February and December 1946 some \$38,000,000 in luxury items were brought into Greece, yet during the same period only \$4,000,000 worth of industrial machinery was imported.

The Royalist Government has been unwilling to make any effort to control the flow of gold and currency out of the country. American bankers estimate that over \$50,000,000 in private Greek assets are deposited in American banks today, and that an additional \$150,000,000 of Greek private assets are deposited in British banks. Furthermore, another \$150,000,000 is owed by British insurance companies to Greek shipowners, and these credits are also deposited in British banks. In other words, there are some \$350,000,000 in private Greek assets in British and American banks at the very time that the Greek Government is asking for \$250,000,000 from the United States. Much of these funds have been shipped from Greece since the liberation—this could never have happened had the government made some effort to control the exportation of currency and gold.

TAX STRUCTURE INEQUITABLE

The Royalist Government has maintained a most unjust and inequitable tax structure. In the recent report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the Greek tax structure was described as follows:

Present Greek taxes fall heavily on the poor people and far less heavily, in proportion to their income, on the well to do. Most local revenues come from commodity taxes. Over four-fifths of the total tax revenues thus come from taxes which either reduce incomes to producers (especially farmers), or raise costs to consumers (mostly farmers and city workers). Less than one-fifth of the taxes is of the type which bears primarily on well-to-do persons receiving large incomes. The tax structure is responsible, in part at least, for the present exceedingly unequal distribution of wealth and income in Greece, far less equal than that in more industrialized countries. In every part of the country the great majority of farmers are poverty stricken and destitute. City factory workers or public employees are not in much better shape. Yet it is on these two classes, farmers and low-income workers, that present taxes fall most heavily. At the same time that this widespread poverty exists the stores are full of all kinds of goods

at high prices and the restaurants are thronged with well-dressed people, enjoying the good food and wine, who live very comfortably despite the poverty all around them. Yet the tax burden falls on them far less heavily in proportion to their incomes than it does on the low-income farmers and workers.

In other words, the Greek Government has refused to evolve a sound tax structure because it would embarrass the wealthy crowd of aristocrats and profiteers whose interests this Government is interested in promoting. Everything that this Government has done regarding policy has been designed to promote the interests and enrich the vested interests at the expense of the people. Inflation was allowed to take place to the enrichment of the black marketeers and war profiteers; no controls over imports were instituted to prevent these same profiteers and wealthy groups from importing luxury items while the people starved; no control over gold was established to prevent hoarding and the shipment of gold out of the country to be deposited in foreign banks in the name of wealthy Greeks; few taxes were levied against the great incomes, while the incomes of the people were taxed heavily. This is the record of the present Greek Government. This Government is one which places special privilege over human rights—the rights of the aristocracy over the rights of the people. It is a Government of special privilege which functions in the interests of special privilege.

IS THIS DEMOCRACY?

It is this fascistic, undemocratic, corrupt and venal government that the United States is selecting to carry the banner of democracy in the Balkans. If it is so democratic, why are some 16,000 men and women in concentration camps? If it has the support of the Greek people, why is it that it is in danger of collapse before 13,000 guerrillas? After all, it has a trained army of 120,000 plus 10,000 British troops and still it must have the support of the United States to maintain itself. Either one or another of the following propositions must be true: Either this Government is in no danger of collapse before the attack of 13,000 guerrillas, or it is so inefficient and so lacking in popular support that it has no right to exist.

The unqualified support of the present Greek Government is a most serious mistake on the part of the United States. In the first place, it will not bring democracy to Greece. In fact, the Truman doctrine has already brought about an intensification of oppression and royalist terror. On March 31, of this year, Mr. Arthur Krock reports the following in the New York Times:

The announcement that the United States is going to bail out Greece . . . was . . . the signal for a new campaign of repression by the Ministry of the Interior. . . . Arrests of citizens were made between midnight and 5 o'clock a. m. and within 24 hours those seized were deported to a lonely island without a public trial.

In one 3-day period after the United States said it would assume political responsibility, the Greek Government arrested 600 persons in Athens, mostly professional—doctors, lawyers, etc.—and sent them away,

frankly declaring that there was no longer any need to exercise restraint . . . the rightists and extremists, encouraged by the President's speech, now trumpet that the center is almost as traitorous as the left because it doesn't make humble obeisance to the Government.

My position is similar to that taken by the scholarly Frederick Schuman, professor of political science at Williams College and America's leading authority on world politics. Recently the United States News asked Professor Schuman this question: "Should the United States help to rehabilitate weak nations in Europe as a means of stopping growth of communism?" Professor Schuman's answer was as follows:

Your query begs the question. Everybody, except Communists, wants to stop the growth of communism. Everybody, including Communists, wants relief and rehabilitation for war-stricken nations. But communism will be promoted, not stopped, by proposals to bolster the Fascist governments of Greece and Turkey with American money and arms.

Walter Lippmann takes the same position in his April 8 column in the Washington Post when he says:

The case of Greece illustrates concretely the basic fallacy of the Truman doctrine in its present uncorrected, unqualified, and unbalanced form. It is that the expansion of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism can be checked by subsidizing governments, parties, factions, which are most undeniably anti-Communist. A policy of this kind is bound to fail because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world and alienates the moderate and democratic forces.

It assumes that mankind is divided into totalitarian Communists and Jeffersonian Democrats. It is not. There are also Nazis, Fascists, feudal lords, war lords. There are also Republicans, enlightened conservatives, liberals, progressives, social Democrats, Socialists, Christian Socialists, cooperators, labor parties, democratic planners, and what not.

If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally—and in his heart a Jeffersonian Democrat—we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people everywhere. We shall embrace the extremists of the right as against the extremists of the left, when it is our interest and our duty to align ourselves with the middle and moderate parties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, upon one thing the Members of the House of Representatives seem agreed. We are in accord that we stand at the crossroads of a great and momentous decision in our national history, a decision which will undoubtedly affect the future course of the world and of the welfare of mankind. Not since the days of Genghis Khan, Alexander the Great, Attila the Hun, and Adolf Hitler has the world seen such an aggressive, conquering, ever-expanding force as now con-

fronts mankind in the form of Soviet Russia. This force combines two elements, that of military might and that of political persuasion. Together these two elements have amassed a total of 275,000 square miles during and since the war, and in this connection I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the map I have here. If there is any doubt that this is an expansive aggressive force, only look at the map. The gentleman who said that Russia is today smaller than it ever was before in history can well look at this map also.

The red on the map indicates those areas of the earth's surface today under the complete domination of the Soviet Union. The areas in orange indicate the areas annexed by the Soviet Union. The red-checked portions of the map indicate Soviet occupation areas. The parts in dark blue indicate the areas of the earth today in which the Soviet Union has evidenced an aggressive interest.

The world is rapidly choosing up sides, Mr. Chairman, and it is rapidly being divided into two zones, one red and the other white. The tentacles of this aggression reach in all directions, into all stratas of society, and these tentacles ruthlessly sweep aside all opposition, military and political. With an attitude of appeasement that would have shamed Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, we have lent ourselves and our strength in aiding and abetting this imperialistic design. We have spoken softly in a world in which violence, unfortunately, seems to be the order of the day. We have urged moderation and legal processes, we have acceded to almost every conference demand made by Soviet Russia. We have been parties to the partition of free lands and the subjugation of free people. We have done all of these things for one purpose, and for one purpose alone, and that purpose was to achieve the peace of the world.

We have supported and entered into the United Nations in almost all of its phases. We have entered into the United Nations realizing that while it is not the perfect instrumentality for peace it is the only hope the world has at the present time of achieving a lasting peace.

Now, in answer to an appeal which definitely falls outside of the capabilities and the Charter of the United Nations, we propose to offer aid and assistance to two nations very direly in need of it if they are to withstand the Red tide of conquest—the forces of armed political and military aggression—the same forces indicated in red on this map. We do not propose under this legislation to consign Greece and Turkey to that fate. Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania are names on a tragic roll call—a roll call that is a said epitaph for millions upon millions of men who died to insure the free determination of free peoples.

In the face of this evidence, in light of these aggressive facts, it is proposed that this Nation take immediate action to stem the sea of red and to grant economic and military assistance to these two countries. Certainly there is a calculated risk. There is a calculated risk in sitting in this Chamber under these

temporary girders. They might fall at any time. There is a calculated risk in crossing the street. You may be hit by a truck. The result of our positive action is uncertain, but should we fail to take such action, I say there is nothing uncertain about the future of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The evidence of things to come is here before your eyes.

Mr. Wallace, the vociferous tourist; the Daily Worker; and the domestic Communists are all in perfect accord. "Let us not do this thing," they say. "Let us not offer an affront to one of our great allies." The affront offered free men is here on this map. The affront is to every one who holds liberty and freedom and human dignity to be a part of his birthright.

It has been said that this is an imperialistic program. What are the facts to indicate that this is imperialistic? If there is one nation in the world today that has no recent record of imperialism, it is the United States of America. We voted fifty and one half billion dollars toward the winning of the war. We received seven and one half billion of it back. Certainly, that is a strange pattern for imperialism. We have demanded no special trade or economic concessions as the result of our participation in that victorious war. That, too, is hardly in the imperialistic pattern. We voluntarily and without strings granted independence to one of the richest holdings ever possessed by a major power, the Philippine Islands. Not only that, but we are doing everything possible to stabilize the Philippine economy and help that nation back to a sound condition. Further than that, we have asked other lands to dissolve their colonial systems and give independence to the subjects of such lands. We have given up our extraterritoriality rights in China and elsewhere. Imperialism! Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, our activity in world affairs does not bear out the contention that we have been imperialistic.

And, most of all, Mr. Chairman, if we were imperialistic, we would have no necessity for the use of soft phrases and diplomatic double talk. We hold in our hands an ace that we have been playing as a deuce for months. No nation in possession of the secret of atomic energy need tread lightly or speak softly in the pursuit of imperialism. We have, however, chosen to pursue our foreign relations in a legal constitutional and humanitarian manner. But, while we have temporized and while we have supported the United Nations in a seemingly impossible situation, the tide of armed aggression has rolled on engulfing everything that has stood in its way.

What of the United Nations? Much has been said of bypassing this great organization. I can only draw this parallel. If it is bypassing anyone to dash into the surf to rescue a drowning man, while another prospective rescuer lies bound hand and foot on the beach, then we have bypassed a bound and gagged United Nations. So long as the veto power is exercised in the Security Council the UN is bound hand and foot, and we can have no hope of success under these circumstances, in trying to rehabilitate these nations to useful membership in

the family of nations through the United Nations as it is now constituted.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] has said that we should put the spotlight on aggressors and on aggression through the United Nations. I agree with him. There is at the present time, and has been for several months, a mission in northern Greece investigating the incidents along the Grecian frontiers facing Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, checking on the circumstances, attempting to get at the facts in the best spirit of international cooperation. What has happened? Was the mission permitted access to information? Were they given the help and assistance that you would expect to be granted to a great international organization? No; they were not.

This morning's paper carried this item from Lake Success, N. Y.:

LAKE SUCCESS, N. Y., May 6.—The United Nations Balkan Investigating Commission informed the Security Council tonight that Albania and Yugoslavia had refused to cooperate with the Commission's subsidiary group which has been ordered to watch over the troubled Greek border area.

The Commission telegraphed from Geneva, Switzerland, that it felt incompetent to deal with questions raised by the refusal of the two countries and, for that reason, was asking instructions.

Now, if that is the sort of greeting and cooperation that is to be accorded an investigating committee operating under the United Nations, how far do you think such a commission could get at the present time in either Greece or Turkey?

The committee which has had this legislation under study has heard almost everything that can be said on the subject. No amendments that will be offered from the floor will be anything new to the members of the committee. Each amendment has been discussed pro and con. We have heard hundreds of thousands of words of testimony. We have listened to scores of witnesses, representing both the extreme right and the extreme left and all way points in between.

I intend to support this legislation, and I intend to support it without amendments, because I think for the first time in many years this Nation is speaking with a voice of authority, with a voice of principle, and with a voice in defense of certain basic rights of man.

Turkey? Much has been said about oil, and it might be well to admit that oil is a dirty period at the end of a long and unsatisfactory sentence. But the unfortunate fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that no one has yet found a substitute for oil. Not only our wartime economy but our peacetime economy operates on oil. Until such time as a substitute has been developed it will continue to operate on oil.

There are in the portion of the world under discussion three great reserves of oil. Two of them are today under the bayonets of the Red Army—the great reserves at Ploesti and the reserves south of the Urals. There remains for world consumption from known reserves one other great pool—the pool in the Middle East.

A knife has been mentioned during this debate—a knife which at one time was

oratorically and dramatically plunged into the heart of the United Nations by one of the speakers, who stated that if this proposal was passed we who support it would have accomplished its death. I say that if this legislation is defeated those who defeat it will have wielded the knife and will not only cut off the hope of these lands for rehabilitation but will also have severed the jugular vein upon which we must depend for our future welfare in war or peace.

National interest, Mr. Chairman, may not be a popular thing, but I contend that it is not imperialistic to think in terms of your own country once in a while.

A great American, Patrick Henry, once said, "Gentlemen may cry 'peace, peace,' but there is no peace." I might add that where a situation like this exists there is an ideological warfare going on. It is going on from day to day. Unless it is stopped, it will engulf the Middle East, Asia, the Mediterranean world, and Africa, and then heaven help the United Nations. When two powers glare across a conference table at each other, Russia on the one hand and the United States on the other, you will indeed have sounded the death knell of the United Nations. You will never sound that knell by saving free peoples to useful membership.

I think that passage of this legislation is essential if the United Nations organization is going to become a great moral force in this world of curs, and I am equally certain that the quickest way to write fins to our civilization as we know it is to fail to face up to the facts in this world of ours as they exist today.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Evidently the gentleman feels that the \$400,000,000 will accomplish the purpose of stopping Russia. Assume that it does not, then is the gentleman prepared to go to war to stop communism, or are we just bluffing with the \$400,000,000?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I do not consider it a bluff at all. So far as I am concerned, I am very serious and very hopeful about our chances with this program. I cannot guarantee success of the undertaking, but I am most hopeful that a show of honest determination at this time, proving that we mean what we say, will do the job.

Mr. BREHM. I am also hopeful, but I have never believed in bluffing and I am also quite sure that Mr. Stalin does not bluff easily.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the easiest way for any Member of this House is to vote "yes" on H. R. 2616.

It is proposed by the President and supported by the Secretary of State. It is supposed to stop the spread of communism throughout the world and preserve democratic institutions everywhere. It pretends to demonstrate the determination of the United States to exercise wise and acceptable world leadership.

And it is opposed by Henry A. Wallace, Communists, and Communist-front organizations. Anyone who votes against it will be called an isolationist and a pro-Communist.

Politically and ideologically, H. R. 2616 looks like a natural.

Yet, in spite of all this, I am against it. But for exactly opposite reasons than Mr. Wallace and the Communist sympathizers.

The people of the United States want to extend reasonable help to the needy of the world. But, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H. R. 2616, is not just something to further assist in the rehabilitation of gallant Greece. It is designed to put in motion the purposes set forth in the President's speech of March 12, 1947, before a joint session of Congress.

Among other things, the President said in that speech:

The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

One aspect of the present situation which I wish to present to you at this time for your consideration and decision concerns Greece and Turkey. * * *

The United States must supply that assistance. We have already extended to Greece certain types of relief and economic aid, but these are inadequate.

There is no other country to which democratic Greece can turn. * * *

The British Government, which has been helping Greece, can give no further financial or economic aid after March 31. * * *

I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey, and I shall discuss these implications with you at this time. * * *

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes. * * *

If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress. * * *

This is a serious course upon which we embark.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be asked: Do we not have something called a bipartisan foreign policy and should not every Republican follow the President?

Follow him where?

When he says we must—cannot afford not to—spend untold billions of the American taxpayers' money for the benefit of named and unnamed foreign governments, or when he says we cannot afford to extend our program for our own veterans any further?

Mr. Chairman, I will not and cannot be a part of any such shameful sham as that.

Follow the President, Where?

When, on March 12, he said we must spend unlimited billions to stop the danger of communism all over Europe and Asia, or when he said it was a mere bugaboo in America?

When, on March 12, he announced this policy, or when, at the same time, the representatives of his State Department were urging us to provide in addition to \$16,000,000,000 already spent, still more vital materials to Russia?

When, on March 12, he branded the spread of communism throughout the world as a serious threat to us, or when, 2 weeks later, for the first time, he decided he ought to clean out the Communists from his own administrative departments?

When, on March 12, he announced this policy, or when, from the end of the war down to that time and since, we have appeased and given to Russia almost everything she wanted, and furnished her with \$11,000,000,000 of lend-lease during the war and almost half again as much since, to strengthen her for the advancement of the very things he now says we must give billions more to other nations to stop?

When, on March 12, he advocated unlimited spending in such amounts, in such places, and in such manner as he might determine, without the slightest regard to its effect upon our own economy, or when, on April 21, he said, "But we can provide the necessary assistance only if we ourselves remain prosperous?"

When he says we should not reduce taxes, but should pay off the public debt, or when he says we should add to that public debt a billion dollars for Greece, Turkey, and Korea and unknown billions in the future for unnamed other foreign nations?

When he says that, to save our economy, we must reduce prices, or when he advocates more and more Federal expenditures, more pay raises, and more shortages of needed materials here by shipping greater and greater quantities abroad?

When he advocates our wholehearted support of the United Nations or when, on March 12, he regards the United Nations as not only incapable of acting in what he calls the present crisis but as not important enough even to be consulted about the matter?

When he says, on March 12, that no other nation is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek Government, that the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind required and that it is absolutely necessary for us to adopt and continue his plan as a long-term policy for our own national security, or when, a few weeks later, his appointed representative to the United Nations tells that organization that if it does not like what we are doing we will abandon this vitally necessary policy upon the mere request of that organization?

When his various Secretaries of State criticize Russia for not cooperating with the rest of the United Nations, or when he announces on March 12 that our own Nation declares its right to act independently of that organization whenever we deem the organization is incapable of taking the kind of action we want?

When he says that we must protect the right of all nations to choose the form of government the people desire, or when

he says that we must spend our money to compel, induce, or bribe the government they have to reject communism and subject its policies to our domination for what we conceive to be our security and purposes?

Mr. Chairman, one might be able to follow the President if one could find out where he is going, and if one believed it to be the right direction; but I confess my absolute inability to follow him when he jumps upon his international horse and rides off in all directions.

Like a man with the oars in a rowboat, we are asked just to pull as hard as we can and never bother at any time to turn our heads to see in what direction we are going.

The United States of America emerged from World War II the strongest nation of the world and one in which individual liberty is still secure. We led in the organization of the United Nations. We are trying to help rehabilitate the world. We have the opportunity and the responsibility for world leadership, both of which are great and serious.

Because of this, never has there been a time when our foreign policy was of greater importance, and hence never a time when that policy should be formulated so practically, so wisely, and so carefully, or with such broad vision and foresight, or when it should be so clearly limited to our ability to carry out and to give at least reasonable promise of success. And is it necessary to say that it should be founded upon the very principles in which we ourselves believe and through which we have attained such success and happiness?

So it is imperative, whatever that policy is to be, that it be not hastily concocted in an atmosphere of excitement, fear, haste, and the breathless psychological pressure of a crisis or emergency, real or fancied.

Yet, Mr. Chairman on March 12, 1947, the President of the United States confronted us with exactly this problem, with exactly the same old plea: That here is something that must be done and done quickly; you do not have time to consider another or better method; never mind whether we can carry it out, what it may cost, or what it may do to us; if you do not take this step, all is lost.

And, worst of all, he candidly told us it was to be the long-term future foreign policy of the United States.

What is this new and revolutionary foreign policy?

I have carefully read the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this bill—Report No. 314. Mr. Chairman, if I did not have such great respect for my distinguished colleagues who prepared that report, I would be inclined to call it a bit naive. As to the details and extent of this new policy, its reasonable chance of success, its effect upon our own economy, and whether there are other possible courses we could take, the report is crammed with conclusions but feeble from lack of facts. It assumes that, since we must combat communism, the policy proposed by the President is the only way to do it; hence anyone who opposes

it will be responsible for the spread of communism in the future. No doubt it is the only policy the President, or rather his State Department, can conceive. But it is not the only policy which can be followed—should have been adopted long ago—and the failure to follow which has produced this present situation. I shall speak of that near the conclusion of these remarks.

The committee says we are not interfering in the affairs of foreign nations, because—report, page 10:

The Greek and Turkish Governments have themselves requested the assistance proposed in this bill.

The Governments have requested it. Of course. By why? And at what price to the freedom of the people of those countries?

Our State Department says—again page 10 of the report:

It is our primary purpose to assist the Greek people, so that they may retain the opportunity to choose the form and composition of their government in accordance with the wish of the majority. This also applies to Turkey. We do not conceive it to be our function to influence the judgment of these two peoples with regard to their governments. . . . whatever we may do to assist Greece and Turkey, we propose scrupulously to respect the sovereignty of those countries with respect to the conduct of their internal as well as their external affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have ever read a statement that was either more stupid or more hypocritical, even from the State Department.

Let us examine it.

To get the results we want, the United States of America must dominate and control the foreign and domestic policies of the governments which are the recipients of our gifts to every extent necessary for that purpose. The committee recognizes that.

On page 1 of the report this appears:

The principal purpose of this bill is to aid Greece and Turkey to survive as free and independent nations.

This statement is repeated on page 10. But on pages 8 and 9 appear the following statements:

The committee has been given assurance that our Government will insist that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in such matters as fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, strict husbanding and control of the foreign exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These are all essential to the establishment of stability in Greece. . . . The committee was assured by the State Department that the Greek Government would be required to take adequate measures to assure the maximum use of its own resources in the program of rehabilitation and reconstruction, and the fullest support of this program by Greek nationals.

Who determines the propriety and adequacy of these measures? We do, of course. We must, to get the results we want.

Mr. Chairman, the present Greek Government, receiving our aid, is obligated to control the endorsement and support of our program by the Greek people, instead of the Greek people being

free to select whatever domestic and foreign policies they choose to follow.

The report further says that the Department of State "recalled in this connection the assurance that had been given, that the purpose of this legislation is to enable Greece to help itself, and that in the administration of assistance given under the bill adequate guaranties would be required of the Greek Government to assure the carrying out of all steps necessary to the achievement of this purpose."

Now, I ask, Mr. Chairman, is the real object of this policy to assist the Greek people to rehabilitate themselves and preserve their own freedom of action? It certainly is not. It is to help a tottering Greek Government maintain itself in power so that the Greek people may be forced to follow policies and take actions which must be whatever we consider necessary for our own national security.

And on page 10 appears this statement:

Government witnesses testified that the greatest care will be exercised to avoid any action which could be regarded as an infringement on the sovereignty of either country, Greece or Turkey.

Yet the whole purpose of this new policy of ours, the expenditure of our money, the presence of our advisers in these two countries, the guaranties we have exacted, is to control the actions of these governments for what we deem to be our own interests and security, which, I submit, Mr. Chairman, is exactly the opposite of maintaining the sovereignty of Greece and Turkey or the freedom of their peoples.

The bill provides for the rendering of financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries. But the report says—page 8:

The terms upon which such aid is furnished from time to time can best be determined by the President. . . . It is believed it would not be wise or practical to attempt, in advance, to specify such terms for all possible contingencies in the legislation.

Assistance provided under the bill for military purposes, being essential to our own security, and not in itself creating the wherewithal to repay, should be made as a clear grant. Financial assistance for current civilian consumption should also be a grant. . . . However, financial repayment obligations should not be established if there appears to be no reasonable prospect of repayment.

Can there be any possible doubt that absolutely none of this money will ever come back to the United States?

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a member of the committee, in his minority report, points out that since 1823, historians say that Greece has been sustained by loans from other countries.

Up to the beginning of 1947, the United States has made available to the Greek Government approximately \$451,500,000, including UNRRA shipments of which we contributed 72 or 73 percent—see report, page 16. Within the past week or so, we passed House Joint Resolution 153 for \$200,000,000. The report says: "Under the provisions of this relief bill Greece would receive" about "\$60,000,000" of the

original \$350,000,000—now cut to \$200,000,000. And to Turkey \$130,979,811.

So we have made available to Greece and Turkey together \$617,479,811, taking the sum of \$35,000,000 as the share of Greece under the reduced foreign relief resolution. Although that bill made no express provision for any country involved, look at the committee report on the present bill, page 9:

Under provisions of the relief bill, Greece would receive from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 for minimum requirements.

But that is not all. Last year this Congress gave Great Britain \$3,750,000,000, one of the purposes being to support her empire policy so that we would not face the very situation we are facing now.

And with all of that, this bill provides for \$400,000,000 more—and just until June 30, 1948. After that, still more. And to other countries still more. In contemplation right now are these additional amounts.

From hearings, section 4, paragraph (b), of the bill says:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

So we are, as usual, merely saying that we can appropriate in the future, this sum of money, or are we?

Paragraph (a) of the same section says.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

If that is not an appropriation of \$100,000,000 I do not understand the meaning of the word.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to General Marshall in his own profession, I cannot consider him an outstanding expert on diplomacy, economics, or political prognostication. His training has been to wage war when war was necessary, and has never been in the field of diplomacy, the sensible object of which today should be to prevent war. Having had some slight military experience myself, I know that no good soldier is a good economist. His job is to win a war no matter what the economic or other cost. As a result, the economic waste that has accompanied wars, particularly our own, has been appalling. Nor am I a believer in the modern tradition that you can make anybody an expert overnight by either electing or appointing him to a governmental job with a title. Furthermore, I think I am justified in not placing too much reliance on the general, as the present administration, in presaging what will take place in the future if we do this thing or do not do that thing, when he, nor it, was able to predict Pearl Harbor 48 hours before it happened. Without attempting to place any blame for past performances, I think I am justified in having doubts about future ones.

Lastly, General Marshall, being new at this diplomatic game, is taking the

advice of those in his Department whom he assumes know something about the business, although many of the rest of us question the soundness of this assumption from past experience. In any event, it is clear to anyone who has followed the course of events since the appointment of our latest Secretary of State, that he is not yet running the State Department. The State Department is running him.

Mr. Chairman, I do not ask anybody to rely on my mere statement that I am not really an isolationist. Not only have I advocated adequate national defense when the majority of our people were against it, but I went further. I did something about it. After serving in World War I, I spent several years in the Reserve of the Army, 14 years in the National Guard and was mustered into the Federal service for World War II. I have advocated the creation of a United States intelligence service throughout the world so that we would never leave the people of our Nation ignorant of what was going on and with no opportunity to prepare for it. I voted for the appropriations for UNRRA—with misgivings as to its administration which were subsequently justified. I not only voted for the foreign relief bill a few days ago, but I voted against the amendment to reduce it from \$350,000,000 to \$200,000,000.

Nor do I ask anybody to rely on my mere statement that I am opposed to communism. For over a quarter of a century I have fought communism, in the face of ridicule and being called a Red baiter and a witch hunter. I certainly do not belong to the Johnny-come-late-lies who are suddenly and vociferously opponents of communism but who for years past have been its most devoted friends and protectors.

Mr. Chairman, I am merely amused at the fright of some people at being classed with Henry A. Wallace should they oppose the presently proposed policy of the President. I have never voted one way or another because somebody else, for reasons of his own, voted one way or another. I expect to go on voting the way I think is right no matter who, for entirely different reasons, may go the same way at that particular time. And, if it be any comfort to those who are stricken with this fear, reliable information has reached me that Eleanor Roosevelt is much in favor of the President's policy. This presents either a dilemma or an out for those who suffer from this kind of fear. Either they will not know which way to go, or they can be right or wrong whichever way they go.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, with all this, there still might be some little excuse for voting for this bill, if there were no other course to follow. But there is another course, a better course, a surer course, a safer course, a cheaper course, which is now and always has been open to us. Our refusal to follow it has brought about the very conditions we are now facing. It is, to my mind, a simple and effective course. It is to say in polite, diplomatic language to Russia that she is not playing our brand of ball, so she gets no more money and no more materials out of us, nor out of anyone else so far

as we can legitimately prevent it until she comes across with a few concessions about letting Greece, Turkey, and other countries strictly alone, about treaties to end the present state of technical war and a few other things in which we and the rest of the world are interested. The one thing Russia needs and has needed to hold communism in Russia and spread it throughout the world is economic strength, and that strength has been constantly bolstered by the policy heretofore followed by the very administration which now proposes to weaken our own economic strength by the presently proposed policy. Russia needs steel, machinery, food, manufactured articles, and everything we are in a position to supply. It is very late, but perhaps still not too late to adopt my suggestion. Yet the administration has not adopted it, and shows no inclination to adopt it. According to reliable information, we have supplied Russia with \$16,000,000,000—\$16,000,000,000; think of it—to build up her economic strength to spread her vile communism throughout the world, and now frightened of the progress and the danger it holds, the only thing we can think of is to spend more billions to counteract the effect of the billions we have spent, and are still spending, to build up.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to start out on a policy of imperialism of our own variety, let us not be hypocritical about it. Let our people know what it is, how dangerous it is, how it may ruin our own economy, and make us a fertile field for the propagation of the very evil germ we say we are going to exterminate elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, the New Deal administration has proceeded upon the theory that it can buy anything. It has tried to buy friendship. It has tried to buy off communism on our own western continents. The success has been negligible and costly. How can we expect to do better in Europe and Asia?

And what will inevitably follow an American policy of bribery and control of other nations? Corruption and collapse, both at home and abroad.

If we pursue this policy to every corner of the earth to which we are lured by the machinations of the Communists it will ruin our own national economy, which is the one big object of communism, and will we not lose the confidence and good will of the people in every country in which we have bribed and bought control of the Government? If we do not follow the policy to its logical conclusion it seems nonsensical to inaugurate it, for when we abandon it will we not lose prestige, all the money we have sunk in it, and the good will of those who liked the hand-outs and expected a continuance of them?

We fed and fed the economy of Japan, only to build her up to try to strike us down, with the loss of thousands of good American lives and billions of dollars worth of our substance. Have we learned absolutely nothing from this experience? It seems not.

I have in mind at least 15 different reasons why I must vote against this bill. I will not take time to list them. If what I have said thus far does not

justify my stand, no further reasons will do so, and I will have to remain in error. But it will be honest error.

The present proposed policy of the President and the State Department which H. R. 2616 is designed to initiate, is a policy to "save the rest of the world in order to save America."

Considering conditions existing in the rest of the world, those which now need attention at home and those which will be created at home as a result of this policy, and with the realization that we are the last hope of individual liberty, so that if we go, everything goes, such a policy is clearly in reverse.

What we should have done long ago, what we should do now, is to follow a policy to "save America in order to save the rest of the world."

Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to doubt the moral, if not constitutional, right of this body to continue the dissipation of the wealth of the American people for purposes which do not bring any direct benefit to them, but which are for the direct benefit of foreign peoples and foreign governments, upon a nebulous theory of some vague theoretical future, indirect benefit to the American people, or through a psychology of fear that by not doing so, they will suffer from some future calamity.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it to be my duty to vote against this bill, and I shall do so.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, no one has attempted to deny that the Truman doctrine as embodied in the legislation before us is a drastic departure from our previous foreign policy, which had as one of its basic factors nonintervention in the affairs of foreign nations in time of peace. Although I realize that the record of the United States is not spotless on nonintervention in times of peace, yet in spite of our adventures into Nicaragua, Panama, Mexico, and a few other ill-advised experiments in imperialism and dollar diplomacy, we have at least given lip service to the policy of nonintervention. We have also had as part of our foreign policy another doctrine known as the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine, in brief, has been a two-edged sword. One edge was pointed toward "any attempt on their part—European nations—to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." The other edge of the sword theoretically pointed toward ourselves and it is embodied in these words from the doctrine, "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part nor does it comport with our policy so to do." Any attempt on the part of the proponents of this bill to make the statement that we are extending the Monroe Doctrine to the borders of Russia and its satellites is fallacious and without foundation in historical record. The Greek-Turkish aid bill is not an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. It is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. This point cannot be denied. Let us there-

fore not try to hide behind any distortion of the Monroe Doctrine.

Two years ago, at the conclusion of the most devastating war in history, the delegates of most of the important nations of the world gathered in San Francisco. For 3 months they dedicated themselves to the task of forming an international organization for the purpose of "saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." They determined to "unite our strength to maintain international peace and security." They wanted to "insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used save in the common interest." They pledged themselves to "employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples," and they pledged further "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." It was upon these principles that the United Nations Charter was formed. It consisted of 19 chapters and contained 111 articles to implement and to facilitate the development and insurance of these principles. The common people of the world lifted up their hearts in hope—hope that at long last the dream of mankind for peace was to be realized. In the 2 years which have passed since then the United Nations has grown. Corollary and auxiliary international groups have been formed. In the main, the United States has taken the lead. In most instances the Russian representatives have failed to vote in harmony with the members of the General Assembly and the Security Council. I hold no brief for their lack of cooperation. In spite of this lack of cooperation, the United Nations has made progress. Various international problems have been settled, problems which are just as grave and fraught with just as much danger as the impending Greek-Turkish matter. Serious international situations in Iran, Lebanon, Spain, Syria, and Indonesia arose. These situations came up for consideration before the Security Council at the reference of one or more of the member nations. Until the present occasion the United States has persistently proclaimed that the jurisdiction of the Security Council and the United Nations be recognized as the prime instrumentality for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our delegates have criticized other members for what seemed to us a failure to recognize such jurisdiction and authority. In each of the above-named cases, Iran, Lebanon, Syria, and Indonesia, and Spain, a solution was found by multilateral action on the part of a majority of the Security Council delegates. We were proceeding within the spirit of collective security and within the framework provided in the United Nations Charter for the solution

of international threats to the peace of the world.

The claim has been made by our President that the United Nations is too weak to take care of the present situation. In view of the previous collective security solutions in Iran, Lebanon, Syria, and Indonesia, many of us consider this statement in need of justification. On March 12 President Truman enunciated the Truman doctrine. In my opinion, this doctrine is in contradiction to many articles within the United Nations Charter. In my opinion, the Truman doctrine is a return to the unilateral relationship between nations. It is a betrayal of the principles enunciated in the United Nations Charter, which clearly indicates that collective security of the nations of the world depends upon a multilateral approach to the problems between nations.

The whole theory of the United Nations is based upon multilateral solutions preceded by full debate and discussion in the General Assembly and the Security Council. Such debate and discussion to be held openly and in the pitiless glare of publicity. The solutions arrived at must be openly arrived at, and must be sustained by a majority vote of the delegates of the respective judicial panels. The conclusions of the General Assembly and the Security Council must also be sustained by a higher force than armaments, be they as antique as the weapons of Greek guerrillas or as modern as the atomic bomb. This force is the moral and spiritual force which is part of the conscience of the common people of the world. It is the force that framed the United Nations Charter. It is the force which alone can sustain international peace. The question before us today is not a question of isolationism; it is basically a question of whether we shall throw the great moral, spiritual, and financial strength of the United States behind the United Nations, or whether we shall turn back again to the unilateral and bilateral methods of solving international difficulties which have twice within our generation engulfed the people of the world in war. Be not deceived by the sophistry and by the plausible arguments which have been presented. Do not be scared by the spectre of war which has been raised by those who seek to support their position. It has been said within the well of this House that this is a question which has to be decided between each Member and his God, and I agree with that statement. I will probably be in the minority when the vote is cast in the House. But unless this bill is amended to bring it within the framework of the United Nations I shall vote against it, and I will vote knowing that I voted in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter, upon which rests the hopes of the common people of the world for international peace.

I consider the Truman doctrine as an undeclared declaration of war if our challenge of unilateral intervention on Russia's borders is accepted.

I do not believe that war with Russia is either justified or inevitable.

If war must come, let it come through the decision of a majority of the United Nations. Let it come with open covenants openly arrived at in harmony with the conscience of the majority of the members of the United Nations.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing upon which everyone here agrees, the sponsors of this legislation and the opponents. That is, they agree that no one knows what this will entail. No one knows where it will end. No one knows when it will end. No one knows what it will cost in either blood or money. We are asked under those conditions to give a blank check to somebody to carry out the objectives of this proposed legislation.

When our constituents ask us what this is all about, we might remember the old barber-shop quartet, we used to sing: "I don't know where I'm going but I'm on my way."

I hope your minds are more susceptible to change than mine is, because, in every part of my being, I feel this is dangerous and the wrong step to take. I was a soldier in the First World War. I was at Versailles when Woodrow Wilson was pleading the cause of the League of Nations. I came back home, and you well remember the charge was made that a few willful men destroyed the League of Nations. Are we to adopt another technique? Is another branch of the Government going to destroy an organization such as the United Nations, that every man, woman, and child with a decent respect for humanity has been praying for for 2,000 years? Yes; you say we have got to be realistic. We have used that old gag over and over again. Are we willing to forget everything we have been taught at our mother's knee. Your preachers and priests and teachers are trying to tell you today that this is not the course to follow. No. I do not think that our Government would intentionally embark upon a policy of imperialism, but I say to you when you take this step there is no retreat. You have got to make good, and the "no imperialism" you are talking about today may be the rankest kind of imperialism tomorrow. Make no mistake about it. The announced purpose of this legislation is, in my opinion, although it is directed at an ideology, a declaration of war. If any other nation would direct toward us that same threat that we now make, I would be willing to declare war on them tomorrow.

Yes; there is an alternative, and that alternative is the United Nations organization, which is intended to deal with problems of this kind. It will never be any stronger than the United States will make it. Let us give to the United Nations this difficult problem to solve. Let us give it our united support, for it can do everything we can do under the so-called new Truman doctrine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, a great philosopher once remarked that "The history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom." If we are really conscious of this blessing in our land, we must also be conscious of the lack of it elsewhere. We must be conscious of it, not only out of a humanitarian regard for others but also as a matter of our own national self-interest.

It must be obvious to most people that even were we so inclined we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. There is no need to rehearse here the well-established fact that because of recent developments in modern science our frontiers are virtually contiguous with the frontiers of others. It is desirable that a world contracted by science be united by freedom in order to preserve peace.

I have been interested in the criticisms which have been made of this measure and I should like to take up a few of these criticisms in order, if possible, to shed some light on what I consider to be the vital issue.

First, it has been said that this is not a relief bill. Of course, it is not primarily a relief bill. It is a measure which is proposed as a strategical move to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of Greece and Turkey, to protect our own national interests, and to preserve peace. The theory behind this bill is that we cannot preserve by appeasement those things which we recently gained by force of arms, and yet in a sense this is a relief bill. If military aid were not given to Greece, the relief which we propose to grant could not reach the needy who are eking out a meager existence in the guerrilla-infested mountains.

Furthermore, this measure constitutes relief in another sense. If we believe that man does not live by bread alone, then we must recognize that there are things other than food and clothing, which man needs. If our system of government has any meaning, it is that we reject the purely materialistic philosophy and base our lives upon spiritual values for which we are willing to make supreme sacrifices. Had Patrick Henry said "Give me security or give me death" we should not know his name today.

Secondly, the argument has been made that the policy represented by this measure is imperialistic and unfriendly to Russia. I have always felt that the Russians themselves who reside in this country must realize that we are not imperialistic. It rather surprises me to find that some of our own compatriots have doubts concerning our intentions. Was it imperialistic when the British landed troops in Greece to help the Greeks defend themselves against the Nazi invaders? Was it imperialistic when the British came to the assistance of Poland and when they landed troops in France? Was it imperialistic when we invaded North Africa, Sicily, Italy, France, and finally Germany? I be-

lieve that the reason for this accusation stems from the failure to recognize that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Wars are but extensions of peacetime conflicts—the final confession of man's inability to solve his differences by peaceful means.

Accordingly, if we were justified in participating in the world's wars, we are at least as justified in participating in the world's peace-time conflicts. We must abandon the idea that we can oppose the disruptive forces now at large in the world without interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. We must interfere. We must interfere in order to bring relief and economic aid to those who need it rather than those who do not and who use it to destroy principles which are still widely cherished. We must interfere in order that these nations shall not be a constant drain on our resources. We must interfere in order that we may rehabilitate rather than pauperize these destitute human beings. We must interfere in order to protect the American people from the use of their money in the cause of communism. More than two billion dollars in relief and economic aid have been expended since the war's end largely through UNRRA. This money did much to strengthen the antifreedom forces. It helped the very forces to which we are opposed. It assisted Communist and terrorist minorities to impose their will on freedom-loving majorities.

I am relieved that the administration has at last seen the error of its ways. I am happy that it has abandoned a policy of appeasement.

There is no question that the betrayal of Poland at Yalta, the help we have furnished to Tito, the hands-off policy in China, the uncontrolled expenditures of millions of the American taxpayers' dollars, as well as many other incidents in the administration's confused approach to postwar problems have contributed to our present predicament. Had the administration been more decisive and clear-headed we might not now be confronted with this grave crisis. Let us hope that the discords and confusions of the past can provide the harmonies of the future. Let us face the actualities as they are presented to us by our President. We must do more than use the power of money. We have been asked to "authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey at the request of those countries and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished." This means involvement. In order to bring this about, in order to shoulder these responsibilities, we must do more than simply export American dollars to relieve human distress. True charity means more than the writing of a check. True participation means more than financial and economic aid.

Now that does not mean that we should be warmongers. In a nation of our demonstrated power, in a people of our mighty achievements, a show of truculence would be as unfitting as it is unnecessary. But I am full of wonder when I hear people violently and vociferously denounce Soviet Russia and yet

seek to shackle their own country in its efforts to contain the spread of despotism. I believe that instead we should talk softly but carry a big stick. It is more becoming to be patient and restrained in our utterances and firm and just in our actions. Then we shall be calling the tune; then we shall cease to revolve in the Russian orbit. We shall have created an orbit of freedom into which we can hope to include Soviet Russia.

In the meantime, we should stop apologizing for our share in the recent war.

We must renounce the hope that we can prevent World War III by methods which failed to prevent World War II. We should place our faith in the force of principle rather than in the power of appeasement. We must bolster these principles, not only by our industrial and military might but by a dynamic concept of our own convictions. It is my profound belief that a peaceful accommodation can more easily be predicated on American strength than on American weakness.

We can perhaps indulge the hope that self-assurance and firmness now will reveal the essential debility of communism. To quote from Abraham Lincoln:

In our intercourse with other nations it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why, then, let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long-threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best.

We can work for the best through the good offices of the United Nations, and we can best prepare for the worst by an abiding sense that until the United Nations has gathered vital momentum the choice for the world lies between a Pax Sovietica and a Pax Americana. This is the issue. This is the salient fact. This is the essential challenge of the hour.

Are we prepared to nullify the tragic sacrifices so gallantly made in World War II? Are we now ready to consign the rest of the world and ourselves along with it to the ash heap of a totalitarian subjugation which differs but little from that which recently engulfed millions of lives?

It is difficult for me to understand those who trust the good intentions of other countries and do not trust the intentions of their native land; those who cry "war" and "imperialism" when the United States acts to protect the threatened and neither report nor denounce certain actions of foreign powers.

Third, the criticism has been made that we are incapable of carrying out this policy. This is a counsel of defeatism and despair which I reject. We have been capable of winning several great wars. Surely we are capable of winning peacetime conflicts. It has been said that this will result in a higher cost of living; that it will bankrupt America. While I do not believe that this will happen, I suggest to you that if the iron curtain were to be extended to high tide on the western shores of

Europe our standard of living would surely go down. May I say also that we were quite willing to make sacrifices to win a war and that, therefore, we should now be willing to make sacrifices to preserve the peace.

Fourth, it has been said that the Greek Government is a reactionary monarchy unrepresentative of the will of the majority. Am I to gather from this accusation that because Russia has a totalitarian form of government we should have refused assistance to her when she became our ally? We may find ourselves in a very difficult position if we cling to such a standard. It might also be pointed out that we in this country have not yet achieved perfection in our Government. With respect to Greece, I should like to state that although the Greek Government is not perfect it represents 85 percent of the Greek Parliament, which was chosen in a fair election under the vigilance of an Allied mission of observers.

It has been said that we should clean out all the Communists in the United States before we take action outside our own country. Are we to wait until utopia has been achieved in Greece and in the United States before we are allowed to take action to salvage some of those things for which the war was fought? Will we have the chance peacefully to preserve our respective systems? Is it not more sensible to take action in order that we may have the opportunity to evolve toward a more perfect freedom? Half a loaf is better than none.

Our choice in life is very rarely between something perfect and something imperfect; it is usually between two imperfect things. Let us not allow the ideal to be the enemy of the attainable.

Fifth, much has been made of American investments in oil in the Middle East. This question of oil is a large subject by itself. While there is no time to go into it in detail, may I say that we should not sacrifice our national interests and the peace of the world simply in order to deprive certain individuals of profits on their investments in oil. May I point out also that aside from oil there are abundantly sufficient reasons for the enactment of this legislation.

We are fast becoming a have-not nation with respect to oil, and we shall do well to look outside our own borders in order to make our strategical position secure. Oil and profit should not be ugly words. Oil has brought comfort and happiness to millions of people, but it would not have done so unless there had been profit.

Sixth, the thought has been advanced with considerable fervor that this measure would involve our fighting on foreign soil. I favor this measure because I believe it to be a deterrent of war. However, I should like to add that if we are to do any fighting, let us by all means do it on foreign soil.

Seventh, it has been argued that we are here bypassing the United Nations. On the contrary, we are proposing to take action in defense of the Charter which the United Nations is incapable

of taking in time. As was well stated in the New York Times:

It will be poor service to the United Nations if Greece has been engulfed by a Communist tide by the time the Committee makes its report.

The United Nations has neither the money, the resources, the military means, nor the power to act. I favor this bill, also, because I have high hopes for the United Nations. Amendments to this bill have been accepted by the other body and by our committee which clearly indicate that the United States has no intention of evading its obligation to consult with the United Nations. Mankind's aspirations for a peaceful world demand that the United Nations receive encouragement while the Greeks and Turks receive our aid.

Aside from all this, Mr. Chairman, there remains the relentless fact that no constructive alternative has been put forward. I realize that this is a sickening moment and I do not suggest for a minute that we are faced with a happy choice. However, we cannot find salvation or security by tying our hands behind our backs. We cannot promote peace by cutting down on our power. We have tried that before. Ours is in a sense a tragic generation. We live in a happy land in which felicitities beyond the dreams of man abound. It is hard for us to take the cold plunge. But we are now, even without this bill, inextricably involved in world affairs. Let us enlarge our conceptions to the circle of our duties. Let us accept the challenge not only within but beyond our borders. Let us remember the words of Winston Churchill when, shortly after the recent war, he said in talking to the British people:

You must be prepared for further effort of mind and body and further sacrifices to great causes if you are not to fall back into the rut of inertia, the confusion of aim, and the craven fear of being great.

This is no time to grow tired. This is the time for greatness.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, when a group of the Pharisaical, or the self-righteous, called on Mr. Lincoln at the time he was President, they said, "Mr. President, we have our way; the Lord's on our side." To which the Great Emancipator replied, "I am not concerned as to that; the question is, Are we on the Lord's side?"

It is not my intention to be dogmatic but let me ask you, fellow colleagues, "Has this so-called debate been fair or has self-righteousness held the right of way and then adroitly put the Lord into the so-called affirmative message in behalf of this power politics proposal?" As has been stated just last week, we voted on this floor and I was happy to vote in behalf of \$200,000,000 for relief, a part of which went to the people—I mean the distressed people; not a ruler—in Greece. We are willing to vote for funds necessary to assist the brave and heroic Greek people in getting food, clothing

and shelter, but how can we support a military alinement with the governments of Greece and Turkey?

Of course the proposal has been blessed with counterfeit metaphysical clothing but I am concerned. Why not listen to the Lord today instead of allowing our self-will and self-righteousness to control us and then claim he has blessed power politics plus propaganda. The common people of no country want war; the common people of whom Lincoln said, "God must have loved them for he made so many." Why could not we listen to the voice of right instead of to leadership that cries, "Peace, peace" and yet detours from the grand trunk line of peace to the side tracks which can only lead us farther afield each mile we travel.

The Senate of the United States has acted on one of the most serious and far-reaching proposals ever presented to this Republic. The Senate vote which approved the President's plan for extending aid to Greece and Turkey marks the official beginning of a new era in world politics. There is little reason to believe that any action can now be taken which will alter the course decided upon by the Chief Executive and the Senate.

We owe it to ourselves and to our children, whose lives will be affected by the decision made this week, to inform ourselves completely as to the direction in which we are traveling. We must reexamine our basic aims in our dealings with other nations. We must recognize the nature of the means which are to be used in an effort to obtain the desired goal. We must anticipate the sacrifices each and every American may be required to make in order to carry this new policy to its ultimate conclusion.

The first and fundamental fact to be faced is that we are now playing power politics, and we are in the middle of the game. The sanctimonious statements made about our humanitarian concern for the Greek people, and for the Turkish people, are window-dressing for the benefit of those who would rather not look at the actual facts, some of which may not be very pretty. If we do not know it, we had better be quick about finding out; we are out to defeat Russia, by peaceful means, we hope; but to defeat her whatever the cost.

Why, we may ask, must we defeat Russia? What about the United Nations? What about the years we worked together as allies against the common enemy, Nazi Germany? What about the principle "live and let live"? What about defeating the threat of communism by making democracy and free enterprise work successfully at home?

The answer to those questions is, "Do not be old-fashioned. Do not be naive. The United States and Russia came out of the recent war the two strongest nations in the world. Unquestionably, we are now stronger than Russia. But potentially Russia is considerably stronger than we can hope to be if we do not expand our sphere of influence." These are the reasons given us for our new policy aimed at defeating Russia. We are also told, by some honest enthusiasts of the new policy, "We

should have had it out with the Russians before we brought our boys home from Europe."

Let us agree Russia is out to take over what she can of eastern Europe, the Near East, and parts of Asia, either physically or ideologically.

Let us agree, we have no stomach for the present Russian Government because it is not a free Government, but a totalitarian dictatorship, which has used cruel and inhuman means to acquire power and maintain itself in power.

Let us agree, we have committed ourselves to stand for free elections in countries throughout the world.

But let us not delude ourselves into thinking that we are planning to solve the problems raised by Russia in the Christian spirit of brotherly love. Let us not indulge in transparent hypocrisy by pretending our policy is based on love of our fellow man or on the will of God.

Let us realize that despite the support given the new Truman doctrine by Secretary of State Marshall it has yet to be shown that anyone has thought through the consequences. The bill was passed by the Senate. The present hysterical fear of Russia has swept Washington so completely that it has drowned the voice of sanity.

Our avowed aim is to keep communism out of Greece and Turkey. Why? Is it because we feel communism would be a bad thing for the Greeks or for the Turks? Examine the form of government which Turkey now boasts. Examine the nature of the present Greek Government. You begin to understand why there are Greek Communists. You begin to see that the present Government of Turkey has a great deal in common with the present Government of Russia.

No; Greece and Turkey must be written off as pawns in the new game of power politics and national self-interest.

Congressional representatives who have just returned from the Middle East admit the truth quite frankly. This is a direct move to keep Russia from gaining access to the Mediterranean.

This is a power struggle to keep Russia from getting into a position from which she might challenge the monopoly held by private British and American oil companies on the vast oil reserves in the Middle East.

This is a one-sided, one-way move to support a worn-out British Empire in its age-old power struggle against Russia.

The question has been asked: "In formulating this new policy, are we consulting with other members of the United Nations?" The answer is, "Yes, we are consulting with certain other members of the United Nations who stand to benefit by this policy. Certainly we have not consulted with Russia, supposedly a member of that group. There is no indication that we have consulted with France, for France, too, has a Communist taint. The State Department, in answer to congressional questioning, promises we will keep the United Nations informed, after we have taken the action we think best.

The question has been asked: "Are we simultaneously building up the UN so

that it will be prepared to take over responsibility of similar problems?" The honest answer is a matter of history. How can a world organization function when its two strongest and most influential members are at swords' points? The official State Department answer is, "It may be that at some future time the United Nations will be organized and equipped so as to render emergency aid to member states of the kind now needed in Greece and Turkey," but, say the managers of our foreign affairs, "Even if the project were not blocked by the objections of certain members of the United Nations, much time would have been lost, and time is of the essence." So you see, there is no reason to build up the United Nations so that it will be prepared to take over such responsibility, for there is always the possibility that the decision might not be in accordance with our wishes.

The question has been asked: "Are we preparing progressively to turn over responsibility to UN?" The honest answer is "Certainly not." We are anticipating a knock-down drag-out struggle between our way of life and the Communist way of life. But is the honest answer given to the Senate when it asks a similar question? Indeed not. The intelligence of our senior statesmen is held in such low repute by the State Department that they apparently expect the following official answer to be credible. I quote: "In the longer range, the United Nations may be able to take over various parts of the economic and financial problem in Greece and Turkey. We are giving serious study and consideration to ways in which the United Nations may take hold of this problem after the present emergency is past."

The question has been asked: "Are military expenditures preparing the Greek Army to maintain order as preparation for a free choice of government?"

The answer is, according to the committee report on the bill, as follows: A total of \$150,000,000 will be spent for arms, ammunition, rations, clothing, and other supplies and equipment for the Greek armed forces for 15 months, ending June 30, 1948. I quote:

This sum will permit the Greek armed forces to maintain a determined campaign against guerilla bands during the summer of 1947 and to maintain their forces at a strength sufficient to assure internal order thereafter.

Mr. Dean Acheson, in testimony before the committee, said:

The present Parliament of Greece was democratically elected in an election which foreign observers agreed was fair. There can be no doubt that it represents the majority of the Greek people. The present Greek Cabinet contains representatives of 85 percent of the Greek Parliament. It is not the object of our aid to Greece either to help to maintain or to help to remove the present government of the King of Greece.

The question has been asked: "Are expenditures being used to improve the basic economic needs of Greece?"

The answer, according to Mr. Dean Acheson, is that a very considerable part of it—the money asked for Greece—is to be used for the importation of current consumable goods. Further sums

for what is called rehabilitation, fertilizers, and agricultural tools and matters of that sort, would be included:

A comparatively small amount would be used for reconstruction—the building of bridges which have been blown up, and matters of that sort.

A good many beautiful and humanitarian aims have been voiced during the discussion of this bill. The trouble is, some people are going to believe those high-flown phrases. Let us be realistic. Are the American people willing to follow through? High-flown phrases win us resounding applause, today. That applause can turn to catcalls and boos in a matter of hours, if we fail to carry out our promises.

It has been argued that this is the economical way to stop Russia. Now, it may look like a bargain to some people, but, as we all know, we usually get what we pay for. The hatred we can incur by wrong guessing on the real temper of the people we are "protecting," the loss of prestige we will suffer if we fail to follow through on our stated policy, not to mention the cost of war, if war should eventually result, all these will cost us, not only money but something far more valuable—the respect, admiration, and good will of our fellow men throughout the world.

Let us remember that to raise the standards of living around the world, to insure security to others, means lowering our standards at home. In the long run we may get something in return, just as a family that scrimps and saves to invest money temporarily lowers its standards, expecting a return on its investment.

Are we really willing to make these sacrifices? Try to translate into actual food, wood, coal, and clothing the sum of \$20,000,000,000, our postwar commitments in Europe and Asia, plus the staggering sum of \$341,000,000,000 which went into war expenditures.

We have a right to ask, Will this initial sum of \$400,000,000 be used to help the Greek people free themselves of need for our aid? Let us use a homely analogy. A child growing up depends on his parents. This is right and good. But there comes a time when the child becomes a youth, and eventually reaches adulthood. The parent who has not prepared the child to go out on his own, support himself, rely on his own intelligence and ability, has been guilty of gross negligence, to say the least.

We saw the effects of continuous support in the thirties. The elections in November proved that the people of this country wanted to get back on their own. They wanted to shake off the parental hand of Government.

Is this new policy in Greece and in Turkey to be carried out like a WPA project, or will it be a healthy building process which will enable the Greek and the Turkish people to become masters of their own destiny? Will our aid be so applied that the people who benefit from it will be preparing to go on their own in the near future?

It has been said that we must uphold the hand of the President in this matter. Let us uphold the hand of the President, by all means. But let us not uphold the

mailed fist. If we are to uphold his hand, let it be a hand raised in benediction, stretched forth to aid and lift up our fellow man, not a hand raised to strike down and crush humanity that we may stand forth as the most powerful nation on earth.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise with heavy heart and acute sense of responsibility to discuss this most important piece of legislation confronting us here today. It is not easy to bring one's self to take a decisive stand or a bill about which we know so many people have such grave doubts. All of us in this historic Chamber are well aware of the far-reaching significance of what we do here today. We are actually being called upon to place our stamp on a new American foreign policy, one without precedent. One in fact, which violates all the traditions of our country. Never before have we indulged in political loans to other countries on so grand a scale. Never before have we handed our relief not to all the needy but only to those who agree with our views.

Mr. Chairman, when we hear an urgent call for blood donors over the radio these days, we do not ask about the race, color, creed, or political views of the needy man. Yet when we hear the call of urgency from foreign lands today, we ask questions about everything from the color of their eyes to the politics in their hearts. There are many here who say this measure will insure the peace. Those of us who have watched with alarm the steady developing chasm between ourselves and the Russians are not so sure that this is not the road to war. Be war necessary, every red-blooded American will rally to his flag. But let us make sure that war is necessary. Let none of us forget that when war comes, it is not you or I who are called. No; the postman rings twice and ten times at the door of every land in the country eligible to fight.

The Gallup poll shows, Mr. Chairman, that 64 percent of the people who have heard of this new foreign policy disagree with it. None oppose aid to Greece. They do oppose unilateral action by the United States. The people, perhaps better than some presidents, know the meaning of the United Nations. They want the United Nations. They say that if the United Nations is not strong enough to help Greece, let us strengthen it until it is able to work. Another public opinion poll, the Roper poll, shows an even greater majority of the people opposed to the loan than Mr. Gallup indicates. It seems clear that the people have more faith in the United Nations than some in Congress have. They know it is still imperfect, but they want to help perfect it.

Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the loan to Greece and Turkey. Under the legislation now under consideration, the United States is called upon to carry 100 percent of the burden. We are laying every penny on the line. Yet, if the plan works, and we all pray that it will, other countries also in a position to carry some of the burden, will benefit, but they

will not have contributed a penny to the cause. Mr. Chairman, we have been charged with creating a new imperialism here in the United States with our unilateral aid program. I do not believe that is true. However, if we should concentrate all this aid in the United Nations, no one could have any doubts about the falsehood of these charges.

Mr. Chairman, a year before the war ended, the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference was held in Bretton Woods, N. H. Present were the ranking members and the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Present also were the now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Fred Vinson, and the now Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. They, together with men like Senators TOBEY and WAGNER, helped chisel out a new form of international finance. The two new United Nations agencies developed at Bretton Woods are the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Both the bank and the fund are capitalized at \$10,000,000,000 each. Many countries are to contribute to make up this \$20,000,000,000 sum. True, the United States is contributing 60 percent of the money. But it is also true that on a bad loan it is better to lose 60 cents on the dollar rather than 100 cents on a dollar. Now the very name International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should mean something in itself. I supposed the bank was set up to help war-devastated countries get back on their feet. It seems to me that to bypass the bank when we need it is to bypass the United Nations. And the United Nations is like an organ of the human body. Fail to use or exercise it long enough and it will shrivel and die. The Russians are not members of the world bank. They have no veto in its actions. The bank has been established for almost a year. Yet, it has not loaned a dime or stabilized a penny's worth of currency anywhere in the world. The spirit of the bank is being violated daily. The American members no longer think in terms of need, but instead in terms of political opportunism.

A reading of section C of part 4 of the charter of the International Bank proves conclusively that this United Nations agency can be used to help the people of Greece. It says, and I quote, "If a member suffers from an acute exchange stringency, so that the service of any loan contracted by that member or guaranteed by it or by one of its agencies cannot be provided in the stipulated manner, the member concerned may apply to the bank for a relaxation of the conditions of payment." This certainly applies to Greece today as it seems to me.

The very first chapter of the bank's charter is even more specific in its application to Greece today. It says under section B the resource shall be used "for the purpose of facilitating the restoration and reconstruction of the economy of members whose metropolitan territories have suffered great devastation from enemy occupation or hostilities. The bank, in determining the conditions and terms of loans made to such mem-

bers, shall pay special regard to lightening the financial burden and expediting the completion of such restoration and reconstruction."

This, Mr. Chairman, is more than a charter. It is a mandate to us to use the International Bank in this Greek crisis. The charter of the bank was ratified overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives, which at the same time, voted authorization and moneys into the billions to make it work.

I dare say that many of my colleagues when they voted for the bank and the fund saw the same possibilities I have described. It comes as something of a shock, therefore, to read the account in today's New York Times of the utterances of Vice President Robert L. Garnes. I think the article should be considered in the light of my comments and under unanimous consent, I include the article:

GARNER SEES GREEK-TURK LOANS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO WORLD BANK

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

BOSTON, May 6.—United States loans to Greece and Turkey are noneconomic operations and not the type the new World Bank will handle, Robert L. Garner, vice president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, told the Nation's mutual savings banks executives today at their twenty-seventh annual convention in the Statler Hotel.

Earl B. Schwulst, executive vice president of the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, was elected president of the association. Other officers elected were William L. Maude, president of the Howard Savings Institution, Newark, N. J., vice president; Edmund P. Livingston, vice president of the Union Dime Savings Bank, New York, treasurer; John W. Sandstadt, executive secretary, New York.

In his speech and later in a brief press conference, Mr. Garner emphasized that the new World Bank, now financed principally with United States official funds, had as its intention the making of loans that would be repaid, so that prospective private purchasers of the Bank's bonds would be encouraged and at the same time international trade would be accelerated. He went so far in his press conference as to say that the Bank hoped many propositions made to it could be handled by private United States capital.

Referring to the Greek and Turkish loans, Mr. Garner said that "it has been frankly stated by the United States Government that these are in effect grants for purposes beyond the economic development of these countries."

"This type of loan," he added, "is completely different from the economic purpose loans for which the Bank is designed. The Bank has no intention of—in fact is prohibited from—engaging in such noneconomic loan operations."

Mr. Garner disclosed in his press conference that, while no decision yet has been taken on the proposed French loan, "we are hopeful we can get them started on the basis of about \$250,000,000 and go on from there."

Asked whether the results of the conference had not been to eliminate partly the objective of the World Bank by making impossible loans to get eastern Europe back on its feet, Mr. Garner replied that "if you can assure western Europe of food and coal for the next year, that's the problem."

Conceding that "there's a kind of economic and political instability" in Europe and emphasizing that "to the extent you get people to work you offset communism," Mr. Garner indicated that if Polish coal could be moved into western Europe with the help of the World Bank it would help relieve the most

urgent of problems. He added, in this connection, that "the Russians are getting only a small part of Polish coal."

Prof. S. H. Slichter, Lamont professor at Harvard, told the gathering of 600 savings bank executives that the Twentieth Century Fund's estimate that national income in 1960 will be \$245,000,000,000, compared with \$194,000,000,000 last year is too low.

This, he explained in his speech, was "partly because the work force has been underestimated and partly because the man-hour production during the next 15 years is likely to be greater than normal." His own estimate for the national income was \$275,000,000,000 in 1960, and perhaps considerably more.

T. B. King, director of the Veterans' Administration's loan guarantee service, called upon the savings bankers to protect from gouging the veterans who are building homes under the GI bill of rights. This, he emphasized, was important to the banks in protecting their part of financing of these loans.

One further word, Mr. Chairman. Today again America finds itself at the crossroads. But this time the choice between war and peace will be harder than ever before in our history. I was in the war just ended. It is impossible to translate the yearning for peace of a tired soldier on a lonely Pacific island in the dead of night, with your only company the hiss of insects and the nervous Jap rustling in the bushes only yards away. This was a terrible war. But those who stayed behind felt it only slightly. The next war will not be fought in the islands and on the beaches. It will be fought in the stricken cities of our own country, burned to crisps under the fantastic fury of exploding A bombs and guided missiles. Twenty-five years ago wars could still be won. We already know that there was no victor from the war which ended 2 years ago. The lands we devastated, we now finance. The homes we destroyed, we now rebuild. Only the dead whom we buried, we cannot resurrect. We thought long and hard before entering World War II. Before we take any step toward World War III, let us think and pray as we have never done before, that Almighty God in His divine wisdom may keep us on the path to peace, plenty, and the brotherhood of man, rather than on the road to war, ruin, and eternal anguish.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in approaching the question of what to do with this resolution which proposes aid to Greece and Turkey, I do so in a little different manner and from a different viewpoint than most of those whom I have heard discuss the problem. To me the determination of what we do today with this bill is a problem of national and international security. If we adopt this bill I am firmly convinced it will be a step in the direction of world stability and world peace.

Before asking you to accept that conclusion I think we should keep in mind certain well-established facts and circumstances which have a direct bearing on the problem of our security today.

Measured in terms of transportation the world is a relatively small world and is still shrinking fast. Also, that portion

of the world in which so-called civilization has developed and flourishes is, generally speaking, the area of the globe north of the thirtieth degree, north latitude. This same area contains the trouble spots of the world. Also, in this civilized area of the world is where all of the wars of the past several centuries have been started. To the present time, the only method by which nations solve their important controversies is by means of mass murder, popularly called war. Twice in 30 years war has broken out and although the United States was not a belligerent at the beginning we became involved and turned the balance that won the victory for the nations allied with us. Any future war would undoubtedly be a world war and encompass our Nation as well as all the major nations of the world. The last war developed a new technique by starting the war without any formal declaration thereof. Any future war will undoubtedly come upon us without notice. The rapid air transit of today and the faster transit which will be here tomorrow makes it possible for aircraft to go from any part of the area of the world from which a war might come and return without landing or refueling. The increase in the destructive power of weapons has been tremendous. Furthermore, some of the most powerful and devastating weapons are relatively light in weight. It is true that the human race now has the capacity to literally destroy itself by the mass murder which we call war. We got a preview of what could happen just at the close of the Japanese war when two atomic bombs destroyed two large cities of Japan and killed several hundred thousand people. The result is that danger is right in our lap whether we want it or not. Every part of our country—the interior cities, exactly the same degree as the border cities of San Francisco and New York, are subject to attack and within the range of any possible attacker. The result is that we are really on the military alert 24 hours a day, every day of the year, if there is any serious friction between us and any other great nation. In this new age of a small world and explosive and annihilating destructive capacity of armed forces we must face the possibility of complete destruction unless some method other than warfare is found to handle the disputes and differences of nations. If some system of security other than one based on might and power and murder is not developed, the people of the world, including ourselves, can no longer live in peace and quiet.

Therefore, we all agree that we must find a system based on law and order to settle international disputes.

This idea is not new. In our own country in 1916 ex-President Taft recognized the need for such an organism and organized the league to enforce peace. In other words, he realized that there must be joint action by the great nations of the world and they must combine to be able to enforce peace if necessary. Following the First World War we made efforts to bring about international understanding and set up machinery to settle controversies between countries, without resort to war. A beginning was made but our country kept aloof and

really walked away from its allies as far as the development of an international peace organism was concerned. The result was that the world relapsed into turmoil and ultimately war, within 25 years of the termination of the First World War.

The last World War engulfed the whole civilized world. Its destructive capacity was a hundred times as great in property destruction and several times as great in the destruction of human life as the First World War. In the modern war all persons are subject to attack and destruction. The entire nation is the battlefield. There are no longer any barriers of oceans, mountains, climate, altitude, and the world is truly round in the conception of those that made war. The planes and missiles fly over Arctic regions and over the highest mountains of the world with the greatest of ease.

During the war, the leaders of the Allied Nations laid plans for a world of peace. Some men criticize them bitterly today, but I believe we can truly say that these leaders honestly and sincerely wanted to lay the fabric of world peace by the creation of some type of effective international organization to settle the fights and controversies between nations.

Among one of the things that they decided was that countries which have been devastated and occupied should have the right to select their own rulers and their own form of government. That was true in the case of Greece, a country which was overrun by Nazis, badly punished and severely injured. We made that agreement with Russia and our other allies. It was a solemn agreement and not only were the nations to have this right but there was the implied agreement that once the right to determine their own form of government had been exercised that that decision would not be nullified by the direct or indirect action of one of the large countries. Greece has held an election. Its electors decided by an overwhelming vote that they wanted a monarchical government similar to the one they had previous to the war. It is no business of ours what their type of government is, so long as they do not injure their neighbors, and so long as the selection of the type by the people was their free choice.

These preliminary agreements made between the United States and Russia were the preliminary steps toward a world organism which it was hoped and believed would be in a position to develop world peace and stability. Russia has violated some of these solemn agreements entered into between its top man and our President. In some cases we have only protested. We have permitted Russia to have her way. Today, we are faced with a problem in Greece as to whether we shall allow Russia by indirection, by infiltration, by the aiding and encouraging of enemies of Greece to destroy the free choice which we guaranteed her. Russia is trying to create chaos, dissension, confusion, and even the destruction of the Greek Government. This strikes at the very foundation of the efforts and the plan to bring about a world of law and order. Therefore, I say we should challenge her right to do this. We should stop Russia from doing this very thing. We

should help Greece secure the government which she by a solemn election decided that she wanted. The sanctity of this agreement is the very foundation of the future development of orderly procedure through the United Nations to bring about world peace.

We should find out today whether Russia is willing to abide by these solemn agreements or whether they were made with her tongue in her cheek. She is talking about disarmament, outlawing the atomic bomb, and, in fact, outlawing war itself. Let us now, before we take these steps, understand whether she will permit little Greece to have the kind of government she wishes after the electors of Greece have made their choice. By taking a firm stand today it is my conviction that we will move toward world peace. The only dividend that the people of the world expect out of the terrific sacrifices made in this war is a stable and lasting peace. We are the most stable country in the world, economically, politically, and socially. We have the capacity to lead if we have courage to act today to compel Russia to abide by the agreement which she made to permit small countries a free choice of their government. Only by developing slowly but surely a course leading to the peaceful settlement of international controversies can we have real security for ourselves and our posterity. The time has come for us to make that decision in the case that we have before us.

If we lack the courage to insist that Russia abide by her agreements to allow this little country her freedom and choice in selecting her government and the right to maintain that government without interference we will be guilty of appeasement, weakness, and expediency. That in my opinion would be the road to a war, and it might be the final gasp of civilization. If we take a firm stand today, I believe that we are facing toward a world of peace. I believe we are laying the groundwork for a system of security that will be based on law and justice. I believe that Russia herself will by the passage of this bill determine that we mean what we say and she will find ways and means of getting along with us. Weakness, procrastination, passing this job on to the United Nations which is not now able to handle it, is the road of indecision that will lead to chaos, controversy, strife, and ultimately world destruction.

A firm stand today will give hope to the millions of peoples who have been saddened and ruined by this tragic war. It will give hope to those small nations who are the victims and the pawns of the aggressive nations of Europe. It will breed new confidence in the hope of mankind that, under the guidance of God and by our own intelligence and character, it can weave a fabric that will bring the peaceful world we are all looking and praying for.

For that reason and other reasons I hope with every ounce of my strength that this bill will pass by a resounding vote to tell the world that we believe in the sanctity of contracts, we are willing to risk our destiny and our power to compel obedience to agreements made. We are willing to put our leadership, our

money and our men if necessary behind our effort to bring permanent peace to this tumultuous world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I want to ask a question of the gentleman from New Jersey. I want to know whether or not there is going to be an attempt to finish the bill tonight. We will reach the 5-minute rule, according to the Chairman, after 5 o'clock.

Mr. EATON. Is the question whether we plan to finish this bill tonight?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. EATON. Certainly not. It will take all day tomorrow under the 5-minute rule, and it may go over even beyond that. We will be lucky to finish debate tonight.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, does the Greek-Turko scheme commit us to gigantic hand-cuts the world over that will result in economic and social collapse in America? Those favoring this proposal cannot answer this question fully, fairly, and honestly. That is my first reason for voting against this proposal.

For there is no more certain way to destroy American capitalism than to overload it with an impossible burden. The proponents of this legislation cannot show how we can give away billions of our resources each year in peacetime without continuous inflation or war regimentation at home.

And so, this act means continuous high prices or peacetime regimentation is ahead—taking us on the one-way road toward totalitarianism.

Lenin, himself, declared that the most certain way to destroy the existing social order is to debauch the currency. This scheme sets off a new outpouring of American dollars. That means higher prices, higher taxes, and systematic and legal cheating of the humble people and the poor. That economic condition helps communism, not freedom.

Suppose you were trying to devise a way to destroy this country? Could you figure out a more certain method than to commit this country, 140,000,000 people, to underwriting the combined budget deficits of the non-Russian world?

That is what this bill anticipates—that the budget deficits of every nation in the world may be paid out of the savings of the people of America. No people can carry that kind of a burden very long.

Already food prices are up close to 50 percent from a year ago. How do you suppose this spiral reflects in the pocket-books and the market baskets of our thrifty people? This hand-out program guarantees that that sort of inflation is going to continue.

That is the kind of economic condition that makes communism just as fast as the bayonets of Russian soldiers.

A 14-YEAR RECORD OF BUNGLING

My second reason for voting against this loan is equally important. For 14 years this administration has been play-

ing into the hands of Russia. Their ghastly bungling has resulted in communism making more gains by American assistance in 4 years than they made by themselves in 25 years.

This administration held in its hands during World War II decisive industrial, military, and economic power. It used that power so recklessly and stupidly that Russia came out of the war the only true victor.

An earlier speaker has called the roll on the countries that have been taken into the Russian orbit following World War II. Who had the power that was used in such a manner that Russia made those gains? It was the United States that had that decisive power.

There may be those in this House who can shut their eyes to that kind of failure and place in the same hands new instruments to wield in foreign affairs, but I yield no part in such irresponsible action.

It is not unlike a chauffeur having your car and driving it up and down the road and smashing up one car after another and killing people and then coming back and saying, "Let me drive another new car for you."

No; I will not agree to placing new power in the kind of administration hands that have given the Russian Government for 14 years steady gains all over the world.

I would rather put a fully loaded machine gun in the hands of a delinquent teen-ager than more opportunities for international destruction in the hands of our State Department.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Does the gentleman consider General Marshall that kind of stupid leader, or driver?

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has asked a fair question and he is entitled to an answer. The gentleman may be willing to put his trust in the hands of a man who under oath before a committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives could not remember where he was or what he was doing on the most important day in his life, but by my standards of integrity I cannot do that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Was the gentleman referring to the Pearl Harbor disaster?

Mr. BUFFETT. I was referring to that event; yes. There are a lot of facts in chapters of our history that have not been revealed. We ought to find out where we are, how we got there, and what shape we are in, before being shoved in any new global messes involving military action.

An administration that is responsible for unconditional surrender, for post-war lend-lease to Russia, for UNRRRA, for the Morgenthau plan, for Potsdam, for the Atlantic Charter going into the wastebasket, and for the sell-out of Poland and other lands does not get new instruments to menace civilization by my vote.

My third reason for voting against this scheme is because instead of restraining communism abroad, it will shore up

ruling politicians everywhere and actually promote and accelerate the spread of communism.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the ghastly failures during and since World War II ended. Perhaps it seems hard to believe that worse disasters can occur. But they can and will if this Congress votes to allow the administration to take us into an American attempt to determine the pattern of human life everywhere.

Mr. Chairman, God Almighty with infinite wisdom and unlimited power does not try to make any person behave according to His ideas. He sets down the natural laws we can live by or disobey at our own risk.

We are asked to go out on a crusade now to tell everybody in the world how to live. I do not think that God approves of such egotism. I do not think it will work. I am sure the people of America do not think it will work.

But let us see how that pattern has been working thus far.

FAILURE IN CHINA

Some time ago, it was announced that America was to help China solve its problems—and that in doing so we were going to drive communism from China.

That scheme was a reasonable facsimile of what is now proposed in Greece and Turkey. About \$3,000,000,000 has been spent to date in China. Our official top man in military and political affairs, Gen. George Marshall, spent a year in China.

Marshall came home in disgust and failure. What did he accomplish? The civil war goes on. Inflation is worse than ever in China. Human butchery has taken place on a large scale in Formosa. Evil days unlimited seem to be the fate of the Chinese.

In the May 4 New York Times we have a report from an authority on Chinese affairs, Nathaniel Peffer, professor of international relations at Columbia. Members would do well to read the whole article. I quote briefly from its most significant passage.

Peffer declares:

Scant as is the hope for improvement, there is no chance of its growth so long as America continues to give even color of support to the existing government. In fact, it has already been diminished by such support as America has given in the form of maintenance of troops in the country, training of the Nationalist army, and the sale on easy terms of surplus property. That this support has been falsely exaggerated by the Communists is a consideration apart.

The help already given has worked to entrench those now in power, those who make China's outlook hopeless. Whatever America's intention may have been in keeping troops in China—and about this, too, the Communists conclusively lie in their propaganda—the effect has been to stiffen the elements in power and negate prospects of reform.

Those elements listen respectfully to America's exhortations to reform, to institute democracy, whether made by President Truman, General Marshall, or Ambassador Stuart, but they have no intention of giving heed to them. They do not believe they have to. Whatever they may say openly, they believe America has to support them anyway. They believe they are in a position to blackmail America. The reason is Russia.

Privately men of that class tell a visiting American, if they know him well enough to be frank, that America is going to fight Russia. Therefore, America needs China, and it must and should stiffen up the national government. It must support the Kuomintang government against the Chinese Communists, because the Communists are the vanguard of Russia.

What they do not say to Americans but do say to each other is why, then, make any concessions to America in return for support, especially concessions by way of reforms that will cost them the perquisites and profits of monopolistic power?

And except in words they make no concessions by way of reforms.

Actually the Chinese Communists say much the same thing. They, too, think America in keeping troops in China has Russia in mind. They say that America wants a base from which to fight Russia and therefore it supports the Kuomintang regime. They hold that a deal has been made: Support for a corrupt, reactionary, and quasi-fascist regime in exchange for service against Russia.

This must be emphasized and understood in America: Many Chinese not Communist, not even radical, are coming to believe the same thing. And so far as they believe it, they have also come to the conclusion that America has betrayed not only its own traditions but its traditional role in China, which has been to foster republicanism and democracy.

Therefore—and this, too, should be understood in America—anti-Americanism is growing in China, not only among Communists and leftist students but among the liberal intellectuals and the scholar class who still make opinion. Much of it is incited by Communist propaganda—lying propaganda, no doubt—but not all.

There is an increasing conviction among all classes that America, having become supreme, is going the way of all great powers, acquisitive in its ends and cynical in its means.

A SET-UP FOR INTERNATIONAL BLACKMAIL

Mr. Peffer declares:

They believe they are in a position to blackmail America. The reason is Russia.

The logic of this statement is terrifying. One does not have to be an expert in foreign affairs to forecast what will happen once the Greek-Turkish deal is passed.

Ruling politicians everywhere are going to spend much of their energies on one goal. That aim will be devising ways and means of using the threat of Communism to blackmail America for continuous handouts. And they do not stay bought.

Picture the outlook. Figure out the possibilities for politicians from everywhere in the world to come around to the back door of our Treasury and say, "Give me the dough or communism comes in the morning."

It is the slickest blackmail racket that has ever been invented for foreign politicians to get the savings of the American people. Make no mistake about it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Why do you think that they will come to the back door?

Mr. BUFFETT. I accept a correction—they may come in at the back door, the front door, the side door, or through the windows.

The Peffer article reflects our position in China.

But you do not have to take his word for it. The logic of his appraisal of the situation is perfectly plain for anyone to see.

NATIONS DO NOT STAY BOUGHT

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to look up the record and see how many countries have ever stayed bought.

Before World War II France made loans to 10 different nations. When the war came 5 of those 10, half of them, 50 percent of them, fought against France. Four of the remaining five were overrun inside of 30 days. No. 10, good old Turkey, sat on the side lines and played both sides.

That is the record of trying to buy assistance in fighting a prospective foe.

That is the record of trying to bribe somebody into coming in on your side. Look at the record of France and you will get the answer as to how far this scheme will work in giving us protection against communism.

Everywhere we are going to have from now on attempts to get hand-outs on account of communism.

A RAT RACE FOR HAND-OUTS WILL RESULT

Whispers about communism were used in this House last summer to put over the British loan. Then the Communist threat was used in silk-glove fashion. Now it is used in bombastic style—perhaps by some trying to wash out the stains of their earlier appeasing of Russia.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this act will accelerate rivalry between most non-Russian foreign governments for American hand-outs. Each will connive to get a lion's share of the resources of America before the bubble bursts. This scramble will cause a rat race between nations for aid in their alleged opposition to communism.

Every ruler abroad, be he tyrant or parliamentary politician, will claim the threat of communism is the most dangerous in his land. Then he will get the largest and quickest hand-out of American resources. At any sign of American reluctance, the pressure will be stepped up.

This scheme sets the stage for international blackmail—blackmail on a scale that will lead our kindergarten diplomats into even worse bungling than that of the past 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Greek-Turkish deal will promote a demoralizing rat race to exhaust American resources. With the American people betrayed and bankrupt from this outpouring, the end result might be world triumph for communism.

For once the Truman administration gets us on this blackmail roller coaster, we will be on a boom-and-bust ride toward a bloody smashup.

Mr. Chairman, this Truman scheme, like the hypocritical actions of the New Deal for 14 long years, plays into Stalin's hands. Only a badly hypnotized Congress will embark on such a reckless course. H. R. 2616 should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly stated here, by the President on March 12 and by every proponent of this legislation, that the United Nations cannot handle the problem of economic rehabilitation in Greece. That statement, in my considered judgment, is belied by the facts. I am not charging anyone with suppressing the facts here, but I am charging many of the proponents with not informing this Congress of the fact that the United Nations has gone into this Greek situation and has, through one of its most important organizations, made specific recommendations. There exists in the United Nations an organization called the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. At the request of the Greek Government itself, this organization of the United Nations sent a mission into Greece, and that mission worked in Greece from May through August 1946. It made a report. I hold that report in my hand, "Report of F. A. O. Mission to Greece." It made 85 itemized specific recommendations for the economic rehabilitation of Greece. The members of this mission are all American citizens, outstanding educators, experts in their fields, and, as much as the Committee on Un-American Activities may try, it and no one else will ever be in a position to charge any of these gentlemen with having any reputation other than that of being conservative.

For instance, the chairman of the committee is none other than Dr. Franklin S. Harris, president of the Utah Agricultural College, located at Logan, Utah.

I cannot in this brief time give you the 85 recommendations this organization made, but I want to give you some of the high lights:

1. A program of special feeding, regardless of religion or politics.
2. A program of citizen labor on repair of roads, participated in by all able-bodied males and also by the armed services.
3. Curbing inflation by rationing and price controls; expansion of industrial production; providing funds for purchase of consumer goods; setting up joint buying and selling offices of the Agricultural Bank and the Confederation of Cooperatives; and undertaking to negotiate exchange of goods with countries which still have controlled foreign trade.
4. Restoration of export markets with the use of proceeds for the balance of trade, instead of hoarding dollars abroad.
5. Larger output per farm family. Breaking up of large estates and raising the acreage of land cultivated per family.
6. Reorganization of the Ministry of Agriculture.
7. Increased support of cooperatives and extension of production credit to farmers.
8. Abolition of the spoils system and pay roll padding in the Civil Service and the accepted system of graft and perquisites.
9. Complete reform of taxes and insistence that the Government undertake to put into effect reforms in its tax system to make it less regressive, and more like that of the United States of America and the United Kingdom and other developed countries.

And the last and most important from the standpoint of this debate:

A United Nations Advisory Mission and financial aid on an international basis.

These recommendations were made by this very important body of the United Nations organization.

How do we meet it here? We meet it here by a proposal to implement the policy of doing what? Not of having these sound recommendations put into effect and bring about financial and economic stability in Greece. Our proposal here is to wipe out, to starve and kill, the opposition to the regime in Greece which has refused up to now even to show any semblance of initiating any of these reforms which may be very properly described as mere rudimentary economic democracy.

It is my contention and the contention of the gentlemen who made this comprehensive on-the-spot study and who did not spend their time speaking to only the rulers of Greece or the men in charge of the police in Greece, that these recommendations, if they were put into effect, would go a long, long way in eliminating the existing civil strife in Greece. If these recommendations were adopted, if the people who are now fighting in the hills were guaranteed the freedom about which you gentlemen have been speaking here this afternoon there would be no civil strife in Greece and there would be no problem such as the President described in his speech of March 12 and which many Members are seeking to accentuate on the floor of this House.

Why do we bypass the United Nations? Why do we insist on ignoring the recommendations of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations? Why do we insist on a program that would prevent the adoption of these reforms in Greece, reforms that would do away with the civil strife and which would give Greece at least some substance of economic stability? Why is it that we ask for legislation that would implement a policy of merely starving or destroying the opposition to a regime which refuses to accept these recommendations made by American citizens, mind you, acting as agents of the United Nations organization after a careful and exhaustive study of the problem?

Mr. Chairman, I recommend that between now and tomorrow or when we vote on this bill the Members obtain this document and spend some time with it. I am sure after they have they will know much more about the situation in Greece than they know now.

Mr. Chairman, the program before us is to starve and kill the opposition to a regime that refuses to accept these reforms. That is the program set forth in this legislation. This legislation represents a policy of refusal to do that which will really aid to eradicate civil strife and restore economic stability and freedom in Greece. Some may say, "Well, the Greek Government will be forced to do this if we adopt the pending legislation." That is impossible. The ruling class in Greece cannot maintain its sinecures that it now holds on to if these reforms were put into effect. In other words, the Fascist rulers of Greece today and the well-entrenched few families in Greece today would not be able to maintain their position of political and class rule if these reforms that have been recommended by the United Nations organization were adopted.

In all fairness to Great Britain, it made some effort to have some of these

reforms adopted during the period of its disgraceful rule there. It met with nothing but resistance, refusal, and sabotage on the part of the Greek regime which we are now asked to sustain with money and with military aid. That regime cannot accept these recommendations and survive. If it accepts these recommendations its control of the political and the economic life of Greece will be destroyed. For the present rulers of Greece to accept these recommendations means extinction for them. They will hang on to their present position and refuse to accept these recommendations. Therefore again I say, this legislation implements a policy not of reform so necessary and vital for the freedom and the economic rehabilitation of Greece, but it implements a policy of destroying, starving out, the people who oppose the regime which refuses to accept these very elementary recommendations so necessary to a democracy, freedom and stability in Greece.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I just want to ask the gentleman why it is that these very excellent recommendations of the United Nations have not been put into effect in Greece. How does the gentleman think they could have been effected?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This report was printed, may I say to the distinguished lady, in March 1947, right here in Washington, D. C. On March 12 the President came here and proposed unilateral action on the part of the United States. Certainly, that foreclosed action on the part of the United Nations to carry out these recommendations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why are we doing all this? We are doing it under the guise of stop communism, and I say while we are doing all this, we are aiding a regime which is shot through and through with Fascists, with Nazi collaborators, petty and big Quislings. Read the roll of those who rule Greece today: The Minister of Public Security, the Chief of Police, the present King, the present Queen, blood relatives, politically and otherwise, of nazism. I just wonder how our men who fought against the Nazis will feel when they learn that we are giving aid and comfort to a regime that is made up of those elements who aided and gave comfort to the Nazis. I wonder how the ex-GI will feel when he learns that we pass this legislation which provides for the shooting down, yes, of these guerrillas, some of them Communists, many of them non-Communists, but all men and women who fought heroically against the Nazis and against the Fascists, and thereby saved the lives of thousands of Americans.

Why are we doing this? We are doing this under the guise of stop communism. I have heard that used before; so have you. You heard it to justify the destruction of republican Spain. You heard it at Munich; the betrayal of Czechoslovakia and the betrayal of democracy in Europe was alibed with the same cry, stop communism. You heard it to alibi the creation of the anti-Comintern pact. You heard it to excuse the terror of the Axis.

You heard it from the lips of Hitler, Tojo, Mussolini, and Goebbels. You heard it at the Nuremberg trials from the lips of the guilty, from Goering and Ribbentrop. It was used before to excuse ruthless warfare waged on the democratic people of the world. Now monopoly capital and its agents set up the same cry in an attempt to stop the forward march of mankind toward freedom from fear and want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a short answer to the gentleman from New York who has just spoken on the FAO report. That report says that the purpose of the Mission was the long-time reconstruction and rehabilitation of Greece and was not aimed at immediate help. It went into such things as reconstruction of industry and rehabilitation that can be done over a long period of time, while this particular bill of aid and assistance is aimed at the present, immediately, so that disposes of the FAO report on that basis.

Certainly, the FAO report clearly had in mind that they would go to some other nations for help, and specifically talked of the United States helping.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York this: The State Department on June 11, 1946, received a cablegram from Yugoslavia stating that Russia had entered into a unilateral compact with Yugoslavia for the reconstruction of Yugoslav industry, assisting its arms industry and putting it back into effect, and also giving them mechanical and other equipment for their armies. Did the gentleman on June 11, 1946, object to unilateral action by Russia in connection with this agreement with Yugoslavia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that this is the first I have heard of it. I cannot account for the accuracy of that report.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman may accept it as accurate, because I will produce the cablegram to the State Department.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. However, assuming the statement to be correct, then I say that that action as well as this action should be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. So the gentleman now disapproves the action of Russia on June 11, 1946; is that correct?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disapprove the action of any country that takes unilateral action on any matter that involves the peace of the world.

Mr. FULTON. Including Russia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Including Russia, the United States, Turkey, Greece, or any other nation in the world.

Mr. FULTON. Then if I am right in my statement that we did receive such a cablegram from Yugoslavia, the gentleman condemns Russia just as he condemns the United States right here, does he not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do.

Mr. FULTON. That is very interesting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think any action should go through the United Nations when that action affects the peace of the world.

Now, will the gentleman let me make a statement with respect to the FAO? The gentleman says that it made only long-range recommendations. I think that if the gentleman will read the report he will find that some of those recommendations were made to be put into effect before the initiation of the 1947 crop.

Mr. FULTON. Yes, and did they not say to go to the United States to get the money?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; they said to go to the United Nations, including the United States.

Mr. FULTON. Yes. The United States was specifically mentioned.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The United States is part of the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. I refuse to yield further.

May I correct someone else? The eminent chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives said yesterday we were "one of the principal sponsors of the United Nations, yet now, less than 2 years later, we are the first nation to attempt to nullify it by proposing to act alone." We were not. On June 11, 1946, Russia did it by specific agreement with Yugoslavia. He was wrong.

"It means our embarkation upon a new policy that may lead to no one knows where." The gentleman does not know where.

May I answer him further. I think the Republican Party should ask the gentleman what he means when he says on page 4640 of the Record, "Are we prepared for it? Can we do so with a national debt of \$258,000,000,000?" Then he states specifically, "And with a budget for next year that may approximate thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars?" These are President Truman's exact figures, from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Republican Party.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. With this program and what will follow, it will be away in excess of what that budget indicates.

Mr. FULTON. Let me answer the gentleman from Ohio on that one. Can we help Greece? We certainly can. The gentleman says we are going to bankrupt ourselves. I do not see how anybody from Ohio, one of the granaries of the country, can stand there and say that when Time magazine on April 28 had this to say:

THE BIN

Actually, the United States could stand the drain on its food resources without even tightening its belt. Production was high. The Agriculture Department predicted a bumper 1947 wheat crop of 1,240,000,000 bushels, compared to 1,185,000,000 last year. Despite 14,000,000 more mouths than before the war, per capita food consumption in the United States had increased 16 percent. In

1946 the United States supplied the world with a net of \$6,600,000,000 of goods and services, but this was only 8.4 percent of the total value of goods and services produced by a fat and wealthy land. Far from scraping the bottom of the food bin, the United States was only spooning out its resources.

May I further state that we also have the greatest industrial production right around Pittsburgh, where I come from. Look and see if anybody else can do it. They cannot. Only the United States under present conditions, with ingot output at a rate above 80,000,000 tons, can even begin to supply the immense world needs for steel. British industry has only 15,000,000 tons of steel. German industry is to be limited to 5,800,000 tons. France has some steel capacity but none for export. Russia has only 20,000,000 tons, and Japan is to be permitted 2,000,000 tons.

Mr. BENDER. What is the gentleman's point?

Mr. FULTON. That we are perfectly able to go ahead on this program, and all these cries of anguish about bankruptcy from certain parties certainly amaze me.

Mr. BENDER. I read some of the gentleman's speeches in the last campaign when he was speaking about bankruptcy.

Mr. FULTON. They were good, because I won.

Mr. BENDER. But you did not win on this program. You did not win by telling them you were going to vote \$400,000,000 for Greece.

Mr. FULTON. I won on a program saying that we were going to help everyone who was friendly to us, whether they were Republicans or Democrats, and that whether it was in this country or abroad we would not let anyone starve. I do not think that we should.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not hold myself out as an expert on foreign affairs, but as a soldier in the United States Army in the recent war I spent 20 months in Europe. Although I learned much about the geography, customs, habits, and political cross-currents of Europe, I know little of the economic and political structure of Greece and Turkey. Few of us have first-hand information on these phases of the question. All of us know, however, first, that these two countries occupy strategic geographic locations; second, that Russia is seeking the collapse of the Greek and Turkish Governments; and, third, that Russia is engaged in a program of expansion toward the south and west.

If we are perfectly frank, we must admit that Russia is conducting a bloodless war in Europe today. She is accomplishing the same results as if she had used her military—that is, placing small powers under communistic rule. The question is—and it is not a complex one—shall we move to stop Russian expansion? Or shall we listen to the familiar cry of the professional isolationist as we did when Japan moved into Manchuria, Italy into Ethiopia, and Hitler into the Rhineland? My answer to the

question is to act, and act now, to let Communists throughout the world know that the issue is joined as between democracy and communism; that God-hating Communists shall not overthrow the Christian brotherhood of man; that the precious blood of the American soldier was not shed to make Europe an impotent prey to the power lusts of Russia.

If we were justified in entering Europe in 1918 and again in 1944 with our troops to save democracy, then we are justified in spending our dollars there to preserve the democracy we have saved. We have waited too long now to take steps to deter Soviet expansion. Long ago we should have issued an ultimatum to Russia that unless she agreed to an accounting of her lend-lease accounts we would stop the flow of millions in manufactured goods as reparations from the American zone of occupation in Germany.

This is the opportune time for America to strike her telling blow to communism; a time immediately following the fruitless talks recently held in Moscow; a time when a tottering and weak government of France expelled its Communist cabinet members, although she is facing an industrial collapse; and a time when the President of the United States has decreed that no longer will any tainted pink disciples of Stalin and Molotov hold jobs in our departments to better sabotage our form of government. The passage of this measure at a time when our Appropriations Committee has very wisely decided to recommend the continuance of our Voice of America broadcasts to Russia will have a telling effect throughout the war-weakened nations who are valiantly fighting communism in the face of starvation and sickness.

Yes; it can be said with great truth that not one of us can foretell the eventual results of our passage of or failure to pass this measure, but I, for one, want to be recorded as favoring the spending of dollars to do something now that may prevent the spending of blood in the future.

To you who choose to take the course of an isolationist, I would say: Turn back the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and look at the names of those who voted against repeal of the Neutrality Act, against arming the merchant marine, lend-lease, and selective service.

They thought they were right, too.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the House today that quite a few of us GIs who served in World War II are disillusioned. I know those of you who were in Europe, if you will turn back with me, will remember how the Army publication, Stars and Stripes, from day to day cartooned the picture of Joe Stalin as one of the finest men who ever lived; a smiling benefactor to humanity. And they talked of the GI, when the war was over, as returning to a home with little kids playing all around—a perfect idea of Utopia. But I tell you, gentlemen, that millennium

days have not come. Utopia is not here. They told us if we would just go ahead and get rid of Hitler the world would be a great place in which to live. Mr. Chairman, you have another dictator in his place today in Europe. If we get rid of him, who will be the next? I tell you frankly, I reluctantly will vote for this bill and pray that some good will come of it. I have heard a lot of talk the last few days about realism. Let us be really and truly realistic. If we are going to send this loan to Greece and Turkey, let us back it up with a great army and navy and air force second to none in the world. That is one foreign policy that America has never adopted in peacetime. That is, maintaining an adequate national defense. I favor that today as a safeguard to peace. Let me remind the membership that when the Roman legion was the most feared force in the world, that was the greatest era of peace that the world has ever known. Not a major war for 300 to 500 years. After the Dark Ages, when Britannia ruled the waves, how many nations of this world were prevented from aggression by the power of the British Navy? I tell you today that the only thing that will stop Russia at the Dardanelles is not this \$400,000,000 that we are voting, but an air force right here in the United States of America that can bomb Moscow, that can strike at the industrial potential beyond the Ural Mountains. That and that alone, and the knowledge that we have the atomic bomb and are willing and prepared to use it, that and that alone will prevent Russia from moving on the Dardanelles or into Turkey and Greece.

Mr. Chairman, the Scripture says that "a wise man's eyes are upon the things about him, but a fool's eyes are in the ends of the earth." Let us not neglect our home front and the power of our home base, which is the one that really counts.

France put her trust in her Maginot line only to have her armies defeated from within. The great Roman legion, feared as it was through the then known world, was finally overcome from within. The great civilizations of the past have fallen mostly from within. I will vote for this loan, but along with it, Mr. Chairman, let us vote adequate national defense to back up our foreign policy. Let us take up where the British Government is no longer able to patrol the seas and have an air force that will put fear into the heart of any would-be world conqueror.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. In line with what the gentleman is saying, does he not think we ought to stop the sale of our surplus war materials?

Mr. DORN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I am told, I know not whether it be true, but I am told that right now goods are being loaded on ships at Norfolk, New Orleans, and elsewhere and being sent to Russia. I am opposed to that policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the proposal to extend American aid to Greece and Turkey, as I see it, is based upon two considerations: humanitarianism and the national security of the United States.

Greece resisted the Axis invaders heroically, but was overcome by superior forces and suffered tremendously from mistreatment and spoliation. She emerged from the war a shattered nation. Recovery would have been difficult at best; under postwar conditions, with rival groups fighting for control of the country, recovery has been impossible. Political stabilization is necessary in order for the Greek people to achieve economic recovery and rebuild their homeland.

The record of the Greeks in the recent war should have earned them the gratitude not only of the United States but of all the Allies, and the right to work out their future in peace, with such financial assistance as they might require. The war record of Greece and the historic friendship between the Greek and American peoples would, I believe, dispose our people and our Government to aid the Greeks from motives of sympathy, even if other considerations were lacking.

In the case of Turkey, sentiment does not sway us as strongly, though Turkey conducted herself during the war to the advantage of the Allied cause, which she formally joined in the closing months of the conflict. In the matter before us the case of Turkey is strategically tied up with that of Greece, and therefore the two countries should be considered together.

Now, the question of American aid to Greece and Turkey cannot properly be examined save in the context of the current international situation. I must confess that I find that situation disquieting. I refer mainly to the uneasy relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Frankly, I find it difficult to reconcile the occasional conciliatory statements attributed to Generalissimo Stalin with the more bellicose statements of other Soviet spokesmen and—what is much more important—the aggressive policies of the Soviet Government and its Communist adherents in other countries.

President Truman stated the situation concisely in his message to Congress on March 12, when he said:

At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

In the face of the self-evident Soviet policy of expansion, the democratic way of life—of which the United States is the foremost exponent—is challenged to maintain its position, or to give way by default. If we are realistic, we must face the fact that—through Soviet choosing, not ours—we confront Soviet communism across a common frontier in Germany, in Austria, in Korea—and, most important of all, across a common frontier in the minds of men everywhere. The meaning of this, in my opinion, is that we must either stand our ground, or retreat. I believe that, since the Soviet Union chooses to repulse all our efforts to eliminate the barriers between us, it is to our best interest to maintain the frontiers as far from our own shores as possible, and not wait for communism to encroach upon our own territory.

Greece and Turkey comprise one area where the frontier is not stable, or where stability is threatened by Communist pressure. The United States cannot ignore the obvious evidence that Soviet communism is pressing to advance to the shores of the Aegean and into the Middle East, where the equilibrium is delicately balanced at best. It is a matter of record, as the President stated, that "the very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists." At the Paris Peace Conference, the Soviet delegate supported Bulgarian demands for Greek territory in western Thrace. The Soviet Government has exerted strong pressure on Turkey in an effort to obtain a preferred position in control of the Dardanelles and military bases on that strategic waterway, which runs through entirely Turkish territory. The Government-controlled Soviet press and radio have waged a determined propaganda campaign for annexation of territory in the eastern provinces of Turkey—an area specifically awarded to Turkey in the Treaty of Moscow, signed by Turkey and the Soviet Union in 1921. It is well to remember that these lands in eastern Turkey are adjacent to northern Iran, where Soviet troops last year over-stayed their treaty deadline by 2 months, and a Soviet-sponsored rebel group seized power until put down by the Iranian Government.

It has been charged that the present Governments of Greece and Turkey are not fully democratic, and therefore do not deserve our support. Though they fall short of perfection, these Governments were chosen by the people of their respective countries, and were not imposed by force controlled from without. I maintain that the substitution of aggressive communism for the imperfect Governments of Greece and Turkey would not solve the basic issues, but would make the solution more difficult.

I am not an alarmist, and I do not mean to imply that war is inevitable, or even imminent. But realism compels us to recognize that we are engaged in a struggle to determine which parts of the world are to be dominated by the Communists and which parts left free to choose their own way of life. I am con-

vinced that the Soviet Government is not ready for war, and does not desire war, but is determined to keep expanding the areas under Communist domination by every means short of war. I believe that an American foreign policy exemplified by the proposal to aid Greece and Turkey is our most effective means to prevent war, by delimiting the area of Communist expansion and exploitation and by stabilizing the frontiers between communism and the democracies. Perhaps with each at work behind its frontiers, both systems can learn to cooperate for world peace—as Stalin professes the Soviets want to do, and as the United States has demonstrated it wants to do.

I desire to make one further point, concerning the relation of American policy to the United Nations. I think it is useful to recall that Great Britain was aiding both Greece and Turkey, at the request of those two countries. This arrangement was strictly a matter between governments, and was not a concern of the United Nations. When Britain served notice that she no longer could continue that arrangement, the governments of Greece and Turkey appealed directly to the Government of the United States. As for me, I fail to see the logic of the objections raised to the replacement of Great Britain by the United States as the nation supplying the financial and economic aid required by Greece and Turkey, without special reference to the United Nations. This is particularly true when the U. N., and its subsidiary organizations, are without funds to respond to the urgent requests of those two countries. Clearly, it seems to me that this is a matter that necessarily must be handled outside the U. N. As President Truman declared:

In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

American aid to Greece and Turkey would contribute to the strengthening of the United Nations because it would contribute to the political stability and economic well-being that are essential to the preservation of peace, and to the maintenance of the national security of the United States.

May I say in conclusion that I am heartily in favor of the President's recommendation of a loan of \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey and shall vote accordingly when the bill comes on for a final vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

GREEK-TURKISH MILITARY MISSION

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed policy of intervention in Greece and Turkey is limitless. President Truman said: "I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." This sets no reservation on the type, the

scope, or the place of the proposed help and support. It is clearly global and permanent in its application.

While at first glance it might seem as though the United States would determine this policy, upon careful analysis, actual control would rest with Russia. Russia could, and no doubt would, stir up the domestic strife or the outside pressure wherever and whenever Russia wanted to force intervention by the United States. Russia would be able to force the extension of the policy to various areas of the world, carefully selected by the Kremlin. By Russia's actions, the United States could be forced to over-extend itself or to abandon the policy, either of which would be most unfortunate. Indeed, either would be fatal.

Some kind of control of these countries from Washington must result. If this were not so, there would be no point at all to the program. Would we move in to prevent communism and yet allow the natives freely to choose communism? Russia has deviated from the original theory of Karl Marx in some respects. Stalin uses communism as an instrument of Russian nationalistic policy. He has abandoned the Marxian theory, as practiced by Lenin and Trotsky, of a general world revolution of international character, but he retains the theory of a world revolution for the benefit of Russian nationalism. Marxian theory still dominates Russian policy. The basic axiom of Karl Marx is that world capitalism leads to an inevitable crisis, that this crisis is the mother of communistic revolution and that, therefore, the sooner the crisis comes, the sooner will the world revolution be accomplished. Hence, the cornerstone of Russian policy is to precipitate economic crisis in capitalistic and democratic nations, particularly in the United States, the strongest one of all. Premier Stalin referred to this in his famous speech of February 9, 1946. What Russia has done during the past years in general conforms to this thesis. If the United States embarks upon a policy which will deplete and weaken its strength and its resources, then we are actually playing into the hands of the Soviet Union and the Communists. We will be doing for the Soviet Union what they are unable and impotent to do for themselves. We will be enabling the Soviets to control indirectly our own domestic economy. By forcing us to expand and affirm at her will, she will decide what we are to make and to do here at home.

The uncompromising attitude of Russia in respect to Germany supports this thought. This was the key question to settle with Russia in the Moscow Conference. Secretary Marshall failed to reach some kind of an agreement whereby the load would be lifted from the United States. He has been unable to do so. Before Moscow, a settlement in respect to Austria was widely anticipated. This failure is even more significant.

This country, with some help from the United Kingdom, has been supplying western Germany, the British and American occupation zones, with goods valued

at more than \$500,000,000 per year. From eastern Germany, Russia first took factories and equipment. After the Russians found they were unable to set these factories up in Russia and make them work, the Russians then changed their method, leaving the factories in Germany and taking the goods currently produced from the factories. Russia has been taking goods currently produced equal to \$500,000,000 which the United States is putting into Germany and which may have to be put into Germany at least until some kind of agreement is reached. The division of Germany gave Russia the self-supporting agricultural section of eastern Germany. The western section, under the British and American control, cannot feed itself, and never did. In this area, the vast majority of the population of Germany have poured—Germans from various other European countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, as well as refugees from the Russian zone. In spite of German territory taken by Russia and Poland, the population of the present curtailed Germany is larger than that of prewar Germany. Seventy-two million Germans are being crowded into an area one-quarter smaller than the whole prewar Germany which supported only 69,000,000 Germans. A square kilometer of German land will have an average of 200 inhabitants compared to 168 before the war. This creates the problem of either a continued drain on American resources or, according to President Hoover, letting 25,000,000 Germans starve. The situation will continue until some kind of an agreement whereby Germany can support itself eventually is reached. The French see in this the threat of a future demand for expansion by Germany and hence, a threat to France.

The net effect of the present policy is for the American taxpayer to feed the Germans so that the Germans can work and produce goods to turn over to the Russians for reparations. Almost exactly the same thing happened between 1924 and 1931. Then the United States loaned Germany over \$2,000,000,000 which was never repaid but out of which most of the reparations sent to France and Britain came. Today our expenditures amount to a subsidy to Russia just as in the former case it amounted to a subsidy to France and Britain. It is entirely inconsistent with President Truman's position on the Greek-Turkish question. We are asked to supply \$400,000,000 to erect a bulwark against Russia in Greece and Turkey, while at the same time the policy in Germany is to give Russia \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 worth of goods to bolster her economy for future expansion. The same can be said of the Italian Peace Treaty, under which we would supply funds and goods to Italy, while Italy would be required to pay reparations to Russia and Yugoslavia. Secretary Marshall is attempting to negotiate an agreement under which Germany can repay us for all sums advanced and can become self-supporting, and thereafter, but only thereafter, undertake the task of paying reparations to other countries. The Rus-

sian policy certainly seems to be designed to drain our resources, to keep this load upon our backs. This pattern is completely clear in every phase of Soviet policy.

In ex-President Hoover's report on feeding the Germans, he calls attention to the fact that, under a limitation imposed by Russia, and I quote from his report:

The fishing grounds in the Baltic and North Seas are being limited against Germans fishing. As there are ample supplies of fish in these seas, it seems a pity that British and American taxpayers are called upon to furnish food in substitution for fish the Germans could catch for themselves.

∞ Fish are one of the finest proteins in the world. Proteins are most needed in Germany. The American taxpayers are required to send protein or protein substitutes all the way across the ocean to Germany in order to supply a commodity quite freely available off their own coast line.

I used to play chess quite frequently. In chess, before making a move, you always study the probable continuation or variation your opponent will adopt. What move will he make to counter or offset yours? The Russian counter move to the Greek-Turkish program seems to me not only obvious but also deadly effective. It will be under their control.

There is another phase. Once we announce our intention of advancing loans and missions to check communism everywhere, we have advertised to every government throughout the world that they can call on us with reasonable hope of success for any Communist menace, whether real or faked. If all this keeps up long enough, one of these days we will be broke and totalitarian ourselves. Dorothy Thompson said, a few days ago, in which she developed this thought quite clearly. To quote:

There is also a more immediate danger than that it will lead us into war. It might, instead, lead us into bankruptcy. . . . The greatest barrier against the spread of communism the instrument of Russian messianic imperialism, is a prosperous, solvent America.

. . . . The quickest way to communism is American bankruptcy after a failure of dollar diplomacy—more dollar than diplomacy—that, plus war hysteria.

I say, if we adopt this Truman doctrine, Russia will totalitarianize this country without firing a popgun.

We can draw some lessons from the British on this. The situation within the United Kingdom today, combined with the changes occurring externally in the British Empire, deserve constant study. Recently, speaking in Richmond, Va., Lord Inverchapel, the British Ambassador to the United States, frankly said:

I am prepared to concede that we—

The British Empire—

may have overdone our expenditure abroad. In fact, we have. That is why we have come here to ask your Government to take over our financial responsibilities in Greece and Turkey.

Yet, from the accounts of Wallace's trip to the United Kingdom, there is a

strong opposition to the Truman doctrine in the British Isles themselves.

It is entirely in the cards that we may be called upon to take over further British commitments, particularly those in the British-occupied zone of Germany. It is reported that discussions have taken place as to what the United States should do after the British withdraw from India in 1948. Russian aid to the Chinese Communists might well force our reentry into China. All these moves and proposals must be taken into account in deciding this question.

From parts of the foregoing you can readily see why I oppose this program.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman feel that, if we undertake this policy, we might just as well tell the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, and his Committee on Appropriations to stop trying to reduce Army and Navy expenses and other expenses, because in line with the argument made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] we are on the march?

Mr. KUNKEL. We are on the march, and as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] has pointed out, we have opened the door to every country of the world to come in and request aid from us on the ground of combating communism. How can you refuse them if they can present any kind of a legitimate case?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Chairman, I shall content myself with less time than the distinguished chairman of the committee has granted me. I do not rise to suggest any particular answer for the question before us, but rather to define if I can, and for my own purposes, the nature of the problem as it presents itself to me.

I envy those of my colleagues who find this question simple and uncomplicated, and who have a completely apt answer which fully satisfies them. I notice that in such cases the answer is almost invariably on the negative, which is itself not without significance.

I also observe that a majority of my constituents who have addressed me on this subject also find the question more simple than it appears to me, and that they too are negatively minded. Perhaps they are right.

But it seems to me that the negative approach to this question is based upon a misconception of its character. There are obviously many who feel that if we can only avoid adopting this bill we will be safe—safe from war; safe from national bankruptcy; safe even from the necessity of making hard decisions.

They seem to think that this problem, like the fabled unicorn, has only one horn, and that to avoid its cruel possibilities is the ultimate good. But this question is not that kind of an animal; it is, on the contrary, a dilemma; and there is nothing merely fabulous about dilemmas; they are part of the stubborn stuff of life, of our urgent realities.

This question threatens us with two horns, on one of which we must voluntarily impale ourselves by our collective vote. Both are about equally grim. To support this bill is to abandon a national policy which had its first expression in Washington's Farewell Address; to support this bill is to advance our declared sphere of national interest to the very core of the Near East, at the hottest spot on an already overheated globe. It means that we are deliberately toeing up to the Russian bear; and that, Mr. Chairman, is quite a chore. Let us have no mistake about that.

But not to support this bill is itself an affirmative decision; a decision to abandon any effort to face up to our international problems and try to alter them to our advantage by courage and firmness; a decision to repeat past errors, rather than profit by them; a decision to repudiate the responsibility which our Constitution clearly commits to the Executive; and finally, a rejection of the leadership of the one man in America in whose wisdom, courage and proven competence we all place the highest trust.

To me, this has never been an issue of humanitarianism, in the smaller and now more generally accepted sense of the word; it is not merely a matter of "opposing the spread of communism" in foreign lands; it is rather a move in the field of international relationships, an operation of over-all and major strategy. I have neither the personal knowledge nor the experience to reach any finally satisfying conclusion as to its ultimate wisdom. But I believe that the man who has already steered this Nation's cause at one of the most critical junctures of history, is probably the best equipped American to guide us in this new emergency. I hope that none, even among my constituents will disparage him as being a "militarist"; he is a soldier, but he is also a statesman of the first order.

I am going to vote for this bill, not without the deepest concern for the future, but because, being in doubt, I revert to my basic philosophy that leadership is the sine qua non of all security, all success, and all progress; and I am willing to trust the foreign relations of America to the leadership of General Marshall.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have a task force in the eastern Mediterranean. We have a foothold in Saudi Arabia where the Arabian-American Oil Co. will pay six billions for oil concessions to Ibn Saud and his 600 sons. We will soon be in Turkey and Greece. The administration is definite about its policy in those places, but what about the vacillation in Palestine in the Near East. In the instance of Greece, compulsion comes from the East and in the instance of the Holy Land, the oppression comes from the West. May I ask, "Do we measure evil by who fosters it?"

It is difficult to comprehend the attitude of our delegates to the UN, Warren Austin and Herschel Johnson. They have given less than lip service to the

declared policy of the United States on Palestine.

Now comes Secretary of State Marshall who believes it would be premature for the United States to formulate its policy on Palestine. What about the two resolutions passed by Congress which called for unlimited immigration of Jews into Palestine, for close settlement on the land and the eventual establishment therein of a Jewish democratic commonwealth? What about the planks in the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in the last Presidential campaign which advocated the same? What about the testimony of our Nation as embodied in forthright declarations of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman?

President Roosevelt said:

I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim, and if re-elected I shall help to bring about its realization.

President Truman said:

It is only natural, therefore, that this Government should favor at this time the entry into Palestine of considerable numbers of displaced Jews in Europe, not only that they may find shelter there but also that they may contribute their talents and energies to the upbuilding of the Jewish national home.

Perhaps Palestine is a new subject for Mr. Marshall, but it is not a new subject for the Nation. Perhaps he is being briefed by Mr. Loy Henderson, the Arabophile. I do not wonder that he is possibly confused. He must know, however, that his party is pledged, as is his chief, President Truman, to demand the abrogation of the Malcolm MacDonald white paper of 1939 which shamelessly closed the doors of Palestine to escaping Jews. He must be aware of the inconsistent attitude of our delegates at the General Assembly, who but for the delegates of the small nations would have even precluded Jewish representation from appearing before Committee No. 1, the Political and Security Committee.

Does Mr. Marshall forget the six million killed in Hitler's charnel houses? He dare not forget that. The Jews must have a voice, although they have no vote. Who is to speak for them unless they speak for themselves? Mr. Austin, apparently, does not speak for them.

There is something indecent about the way Great Britain's spokesmen and American spokesmen and Indian spokesmen, and even Arabian spokesmen, begin with an apology about Jewish suffering and Jewish martyrdom and end up with a verbal shrug. Never mind these apologies. Never mind the soft-soap. Do not bother with the dripping sentimentalities. Say your piece and do not bother to prettify it. The insistent note of hypocrisy is by this time a maddening monotone.

The Arabs in full dress and full parade have seized upon their advantage and have stated their arguments and distorted the truth before the General Assembly. But Warren Austin and Herschel Johnson would have precluded the

Jews from replying. Do they not want the truth? The whole question of Palestine revolves about the Jewish stake in Palestine, and yet it is claimed they are not entitled to representation. They are relegated to the antechamber, cooling their heels while their fate is decided.

And what does all this sound and fury, this procedural tangle add up to, all this feverish debate and thumping of memorandum, and the whispered meetings between the Arabs and the British and the United States, all the sage remarks of our columnists and the breathless reporting of our radio commentators? What will be the sum total? Another investigatory commission, the twentieth of its kind. And what, too, if that commission probes and searches and listens to testimony of all sides and recommends in all sincerity what it considers the best of solutions? If not acceptable to Great Britain, then she will dismiss the commission with the usual British civility and proceed on her devastating way in Palestine.

Will this farce never be played out? Will commission follow commission in an endless merry-go-round? How much can one people endure?

Well-wishers of Jews and the Jews themselves, the people of our country, can expect little from those in the middle echelons of the British Foreign Office of our own State Department. The Loy Hendersons have their counterparts in the assistants to Bevin at Whitehall Street. Most of those having to do with Palestine were educated or spent a long period of time in the Middle East. Henderson, who is Director of the Office of Near Eastern Affairs, was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iraq. Gordon P. Merriam, Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs, was a teacher of English and geography at Robert College, Constantinople, and was vice consul and consul at various times at Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, and Istanbul. He was secretary of the Embassy at Cairo as well as at Tehran. In turn, Evan Wilson, assistant to Merriam, was vice consul at Cairo.

These men have all taken on the color of their surroundings and have become Arabophiles. In fact, they are more Arab than the Moslems. They never walked and talked with the fellahin, the humble denizens of Arabia, but they were wine and dined by the pashas and emirs and caliphs and courted by the British Foreign Office on all occasions.

Mr. Loy Henderson had the audacity some years ago to try to explain to me that the splitting off of Trans Jordan from Palestine and the promulgation of the white paper of 1939 were not violations of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924.

We see these devil's advocates acting behind the silken curtain when they attempted unduly to influence the American members of the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee. Bartley Crum in his book speaks of the action of Loy Henderson in attempting to brief him and his colleagues. He wanted to have them prejudge the whole subject of Palestine before there was any inquiry.

We see Evan Wilson as the villain of the piece. He accompanied the American members of the inquiry committee and sought to pressure them. Wilson used the phrase, "an aroused Arab world." He spoke of Britain's life line and as he did Bartley Crum "heard in my mind again the careful words of Loy Henderson."

The presence, too, at Flushing Meadows, of the State Department oil expert, Hayden Raynor, is very significant.

These are the mischief makers who sabotage the declared congressional and executive policy of the United States. Perhaps they applaud the appearance of the members of the higher Arab committee before the political and security committee. This is the same Arab higher committee, most of whose members, according to British and American intelligence reports, played the pro-Axis game in the last war. It is headed by the Hitler stooge, the Grand Mufti, who in his broadcasts from Berlin encouraged the Moslems to fight against the Allies, who organized the Arab brigade that killed Allied soldiers. He should long since have been hanged as a war criminal on a gibbet five times higher than the one from which Haman hanged.

It is high time that our State Department spurned the Loy Hendersons and Gordon Merriams and Evan Wilsons and refused to dance to the tune called by the British Foreign Office. It is high time our Palestine policy were made by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and not by our striped-trousered underling saboteurs.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are advised that the \$400,000,000 provided in H. R. 2616 is to be given to Greece and Turkey to stop communism. I challenge anyone to show me how communism is going to be stopped by the granting of this gift.

I must admit, however, that it is encouraging to see the President of the United States, after all these years, finally acknowledge there is such a thing as a Communist threat in this world. There are many of us who have been trying to point out the dangers of communism to the people of this country, as well as those in high places in our Government, and as a result of our patriotic efforts have had to stand up under one of the most vicious smear campaigns that has existed in the history of our country. We were called Red baiters, witch hunters, Fascists, Hitlerites, and many other names which are all a part of the familiar technique of the Communist, left-wing, and fellow-traveler groups in this country.

Instead of stopping communism, the granting of this gift will only act as an invitation for any country in the world to come to us with the plea that its Government is threatened by communism and ask for gifts for the purpose of stopping communism. It is only reasonable to assume that if these gifts are not granted, the United States will then be charged with taking an unfriendly attitude toward those who are refused.

Already many countries are lining up with hat in hand ready to ask for these gifts if they are granted to Greece and Turkey.

You can no sooner stop communism by granting gifts to the various countries of the world than you were able to stop people from drinking when the eighteenth amendment was added to the Constitution. Friendship is something you cannot buy. It is something you must earn, and, in order to earn it, you must have a definite program better than communism, and a means of conveying that program to the peoples of the world. The Communists, through the Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia, have had a very definite foreign policy of world revolution from the beginning of the Lenin regime. They not only stick to it but work at it consistently throughout the world in every country. On the other hand, the United States of America has not had a definite foreign policy and no one seems to know from year to year in what direction we are going. Combating the ideologies of communism is an educational problem and not a monetary one.

It is encouraging, at least to a slight degree, to see the President of the United States recognize the threat, and I hope a practical and constructive program will be offered by him to meet this menace, particularly here at home.

I received a letter the other day from one of my constituents and he raised a question which I think very aptly states the point:

Did it ever occur to you that a lot of people in the United States think it is more important to protect the Potomac from the Communists than the Dardanelles?

Anticipating that some Members of this House might raise the point here by saying, Did not the President in his Executive order of March 22, 1947, recognize the threat of Communists on the Potomac, particularly those employed by the Federal Government, and prescribed procedures for eliminating them from public office?" I have studied this release very carefully, and, notwithstanding the screaming headlines of the press on the following day to the effect that Mr. Truman was going to get rid of Reds in Government, there is nothing in the Executive order that will expedite or assist in getting rid of these subversives. It may come as somewhat of a shock to you to know that in the opinion of a great many people, as well as myself, who have studied this Executive order, sincerely believe that it will be twice as hard to remove these Benedict Arnolds from our pay rolls under the President's order.

Ever since we recognized Soviet Russia in 1933 we have done nothing but appease her. We have written numerous letters of protest, and our Ambassadors to Soviet Russia have made many verbal protests, but nothing was ever accomplished. We have let Russia dominate Finland, and take over completely such countries as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and let her set up puppet governments in Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and many other places. Why did we not call her hand at that time rather than at this late date?

We have actually been appeasing Soviet Russia for the past 11 years. In fact, we started appeasing Russia when President Roosevelt, through Ambassador Bullitt, in August of 1935, charged Soviet Russia with violating her pledge of November 16, 1933, the conditions under which we gave her recognition. The exchange of these communications regarding the violation of Russia's pledge makes very interesting reading at this particular time. These communications were released by the Department of State on Saturday, August 31, 1935, and they were as follows:

VIOLATION BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF ITS PLEDGE OF NOVEMBER 16, 1933—NOTE OF PROTEST BY THE UNITED STATES

(Released August 25)

The following is the text of the note presented today to the Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs at Moscow by Ambassador Bullitt and thereafter made available to the press at Moscow by Ambassador Bullitt: "Under instructions from my Government, I have the honor to call attention to the activities, involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States, which have taken place on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in connection with the VII All-World Congress of the Communist International, and, on behalf of the Government of the United States, to lodge a most emphatic protest against this flagrant violation of the pledge given by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on November 16, 1933, with respect to noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States.

"That pledge, which was given by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a result of the discussions which took place prior to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, reads in full as follows:

"WASHINGTON, November 16, 1933.

"Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
"President of the United States of America,
"The White House.

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Republics:

"1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable rights of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories and possessions.

"2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed interventions, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

"3. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which make claim to be the Government of, or makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of, the United States, its

territories or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups.

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

"I am, my dear Mr. President,

"Very sincerely yours,

"MAXIM LITVINOFF,

"People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,
"Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

"My Government invites particular attention to the obligations of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contained in the paragraph numbered 4:

"In view of the fact that the aim and activity of an organization, such as the Congress of the Communist International, functioning on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, cannot be unknown to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it does not seem necessary to present material to show the aim of the Congress of the Communist International with respect to the political or social order of the United States or to quote from the published proceedings of the congress to show its activity relative to the internal affairs of the United States, as evidenced in the discussion at the congress of the policies and activities of the Communist organization in the United States and the determination and formulation by the congress of policies to be carried out in the United States by the Communist organization in the United States. Nor does it appear necessary to list the names of representatives or officials of the Communist organization in the United States who were active at the above-mentioned congress whose admissions into the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was, of course, known to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"As I have pointed out to the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs when discussing earlier violations of the undertaking of November 16, 1933, the American people resent most strongly interference by foreign countries in their internal affairs, regardless of the nature or probable result of such interference, and the Government of the United States considers the strict fulfillment of the pledge of noninterference an essential prerequisite to the maintenance of normal and friendly relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The Government of the United States would be lacking in candor if it failed to state frankly that it anticipates the most serious consequences if the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is unwilling, or unable, to take appropriate measures to prevent further acts in disregard of the solemn pledge given by it to the Government of the United States.

"I may add that it is a source of regret that in the present international situation the development of friendly relations between the Russian and American peoples will inevitably be precluded by the continuance on territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in violation of the promise of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of activities involving interference in the internal affairs of the American people."

REPLY OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

(Released August 27)

The following is a translation of a note received by the Department of State from the American Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The note was handed to the American Ambassador on August 27 by the Acting People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs:

Moscow, August 27, 1935.

MR. AMBASSADOR: By note of August 25 of this year you invited my attention to the activity of the Congress of the Communist International which took place at Moscow and, referring to the note of the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Litvinov to the President of the United States of America, Mr. Roosevelt, under date of November 16, 1933, protested against this activity, considered by your Government as a violation of the obligations of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States provided for in the note of November 16, 1933.

In connection therewith I consider it necessary to emphasize with all firmness that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has always regarded and still regards with the greatest respect all obligations which it has taken upon itself, including naturally, the mutual obligation concerning noninterference in internal affairs provided for in the exchange of notes of November 16, 1933, and discussed in detail in the conversation between the President of the United States of America, Mr. Roosevelt, and the People's Commissar Litvinov. There are contained no facts of any kind in your note of August 25, which could be considered as a violation on the part of the Soviet Government of its obligations.

On the other hand it is certainly not new to the Government of the United States that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot take upon itself and has not taken upon itself obligations of any kind with regard to the Communist International.

Hence the assertion concerning the violation by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the obligations contained in the note of November 16, 1933, does not emanate from obligations accepted by both sides, in consequence of which I cannot accept your protest and am obliged to decline it.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, sincerely sharing the opinion of the Government of the United States of America, that strict mutual noninterference in internal affairs is an essential prerequisite for the maintenance of friendly relations between our countries, and steadfastly carrying out this policy in practice, declares that it has as its aim the further development of friendly collaboration between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America responding to the interests of the people of the Soviet Union and the United States of America and possessing such great importance for the cause of universal peace.

Taking advantage of the occasion, I invite you to accept the assurance of my high esteem.

N. KRESTINSKI.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

(Released August 31 for morning newspapers of September 1)

In connection with the protest lodged by Ambassador Bullitt against the violation by the Soviet Government of its pledge of November 16, 1933, with regard to noninterference in the internal affairs of the United States, and the reply of the Soviet Government thereto, the Secretary of State today made the following statement:

"The recent note of this Government to the Government of the Soviet Union and the reply of that government raises the issue whether that government in disregard of an express agreement entered into at the time of recognition in 1933 will permit organizations or groups operating on its territory to plan and direct movements contemplating the overthrow of the political or social order of the United States. For 16 years this Government withheld recognition—as did many other governments—mainly for the reason that the Soviet Government had failed to respect the right of this Nation to maintain its own political and social order without interference by organizations conducting in or from Soviet territory activities directed against our institutions.

"In 1933 this Government, observing the serious effects upon peace and prosperity of the many partial or dislocated international relationships throughout the world, took upon anew the question whether the United States and the Soviet Union, two of the largest nations, could not find a way to establish more natural and normal relations, which would afford a basis for genuine friendship and collaboration to promote peace and improve material conditions both at home and abroad. After various stipulations in writing had first been carefully drafted and agreed upon by representatives of the two Governments, recognition was accorded to the Government of the Soviet Union by this Government in November 1933. One of the most important provisions of the agreement thus reached was the pledge of the Soviet Government to respect the right of the United States 'to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories, or possessions.' The essence of this pledge was the obligation assumed by the Soviet Government not to permit persons or groups on its territory to engage in efforts or movements directed toward the overthrow of our institutions. The representative of the Soviet Government declared in writing that 'coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the affixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"4. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories, or possessions."

"The language of the above-quoted paragraph irrefutably covers activities of the Communist International, which was then, and still is, the outstanding world Communist organization, with headquarters at Moscow.

"In its reply of August 27, 1935, to this Government's note of August 25, 1935, the Soviet Government almost in so many words repudiates the pledge which it gave at the time of recognition that 'it will be fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics * * * not to permit and to prevent' the very activities against which this Government has complained and protested. Not for a moment denying or questioning the fact of Communist International activities on Soviet territory, involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States, the Soviet Government denies having made any promise 'not to permit * * * and to prevent' such activities of that organization on Soviet territory, asserting that it has not taken upon itself obligations of any kind with regard to the

Communist International. That the language of the pledge, as set out above, is absolutely clear and in no way ambiguous and that there has been a clean-cut disregard and disavowal of the pledge by the Soviet Government is obvious.

"The American Government, having previously made oral complaints of failure by the Soviet Government to carry out its pledge and being deeply concerned over the growing instability of international relations and the dangerous consequences thereof to peace and economic recovery, sought most earnestly in its note of August 25 to impress upon the Soviet Government the sanctity of its pledge to the end that there might be between the two nations continued development of friendly and official relations and valuable collaboration in many beneficial ways. When in its reply the Soviet Government indicated an intention entirely to disregard its promise to prevent such activities as those complained of, it struck a severe blow at the fabric of friendly relations between the two countries.

"To summarize, in view of the plain language of the pledge, it is not possible for the Soviet Government to disclaim its obligation to prevent activities on its territory directed toward overthrowing the political or social order in the United States. And that Government does not and cannot disclaim responsibility on the ground of inability to carry out the pledge, for its authority within its territorial limits is supreme and its power to control the acts and utterances of organizations and individuals within those limits is absolute.

"It remains to be seen to what extent the intention indicated by the Soviet Government's reply, which is directly contrary to the fixed policy declared in its pledge, will be carried into effect. If the Soviet Government pursues a policy of permitting activities on its territory involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States, instead of preventing such activities, as its written pledge provides, the friendly and official relations between the two countries cannot but be seriously impaired. Whether such relations between these two great countries are thus unfortunately to be impaired and cooperative opportunities for vast good to be destroyed, will depend upon the attitude and action of the Soviet Government."

Regardless of these protests, we have continued to appease Soviet Russia by permitting her to carry on her insidious propaganda against our country throughout the world, and particularly inside the United States. Our present program must come as somewhat of a shock to Soviet Russia in view of our many years of appeasement.

In August of 1941 we were given the Atlantic Charter. This was the charter which was to give hope to all small nations and guarantee their independence at the termination of World War II. Let me read you the third provision of the Atlantic Charter, which is as follows:

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Did we stand by our commitment to that Charter when we let Soviet Russia gobble up all her satellite states? The answer is obviously "No."

A greater disgrace, however, was when the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, sold the brave, gallant, patri-

otic people of Yugoslavia down the river to Stalin, and permitted him to put his Communist leader, Tito, in as dictator of Yugoslavia.

We must admit in this present situation, if we will be honest, that the Communist pressure on the Greeks is due wholly to the activities and the program of Tito. Tito would not be in a position today to bring this pressure to bear on the Greeks if Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had not agreed to Tito for the dictator of Yugoslavia. He was supplied with millions and millions of dollars' worth of food and various materials, through UNRRA and other agencies, with which to build up his strength in Yugoslavia. This total amount almost equals what we are asked to appropriate in this bill. In other words, we are asked to appropriate \$400,000,000 to fight a program that was set up by approximately a like amount for Tito.

Now the President of the United States has the audacity to come before the Congress and ask us to furnish money to fight what he and his predecessor are responsible for.

The most effective way to promote the forward march of communism throughout the world, and particularly in our own country, is to weaken our economy to the extent that we are no longer financially able to help ourselves, let alone the peoples of other countries.

The New Deal can accuse the Republican Party all it wants for the inflation of prices and wages, but the fact still remains that the reason prices have gone up, thereby giving labor a legitimate excuse for increased wages, is due to our own Government and the governments of other countries, with money we have given them, coming in and bidding against individuals for merchandise and commodities.

It is high time that the Congress of the United States starts paying a little attention to the people of our own country. I do not believe any individual, including the President of the United States, has the right to put the Congress and the people of our country in the position of either granting this gift to Greece and Turkey or losing face with the peoples of all the other nations. And that is exactly the position we are in today.

If the administration had not been so foolish as to appease Soviet Russia at the San Francisco Conference that brought forth the United Nations organization, when they agreed to give her the veto power, we would not be in the position we are today.

The Congress should either agree that situations of this kind should be handled through the United Nations organization, or be willing to admit the United Nations organization is a failure and is not capable of doing those things we were told it would do when it was organized. A proposition of this kind should be handled through the United Nations organization as long as it is in existence. Loaning this money to Greece and Turkey will be serving notice on the entire world that in our opinion UN has failed.

Our plight in considering this gift to Greece and Turkey is proof of the old adage that "politics has strange bed-

fellows." I assure you my reasons for opposing this gift are entirely different from those of the Communists and their fellow-travelers.

In a speech made by Daniel Webster in Congress on January 26, 1830, he had this to say:

When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick weather and on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence and before we float further on the waves of this debate, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

I sincerely believe the best interest for the future of our country lies in the defeat of this gift to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Congress is being maneuvered into a course of action simulating the one that led the Nation into World War II. Is this a mere coincidence?

I, along with many others, warned in 1940-41 that legislation forced through the Congress at that time under the guise of keeping America out of war would have the reverse effect. Each of us that were Members of the House at that time remember the repeal of the Neutrality Act, lifting of the arms embargo, cash and carry, arming merchant-marine vessels, use of American ships to convoy materials to countries at war and lend-lease. And all of this in the name of peace, but we know it finally ended with a declaration of war.

What will be the next step? Restoration of OPA? It is well known that the administration reluctantly yielded to the public clamor for ending price control and that it has been possessed of the urge to restore it. Furthermore, as the reenactment of the rent-control law last week clearly reveals, the thinking of a majority of the Members of Congress is in line with that idea.

Will the President request Congress to reenact the price-control law on the ground that this is essential to effectuate the policy embraced in the pending bill? If so, will the Members who supported the measure presently under consideration refuse such request? How could they?

All this comes at the very moment inflation is getting out of control. Carrying out of the program projected by the pending bill will add to the existing inflationary forces and will have the effect of increasing the efforts of the groups that are pressing for restoring the OPA.

Suppose the President some time later tells the Congress that conscription is also necessary to carry out the program involved in the pending bill and requests Congress to reenact the conscription law. Will the Members who are voting for the measure under consideration refuse such request? Would it be consistent for them to do so?

A vote for this bill is sanction for the administration to restore OPA and all

the political restraints and regimentation that were in effect during the war, but intensified to a degree that will make the political interferences of World War II look like a picnic by comparison.

It will simply mean the completion of the collectivist economy.

To stop Russian territorial expansion and domination is one thing. To take action against her to stop communism is something else. It is ridiculous. How can the United States pretend to be opposing communism when we ourselves are already more than half way down the road to that irreligious ideology?

It is wrong to say that the United States is not launching upon a program of imperialism. The fact is that we have already done so, as those who are familiar with the work of the International Trade Organization and other international bodies well know. Either we will have to levy tribute upon some or all of the peoples of the world to meet the cost of policing it, if that is what the cult of internationalism succeeds in establishing, or we will bleed our own Nation to death in the attempt to meet such cost.

Emotion and blind belief are also playing an important role in the passing of this bill. Does the Foreign Affairs Committee pretend to tell the other Members of Congress that it knows the whole background of the President's request for this legislation? Who believes anything of the sort after Yalta, Potsdam, Tehran, and the Atlantic Charter, and so forth?

In going into Greece we are taking sides in a quarrel between two groups, a quarrel that is not remotely related to communism versus free enterprise, but a quarrel that relates solely to the control of the Greek state. Can it be expected that the other nations of the world will look upon this act as being proper and just? Is not this action we are taking tantamount to declaration of war upon Greece itself? Does it not involve our holding Greece by military force? Let the Members supporting this measure pass these things off lightly, if you will, but coming events will have it otherwise.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I have listened to the testimony of the officials of our State, War, and Navy Departments and that presented by our Ambassadors to Greece and Turkey. All have testified that the need for this legislation is immediate and urgent and that it is essential if Greece and Turkey are to survive as free and independent nations of the world. These officials have also given the committee absolute assurance that the passage of this bill would not lead us into war.

On the other hand, we have listened to the opponents of the bill, who have testified that it is a complete reversal of our previous foreign policy, that it is by-passing the United Nations, that it will lead us into war, that it will end in a race for armaments and will eventually lead to bankruptcy of the entire world.

Thus, I have earnestly sought, how I should vote on this pending bill and

after careful consideration, I will support the foreign policy proposed by our President. It has been called "dollar diplomacy" and rightfully so, but it is my belief that it is better to give dollars now than to receive bullets later.

This bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed \$400,000,000 and gives the President the power "when he deems it in the interest of the United States" to furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey upon the requests of their governments and upon the terms determined by him. Thus the assistance would be of four types: First, financial aid in the form of loans, grants, and credits; second, sending American officials for the purpose of assistance; third, a limited number of military men in an advisory capacity for instruction and training; and, fourth, articles, services, and information which the President may deem advisable. This has been described as giving the President a blank check for \$400,000,000, but if the program is going to be successful, it is absolutely necessary to grant the President blanket powers.

Mr. Chairman, we have the testimony of State Department officials that Turkey is being subjected to severe external pressure from the north, which has forced her to maintain a large armed force for defense purposes. Her army at the present time is about 800,000 men and this has put a severe strain on her national economy. The pressure includes definite demands for portions of east Turkey and for bases that would give other powers control of the Dardanelles. This would lead to the collapse of Turkey and let Russia gain control of the entire Middle East. In my opinion this would comprise the strategic position of the United States and make it impossible to gain world peace. Thus, I think it is vitally essential that we aid Turkey to remain militarily strong. From information received, we find that the morale of the Turkish Army is excellent, and knowing the background of the Turks that they will fight if invaded, the financial aid poured into Turkey will not be wasted. In fact, I feel sure that in years to come the entire world will profit by this investment. The sum of \$100,000,000 has been recommended to be used to provide military security for Turkey. No part of this amount will be used for civilian supplies. The funds will be used to modernize the Turkish Army. The purchases will be under the supervision of our ambassador and I feel sure that the members of the committee who have listened to the frank and enlightening statement of Mr. Wilson, who appeared before the committee, of the existing conditions in Turkey, that they can have no doubt as to his ability to see that the money is expended as this great body intends it to be.

However, in Greece we face an entirely different situation. The Greek Government is weak and her condition has become very acute after 4 years of war and enemy occupation. The \$275,000,000 thus proposed for Greece is going to be quite a gamble. It will, however,

help save a free and proud people. Greece has always been a very poor nation, one that was just able to survive on a hand-to-mouth basis. That, together with great destruction caused by 4 years of war, has left Greece in such a weakened condition that at present she is fertile pasture for aggressors and expanding neighbors. In fact, Greece has charged before the Security Council of the United Nations that her neighbors to the north have been supplying and training insurgents who have been conducting raids upon her northern civilian population. In order to combat this, House Resolution 2616 will provide \$150,000,000 for the armed forces of Greece. It will permit the Greek Army to maintain operations against the Russian-inspired guerrilla forces operating from the north and also that she may defend her other borders. What Greece needs most is military equipment for mountain fighting. The other \$125,000,000 is intended for civilian reconstruction and rehabilitation. This will help her repair her bridges, roads, railroads and farms. This will be necessary if Greece is to survive as a free and independent nation and enable her to return to the export market.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this legislation have charged that it is by-passing the United Nations. I deny this accusation. The United Nations is still in its infancy and it is not possible for it to do the job. For almost 2 years the United Nations organization has been trying to lay the ground work for a pattern by which the people of the world can once again live normal lives free from fear. The progress thus far has been slow because of the obstructive action of Russia. This action of Russia and her aggressive tactics toward her smaller neighbors should convince every Member of this great body that there can be no lasting peace until she demonstrates a greater degree of cooperation. So by helping Greece and Turkey we are strengthening the United Nations. I am for a strong international organization for peace and will support such an organization as long as I remain a Member of this body.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it is our desire to let the world know that we are through with appeasement and are going to stand firm against Russia. Our policy is one of great sacrifice to our own people and all we ask is to attempt to bring lasting peace to the free peoples of the world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to obtain as much information as possible on the subject of assistance to Greece and Turkey in order that I could intelligently reach a decision on our aid to these countries. It is a gross understatement to say that this is a grave decision for us to make, as I believe we are well aware of the implications this policy may entail if enacted. I believe that we are also aware of the fact that world peace is threatened whenever totalitarian regimes are imposed on free people by aggression.

I have tried to read every written statement on this subject since the President addressed the Congress bringing this matter to our attention. I have listened to the Members of the House debate this proposed legislation both pro and con. The hearings held by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have been very thorough and reflect sincerity on the part of both Houses to examine this measure carefully.

Greece fought valiantly on the side of the Allies during the recent war and continued to offer effective resistance even when she was occupied by enemy forces. The ravages of war have left Greece with many serious economic problems which can only be solved if assistance is given to her and the threat of communistic aggression is removed. Greece is in need of our assistance to bolster her economic position. In this way only will she be able to defend herself from the disrupting attacks of the Greek Communists who receive a substantial portion of their supplies from the Communist-dominated neighboring countries.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think any of us fought to free these countries from Nazi oppression and to remove the Hitler threat from the world only to deliver them into the hands of the Communists. We would not be accomplishing a single aim we fought for if we continue to allow freedom-loving people to be subjected to the expanding policy of another totalitarian regime.

The following testimony of Mr. Frederick J. Libby, of the National Council for Prevention of War, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is incompatible with the American ideals of freedom and fighting for that freedom.

Note: Mr. JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Congressman from Connecticut, directs the questions:

Mr. LODGE. Do you believe there is anything worse than war?

I can answer the question. Can you answer it?

Mr. LIBBY. I think, Mr. LODGE, that my answer will be that there is nothing worse than war. It sums up all the evils that there are, it breaks all the commandments, and there is always another way out.

Mr. LODGE. If we were now living under the German Nazis, under Hitler, with their race persecution, their hangings, their concentration camps and incinerators, that would be better than war; is that your view?

Mr. LIBBY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Greeks know that there are several things worse than war. They feel, I am sure, that living under a communistic totalitarian government would be worse than war. I know that I would rather fight for my freedom than to submit to either Nazi or Communist domination. I hope that all the Members of the House feel this way.

The situation in Turkey is not a healthy one either. It is reported that the Russians have 20 divisions of troops on the Turkish border. This is a war of nerves against the Turks, and their government has requested military equipment to provide the Turkish army with weapons to defend their borders. Our military leaders feel that if Turkey is compelled to give in to the Russian de-

mands for military control of strategic areas, Turkey would collapse which would involve the subjugation of the entire Middle East by Russian forces.

Mr. Chairman, world leadership has been thrust upon the United States and whether or not we accept this leadership is a part of this present bill. If we do not accept this leadership, a less desirable leader will accept it. I do not believe this policy if enacted will lead one step toward war, but instead will be another step toward the prevention of a third world war.

It is my belief that General Marshall is one of the greatest living Americans and if we support his leadership, the United States will remain strong as we must be if we are to prevent World War III and to assist other nations in becoming strong democracies.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to this debate for the past 2 days. I am amazed and at the same time depressed at the utter callousness of warlike statements issued by certain Members in support of this bill. It has been said by some that the passage of this bill will strengthen the United Nations, thereby contributing greatly to the cause of peace. Others have said that the United Nations is a weakling and that it is incapable of meeting the crisis which confronts the world today.

Let us examine the immediate past. Two years ago we were on the eve of a great victory, culminating one of the most terrible wars in the history of all mankind. That war was so prolonged, devastating, and destructive that all of the nations of the world were convinced that it was necessary to build an organization to prevent further wars. This Nation assumed the leadership in the building of such an organization in the search for a permanent and durable peace.

Fifty-one nations of the world joined together pledging themselves to the principle of collective security, binding themselves and their peoples in a solemn obligation to work out their differences and conflicts by peaceful means rather than by force of arms. This new organization was properly called the United Nations and gave great joy and hope to the people of every color, race, and creed throughout the world. After the hundreds of years of wars, here at last was an organization by and through which the common people of all nations could achieve their dream for a continuing and lasting peace.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; I am amazed that anyone could believe that we are strengthening the United Nations when, in fact, we refuse to use it at all. The United Nations can only be strengthened by continued use of its machinery in settling those problems which affect the peace of the world. That is the purpose for which the United Nations was created. Leading educators, scientists, and diplomats of the world are all of the opinion that by ignoring the United Nations as we propose to do in this bill, we are dealing it a blow from which it will not soon recover, if ever.

I am depressed, Mr. Chairman, at the cynicism and pessimism of leaders who now regard the United Nations as being incapable of performing those functions for which it was created. This is indeed a bitter pill to the people of the world who repose so much hope and faith and confidence in the peace machinery of their own organization.

I do not share the view of those cynical leaders. I believe the United Nations can work if we have the will to make it work and will give it the opportunity. It is imperative that we do so, for only by following such a course will we travel along the road to peace.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in two world wars. In the first I believed, as most people believed at that time, we were fighting a war to make the world safe for democracy. We know now the history of the League of Nations, we know of the great spiritual and moral leadership the United States gave to the world in the quest for peace. We know now that a small group of selfish, willful men interfered with our leadership, and it was only a matter of time until the nations of the world began to play the same old game of power politics. And then we entered World War II.

Every thinking person admits that under the circumstances we had to fight in that war in our national self-interest. True, it cost us blood and treasure but it was a war we had to fight. If nations begin again to act independently of one another, maneuvering and conspiring to outdo each other in the broad field of power politics, war is inevitable. All through the centuries this had been the history of civilization. Practically all of the military leaders of the world and most of the world's politicians and diplomats regard war as inevitable. They accept without question the doctrine of Hegel, the German philosopher, who is dogmatic about the inevitability of war. I suppose it is the thinking of this group that is primarily responsible for this tongue-in-the-cheek attitude insofar as our present United Nations organization is concerned. However, there are wise leaders in this world of ours and they have the support of all of the common people who believe that war is not inevitable; that we can have peace if we have the will to have peace; that we can have peace if we remain united for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no peace in this world if each of the big powers arrogate to themselves the sole right to determine what is just or unjust. In pure and simple language that is anarchy. That course of action has always led to war. It is for that reason that the United Nations, imperfect as it is in some respects, must be given the opportunity to determine what is just or unjust if war is to be prevented. It may well be that the United Nations, due to the existence of the veto power, cannot give us a positive and definite assurance of peace, but a proper use of its machinery can focus world attention upon those who are trying to defeat its purpose. From my experience, I can tell you that the game of war is stupid, and criminal, and brutal. No nation ever solves anything by war. It is true that

sometimes we have to wage war to prove that point. All will agree that wars have become so terrible and costly that even the victor is also the loser in the end.

I should like to emphasize this point. As an American I want to do everything possible to assure and protect our own national self-interest. If the occasion arises and there is no other alternative, I will not hesitate to wage war against Russia in the protection of our own Nation. I do not believe we have reached that point yet, nor do I believe that the people from Colorado and particularly of Denver, whom I represent, believe that we have reached that point yet. That is why I urge upon the Members of Congress to use the machinery of the United Nations in the hope that we may not reach that point at all.

What can we do through the United Nations? What can we do to prevent us from taking this step toward war? We can do this. We have given \$50,000,000 for food and medicine for Greece. That is a step in the right direction but it is not enough. We can, by resolution of this body, give to the President of the United States authority to spend \$100,000,000, or whatever additional amount we may designate, to be used in restoring the economic stability of Greece. That can also be done through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There is no delay in that program. That can be accomplished immediately. Any military aid must come and should be given through the United Nations. There is machinery in the United Nations notwithstanding what has been said on the floor in the past 2 days. There is action that can be taken against Russia or her satellites. Vigorous action by our United States representative in that body can clearly point up the issue. If Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are threatening, let us smoke them out into the open.

Let us turn to Turkey for a moment. The situation there is critical. The President in his message states that the situation existing there is a threat to the peace of the world. In the interest of world peace, of course, it is important that Russia does not overrun Turkey. What can Turkey do about it is the question? Under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, she can petition the Security Council of that body for action. She has merely to say, "My national sovereignty is being threatened by Russia and I ask the protection of the United Nations." The matter will then go to the Security Council, which would then set up an investigating committee. There is a difference of opinion as to whether or not Russia has the power of veto. The majority opinion is that Russia, having been named as an offender, could neither vote nor veto, this being a procedural matter. However, let us assume that Russia not only had the power but exercised her veto. She would then stand indicted before all the people of the world. No; she would not dare to exercise such a veto in that situation any more than was possible when Iran asked for protection. You must understand that the United Nations has been effective in similar situations and I refer specifically to the call for help from Iran, Syria, and Lebanon.

If Turkey is fearful that the Russians are about to attack her for the purpose of seizing the Dardanelles, under the Charter of the United Nations there is a proper procedure to handle such a situation. If there is justification for such a charge, it is the duty of the United Nations to notify the Russians that any such aggressive action is contrary to the Charter, of which Russia is signatory. The United Nations could then set in motion the existing machinery to resist and prevent such an aggression. Then at that time it would be the duty of the United States to come forward, assuming its rightful leadership, and say to the nations of the world, "I stand ready to meet my obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and I ask the nations of the world to join with me in resisting this act of aggression."

No, Mr. Chairman; the path we are pursuing is not the right one. I am in complete agreement with the objectives of this bill, but I should like to travel another road—a road that leads through the United Nations. Again I want to make my position perfectly clear. I am not in agreement with isolationists who are opposed to this bill for different reasons. They are the fear mongers who have always been afraid to go forward. I am not unwilling to spend the amount of money set forth in this bill. I am willing to spend a lot of money now rather than to spend it later for war.

Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that there will be amendments presented to this bill for the purpose of bringing the United Nations into this picture. I shall support those amendments. Clearly by doing nothing we shall injure our own national security and at the same time we shall not be providing the means whereby the United Nations can function at a later time. Therefore, it is my present opinion that should these amendments fail I shall join with others who are in favor of the passage of the bill in the hope that the United Nations may in the future take upon itself what so rightfully belongs to it now.

As for those orators who feel we must act unilaterally and who feel that we, independently, can fight for the "four freedoms" all alone all over the world, in my opinion they ought to talk to the GI's back home. But I warn you that they have a peculiar cheer for that type of oratory which would place them again in military service. They are not anxious to go into another war. They have had their belly full of it for now. It is all very well for world politicians and for striped-pants diplomats to determine these great issues which lead people into war, but, I tell you, the people do not want to go to war, and I say to you that this bill, unless amended, may very well lead us into World War III.

All history is screaming at us. In this age of the atomic bomb, religious leaders, educators, scientists, and elder statesmen have implored and beseeched us to close the gap between present political thinking and the great advances made by science. Truly this is a race between education and catastrophe. As a result of World War II, on every side there is chaos, misery, and suffering. It will take a generation for some of the nations

of the world to recover from the effects of the last war.

Already we have seen evidence of great political changes throughout the world. The tide of these political changes will ebb and flow until some measure of economic stability is restored to those nations most seriously affected by the war. Our greatest contribution to world peace and to our own peace is to do all that we can, without endangering our own economy, to aid and assist the people in the war-torn areas of the world in regaining their economic balance. This is the proper method to meet the challenge of communism. By proper action the people of the world will continue to look to this Nation for hope and leadership. Such will not be the case if we assume the position followed by others in the game of power politics. That is a costly game and one for which we as a people are unsuited both by temperament and tradition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, America is faced by two prongs of a foreign policy. The one prong is to pour out our money in foreign relief which inevitably will be a heavy drain on our national resources. The other prong of the foreign policy involves loans being sought by foreign governments. These also will add to the drain on our national resources and to the danger of inflation which results from an artificial activity which brings in no return.

Last week I voted for the reduced relief assistance to people of countries devastated by war because I realized, as did other Members of the House of Representatives, that to withhold food from the starving, wherever situated, is inhuman and cruel, even in the countries of our former enemies or in those whose present governments are dominated or coerced by the Soviet Union. We were, and are, firmly convinced that unless we help to keep starvation out of Europe, chaos—communistic regimented chaos—will sweep the Old World.

Now we are considering another bill, a proposal for loans approximating \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. My vote on that proposition will be in the negative.

The relief funds, voted last week, while they do constitute a drain on our resources, are temporary in nature, and are designed to help sustain hungry European peoples until they can recover sufficiently from the ravages of war to take care of themselves.

The Grecian-Turkish loans in their naked reality are military loans. They simply open the door to demands for the expenditure of not hundreds of millions but many billions of dollars over a long period of time in a policy which would involve us in every war, big or little, that would take place in Europe or the Orient for the next 50 or a hundred years.

Since this proposal by the administration has split party lines in all directions, it is not a partisan question.

What actually has been proposed by the administration is that we, the Con-

gress, commit the American people to accept and to finance a jigsaw-puzzle foreign policy, the outlines of which we can only surmise. Two—only two—little pieces of this jigsaw puzzle are laid down for the American people to see. Those are the loans to Greece and to Turkey. It is admitted that they are military loans.

If we grant these loans, what about Poland, Estonia, Finland, Rumania, Austria, Russian-occupied Germany, all the countries which are now behind the iron curtain or under the domination of Soviet influence, or which may in the future come within that zone? Are we going to lend money to all of them along with more billions to England and France and China and Italy? What is to be our attitude toward other countries which may be menaced by the shadow of "the bear that walks like a man"?

The American people, and I as a Member of Congress, want to see more of this picture. It is not enough that the door to the United States Treasury be opened while the door to this whole foreign policy is kept closed against the view of the American people.

It becomes appalling when we stop to realize the billions upon billions of dollars we have loaned in addition to our war expenditures.

We have loans amounting to \$9,280,000,000 to 53 foreign countries.

We have the bulk of the money in the World Bank Fund. We have the bulk of the money in the Foreign Currency Stabilization Fund. We put the bulk of the money into UNRRA. The pattern thus far is that we not only fought and paid for two wars, one of them in the Pacific which we fought practically alone and unaided, but we are now asked to rehabilitate, to feed and clothe not only our allies, but our former enemies as well.

The question everybody in America is asking, the question uppermost in your thoughts and in my thoughts is this:

"Are we going to have to fight Russia to stop the expansion of despotism by the Soviet group over all Europe and the Orient?" If that is so, is it better to stop Russia now and compel her to move the iron curtain back to her borders, or is it better to wait for 10 or 15 years, meanwhile maintaining the strongest national defense in the world, cost what it may, and run the risk that Russia may become so strong, or that she may attain the secrets of atomic warfare, and that such a conflict would simply be mutual suicide, and the destruction of our civilization?

It serves no good purpose for us to keep that question unspoken and under cover to fester and spread until it overshadows all other questions. Let us at least have the courage to look it squarely in the face.

If the Grecian-Turkish proposed military loans are for the purpose of stopping Russia from expanding Stalin despotism, then \$400,000,000 is a mere bagatelle—it is not enough. If these Grecian-Turkish loans are not for the purpose of stopping Russia, then what are they for?

What is the total cost going to be if we embark on this adventure totally out of keeping with American tradition? These

are questions the American people want answered before they are led into this policy.

If we make these loans, shall we have American military and civil commissions set up in the debtor countries to supervise and police the spending of those hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, or will we turn our money over to foreign manipulators to be stolen—much of it to be used to finance communistic expansion? If we are to police the spending of this money, then we shall have embarked upon an imperialistic technique with colonial administration, whether we like the term or not.

What will be done in the case of China; Korea; India; Palestine? These are all pieces of this great jigsaw puzzle of foreign policy which the administration has thus far refused to lay down for us to see.

If, as, and when the other parts of this puzzle are brought into clear view, I shall then decide how I will vote, but until those questions are answered for the American people, I shall vote against taking this Nation into any such policy with our eyes shut and the American people blindfolded.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to my colleagues who have preceded me in discussions of this bill, I have been impressed with the sense of responsibility that they feel rests upon them in casting their votes either for or against the resolution. I have been gratified that, almost without exception, they have approached the problem with a sense of its tremendous importance, its implications and imports to all America, and free from partisan political bias or prejudice; that they have attempted to resolve any questions in their minds from the point of view of Americans, rather than as members of a political party.

I am glad that that is the case, and that this debate has been kept on that plane, for, it seems to me, the matter rises far above any considerations of partisan politics. I shall try to emulate them in my own discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for this bill because, primarily I believe that its passage is essential, is vital, to our national security, and to our national defense. However much I might be moved by humanitarian considerations, I am in complete accord with the gentlemen who feel that our first duty is to our own people, that we should not squander our substance in riotous living, and that we cannot afford to play Santa Claus to the whole world until we first take care of our domestic requirements.

To my mind, this is not a relief bill, however, not a charity, no matter how it is entitled and no matter how it is presented. Whatever may be the disguise it wears, I hope we may see beneath it the reality that confronts us. Having been in two wars I shall vote for the bill to prevent, if possible, a third world war, but if that be impossible, then to ensure that our sons, the sons of my constituents and your constituents, who will be

the ones to fight it, will, at least, have an even break and will do so under the most favorable circumstances possible.

It is my belief, as a result of observation and study, that such a war, if it is to come, will have its origin in the Middle East, in Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Palestine, and Trans-Jordan. From the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, the Middle East has been the crossroads of the world, both physically and ideologically, and today, with our global air lines, it is more so than ever. Its tentacles reach into India and Tibet and thence into China, into Egypt and North Africa, into Greece and Turkey. Never, with some few exceptions like the Valley of the Nile and the Fertile Crescent, a productive land, it is yet immensely wealthy in hydroelectric power and in oil. Its resources in those things have hardly begun to be tapped.

In years gone by England has been the dominant power in that region. Today the British Empire can no longer fulfill its commitments. It is on the verge of national bankruptcy and must, if it is to preserve its national economy, draw out of that whole region. It is a truism of physics that nature abhors a vacuum. And when Britain moves out, someone is going to move in, and, unless we take steps to prevent it, that someone will be Russia. Today two countries stand on the flank of that advance, and only from their territories can that advance be hampered or stopped. They are Greece and Turkey. As a result, they are being attacked, for what is happening is but a form of military operations and unless they are aided they cannot survive as independent nations.

With their flank secure, with Salonika and the Dardanelles under the control of a vassal regime, the Russian march into oil fields of the Middle East is but a short, and a safe, step. And with the inoculation of the Arabs of that region with the virus of communism, an inoculation which will follow occupation as the night the day, it is but a step to spread the disease to their coreligionists of India, the Dutch East Indies, Egypt, and North Africa. As the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey will tell you, once an epidemic starts it spreads fast. Only by isolating the patients and imposing a quarantine can it be conquered. I am for imposing that quarantine as a matter of self preservation.

Some gentlemen have referred to this as a blank check. If it helps to prevent a third world cataclysm it will be worth all its costs, for, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio so correctly observed, civilization can ill afford another such debacle as those through which we have just passed. If it fails to do so it will have immeasurably added to our strength in any conflict which might come.

Others have referred to it as a change in our foreign policy. I do not consider it as such. To my mind, it is but the logical application, in a world grown smaller in this day of more speedy communications, of the Monroe Doctrine which has guided us over the years since

its enunciation. As the world has decreased in size our frontiers have pushed farther and farther from our coast lines until today we must, of necessity, as a matter of self-preservation, be concerned with attacks on democratic institutions and free nations wherever in the world they occur.

I wonder if the gentlemen who propose to vote against this bill have forgotten Munich and Mr. Chamberlain's remarks on his return from that surrender, that he had insured at Munich "peace in our time." All that Munich did for peace was to enable the aggressor the better to prepare for war, to permit him to grow so strong that he was ready to take on all of Europe, all the world. And he nearly succeeded. It took us 3 years to win that one.

Have we not seen enough of the results of such appeasement policies? We tried them with the Kaiser's Germany, and also again with Hitler's, and what was the result? You all know.

Are we to learn nothing from those experiences, so recently and so vividly before us? Are we again going to sacrifice needlessly the lives of thousands of our young men to stop an aggressor whom we, ourselves, have helped to strengthen? But for the change in names, we are today in exactly the same position in which the world was after Hitler had moved into the Rhineland and before his troops occupied Austria and Czechoslovakia.

Are we going to let history repeat itself, or have we, at last, learned a little wisdom? The vote on this measure, I believe, will answer that question.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for these two days with a great deal of interest to the debates. I question no one's motives, for to me it is inconceivable that a Representative of the people in this House, facing so great an issue as we face, would approach it in the spirit of partisanship or fail to do what he conceived to be his duty.

A little more than 25 years ago I engaged, I think, in the most bitter political debate in my career with a very dear friend then, as he is today. I supported the League of Nations proposal, and in the Democratic convention in my section my friend opposed it. A lot has been said through the years since that a few willful men in the United States sabotaged the League. I have come to look at it differently and to believe that our people were not prepared in their hearts and in their thinking to accept the responsibilities that go with world leadership.

But whatever the reason, we then turned away from our opportunity and left the stricken peoples of the world who were struggling toward freedom without our leadership, and without it they turned to their Mussolinis and their Hitlers. The white crosses which mark graves of our sons all over the world bear striking testimony to the price we paid for our failure to humanity.

Let us turn our minds back a moment. When World War I ended and our President went abroad, in Italy and in France

and throughout the countries he went through multitudes that thronged the streets, millions of them, until traffic was jammed for hours, simply to catch a view of him. To them he represented that one great nation which had demonstrated in the 150 years of its history the truth that men are qualified to govern themselves and to build free institutions. But when he came back we would not accept that leadership. We drifted down to World War II.

I think one of the tragic examples of our failure, one that will not be a proud page in our history, occurred in 1936 when the struggling League of Nations, which was doomed without our leadership and our membership, was in session in Switzerland in an effort to devise means of stopping Hitler and Mussolini. We were there represented not as a member but by an observer who peeked through the keyhole while the conference failed and preparations were continued by the aggressors to plunge us into World War II. In the weak-kneed attitude of the freedom-loving peoples of the world we permitted Hitler and Mussolini to go their way until World War II was inevitable. No matter what one may think of the League of Nations or of the wisdom of President Wilson, I would recommend that every member before he votes on this bill read that series of speeches he made in support of it back in 1920. One passage in the speech he made, I think at St. Louis, I shall never forget. He there predicted that unless America took her place of leadership for democracy and gave assurance to the world that we meant to support free institutions, that before another generation should pass away the soil of Europe would be stained with the blood of our sons. It reads like prophecy.

The real issue here today is not whether we shall contribute \$400,000,000 to aid in the rehabilitation of Greece and Turkey. Were that the controlling issue, it might be well to consider whether it would not be better to extend it through the United Nations, or as a loan through the International Bank, or by some other means as a simple gift to the stricken people who sorely need aid. But the fundamental issue is not the mere extending of aid to needy people. The bill under consideration is an expression of the policy of this Nation to aid weaker nations to maintain their freedom and to resist efforts from without to force communism upon them. The grant of funds is a necessary means to an end. It is merely the implementing of an international policy of our Government in which we are saying to the people of the world that this Nation will hereafter assume its place of leadership and give its strength and support to people who are trying to establish for themselves free government. That policy requires more than just money; it takes our leadership.

Four hundred million dollars is a relatively small contribution for the maintenance of peace. Having contributed so much in blood and treasure to win a war we should not hesitate to contribute this relatively small sum to win the peace and insure that we and our children shall live in a decent world. A world in which the people of every coun-

try, large and small, shall be free to work out their own government and their own social institutions without fear of aggression from without or sabotage from within by any other country. It is only in such a world that we can hope to maintain our own freedom. I believe devoutly in the principle of collective security, and in United Nations. Our membership in that organization is a guaranty of our support—an assurance that we shall not repeat the mistake of 1920. We are not bypassing it. The Vandenberg amendment expresses our desire to work with United Nations. That organization can take over the task whenever it chooses. This Government will withdraw when the Assembly or the Security Council desires it. In the meantime, and on a temporary basis only, we shall meet the emergency. We shall accept communism's challenge to democracy. This is urgent. This does not weaken United Nations. It gives it added strength and recognition.

The policy of President Truman and Secretary Marshall, embodied in this bill, is intended to secure these ends and I shall vote to uphold their hands and sustain their efforts in this crucial hour.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill. Like most Americans, I regret the world conditions which force us to consider such legislation. I concur fully with the views so ably expressed yesterday on this subject by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. History teaches us that the principal nations of the world have, for years, pursued foreign policies for war. What is now needed is a world policy for peace. To accomplish this end, the United States must take a positive, courageous, and realistic stand in its dealings with other nations. The adoption of this measure will, in my opinion, implement such a stand.

Yesterday, during the debate on the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] stated that it has been suggested that no one could vote for this measure in view of his oath of office, unless he felt that our first line of defense was the Greek or Turkish border. I disagree with this point of view, but for the sake of argument, let us accept it. Where is our first line of defense? It is not a static line to be found on any map or chart. It is a mobile line depending on the precarious balance between the offensive and defensive implements of war. It might well be determined by the cruising radius of tomorrow's plane, or the range of some rocket-propelled guided missile, or even some imaginative fantasy found in a Buck Rogers comic strip. In any event, the war head of the missile will be filled with a derivative of uranium and not nitrogen.

Along with most Americans, I deplore the fact that the United Nations organ-

ization does not yet have the stature to deal with this problem. I know that most of my constituents in Kentucky agree with me that the peace of the world depends upon a strong and effective United Nations. Yet, in Kentucky, no one in his right mind would think of starting a 2-year-old, carrying top weight, in a mile and a quarter race. Let us not cripple the United Nations in its infancy.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, the whole 9 hours of debate allowed to discuss the Greek-Turkey \$400,000,000 gift is an inadequate time to analyze its far-reaching implications, and certainly I cannot do it in the short time allotted me. It may be useful, however, to point out the profound misconception of the scope of this proposal advanced yesterday by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

In the course of the debate, he said this:

The second thing that this bill does not do is this. I think it does not mean that we are adopting for America a permanent foreign policy called the Truman doctrine, or anything else which could be interpreted as meaning that we are going to finance faltering governments all over the world simply because they claim to be operated by free men. I do not think that that is involved in this decision. We are meeting an important problem, recognizable at two specific points, and answering it in a specific manner.

This does not mean that we are committing ourselves—and our committee report makes that very clear—to faltering governments which may get into difficulty all over the world, and simply by coming to us and saying, "We need help; we believe in freedom," expect that we will aid them with hundreds of millions of dollars. These are two unique cases paralleled by no other country in the world, unless possibly you could present the case of Iran. In Iran we have already done the thing we now propose to do in Greece and Turkey.

Not a word of this statement is correct.

I am not concerned with what the gentleman thinks the bill means, or what some newspaper writers say it ought to mean. If we will take the trouble to read the President's speech to the joint session of Congress, we will know what it means.

Mr. MUNDT says this particular problem is unique. He suggests that we vote this four hundred million and stop. But the President said:

One aspect of the present situation, which I wish to present to you at this time for your consideration and decision concerns Greece and Turkey.

This is "one aspect" for our consideration "at this time." Let me warn you that the other aspects are innumerable, impossible, and ruinous.

Mr. MUNDT said that we are not committing ourselves to faltering governments all over the world. But Mr. Truman said:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

And the President said:

We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said that the instant problem is unique, "unless possibly you could present the case of Iran." But the President said:

The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will. The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

If the President thinks that the United States has the moral duty, or even the moral right, to interfere with all governments that are not democracies, he might have also mentioned most of the rest of the world; not just Iran, but Iraq, Egypt, India, Korea. He might have mentioned the communistic threat of Togliatti in Italy, of Thorez in France. He could have referred to the totalitarian Franco in Spain, and closer to home, Argentina and Chile are not conspicuous adherents to the form of government that we in America prefer.

Mr. Chairman, it is the President's proposal that we are voting on, not Mr. MUNDT'S. Four hundred million is appropriated to the President, to start America on a dark journey, a dangerous journey, an imperialistic adventure to every plague spot in the world.

There should be no misunderstanding of the Truman doctrine. The President was frank about it. Summed up, it is this:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

I cannot bring myself to believe any such thing. I do not believe we have either the duty or the right to interfere with the internal affairs of foreign nations throughout the globe.

So much for the broad implications of the general doctrine.

DRESSED UP IN ATTRACTIVE CLOTHES.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal would not get 50 votes in the House if it were not appealingly presented as a move to curb communism, or to contain Russia. Both objects are greatly to be desired. In common with almost all Americans, I hate communism, and am exasperated with Russia's lack of cooperation. But this bill will do neither.

Indeed, it is not even aimed at communism, which is a threat in many other parts of the world in addition to Russia; and I hope no one is so gullible as to think that one hundred and fifty million

for the Turkish Army or new uniforms for the Greeks will reform the Soviets.

If Russia is to be contained it must be done by more direct and less scattered means. We must say bluntly, "Thus far and no further"; and our State Department must make up its mind which way it is going. You cannot in common sense advocate the Truman doctrine in one breath and the continuance of lend-lease in the next; nor ask \$31,000,000 for propaganda broadcasts one day and extol Henry Wallace the next.

ARE WE HELPING DEMOCRACIES?

Strengthening the democracies of Greece and Turkey to oppose Russia is the old balance-of-power system, which has not kept peace in 500 years. Let us examine the nature of the democracies we seek to ally with us.

Greece is a very small country with a population of approximately 7,000,000 people, the overwhelming majority of which are illiterate. Because of its strategic location on the Mediterranean Sea—which even now must not be overlooked—it was, shortly before the time of Christ, the world's leading community, since which time it has experienced a continuous deterioration. Although the birthplace of democracy it has not for centuries, and does not now, enjoy democratic government, and particularly in modern times it has suffered a series of dictatorships including that of the notorious Metaxas, and today it is for all practical purposes a police state. There is no proof that in their government there is anything remotely like our conception of democratic government, which is evidenced, among other things, by their tax law, which bears heavily on the poor and lightly on the rich, with virtually no income tax and virtually no government revenues of consequence, so that the result is that the President's proposal asks American income taxpayers to pay for government expenses that the Greeks do not even try to pay for.

Their agricultural methods are wholly primitive, with no surplus crops except olive oil and wine. Their soil is eroded and uncared for. Their manufacturing is nonexistent for all practical purposes, and their army, while fighting gallantly against the Italians, is of no consequence in the modern world. So it is my position that they are a liability to the country which "takes them over" rather than an asset. Their only possible advantage, if we are talking about imperialism and control of the Mediterranean, is a highly strategic location, with a land easy to defend with its mountainous terrain, and of great naval importance because of literally hundreds of excellent bays and harbors.

The talk about this country as a free country or a democracy is laughable. They probably have not been for 2,000 years. For the last few years they have lived entirely on the benefit of foreign capital, principally British, although America has contributed since VJ-day about \$500,000,000. Aid to Greece can be justified only as to a people who are unable and unwilling to help themselves. In the modern world there is no sense to their archaic methods of agriculture

and industry, and in their complete unwillingness to make sacrifices that we in America are now making, and have been making, to support their own Government by the taxation of their own people.

Only as a bastion or a fortress for offensive and defensive actions in the Mediterranean against Russia, as a recognized enemy, and to protect the great oil fields in the Middle East, in which American and British oil companies have a substantial interest, can we possibly justify the slightest interest in Greece.

It must also be remembered that notwithstanding the gallant fight of the small Greek armies against Italy, Greece was definitely pro-German before and after World War I, and its political history indicates that no reliance could be put on their sympathies, since for 50 years they wavered back and forth between one policy and another—and what has suddenly happened to change this situation? Nothing, except that Britain has decided that they could no longer afford to keep soldiers in Greece to protect British interests. So now we do it, while Britain can still afford to keep 100,000 troops in Palestine.

TURKEY

And what of Turkey?

Although aid to Greece might be justified on an exclusively humanitarian basis, and undoubtedly they need aid as a helpless people, aid as such to Turkey is pure nonsense. See the article of the London Statist in January 1947 indicating that Turkey is one of the well-off countries of the world. It is evident that Turkey needs no aid whatever except to revamp and modernize its military force—which force was used on the side of Germany in World War I, and in World War II was neutral until 1945, and was then forced into a technical declaration of war by Roosevelt pressure, and after the war against Germany and Japan was obviously successful. There is no possible justification for supporting Turkey by reason of its need or from any sentiment, or from past favors, and the only reasons are:

A. Turkey controls the Dardanelles and wishes to keep Russia out.

B. Turkey stands in a strategic position with reference to a considerable interest in oil fields by various American and British oil companies.

Again it must be said that it is absurd to talk about aiding democracy and resisting totalitarianism in Turkey because of all the nations in the world, including Russia, none has shown consistent totalitarianism more than Turkey for six or seven solid centuries, first under the complete domination of a sultan, and in modern times under practically the first rigid dictatorship, that of Kemal Pasha, who knew all about dictatorship long before Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

IF THE SHOE WAS ON THE OTHER FOOT?

What would happen if Russia said, "We sympathize with the evidently totalitarian government in Argentina, and we feel that the United States is attempting to encircle Argentina with pressure and propaganda, and therefore we will send money, food, and a military mission to Argentina to help her resist the Colos-

sus of the North." I think this is analogous. If Russia took that position, the United States would declare war in 24 hours; and I think further that Russia would declare war in 24 hours against us if she had reasonable hope for success, which presently she does not have. The principle, however, remains the same. It is an act which invites war, either now or in the future.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The criticism that the United States, in acting unilaterally, bypassed the United Nations was so obviously justified that Senator VANDENBERG was prompt to present an amendment, since passed, providing that United Nations could stop this proposal, which was evidently an apology for the premature action of the President. I am skeptical of United Nations success, but we must patiently try to support it as the only means toward peace, and nothing could have weakened it more than the American attitude that we will do what we want in the Near East, and will fight all governments that we do not like, regardless of what anybody else says.

THE BOTTOMLESS BARREL

Is the Treasury of the United States a bottomless barrel? We now owe \$260,000,000,000—the Truman peacetime budget is thirty-seven billion this year. To cope with such staggering sums we levy income taxes ranging up to 90 percent. In an attempt to find the road back to solvency, the House has cut about four hundred million from appropriations for our own needs. In one stroke we cancel these savings. We provide this money for people that do not tax themselves; do not try to be self-sufficient.

NONPARTISAN POLICY

It is argued that we must not oppose the President because foreign policy is nonpartisan. I understand that to mean that party politics should not be injected, and I agree. I do not understand it to mean that we must swallow whatever is spoon-fed to us by the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal will be adopted, but my conscience impels me to continue to fight it and similar demands in the future. I did not come to Congress to assist in dissipating the blood and treasure of America in the Balkans, in Asia, all over the world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending measure, H. R. 2616.

Since the President came before us on March 12 I have had very little doubt about the necessity of giving financial assistance in Turkey and Greece. The alternative to the action provided for in the pending measure is to allow these countries to become Russian dominated, then to stand idly by while Russian aggression spreads over the whole Middle East and the Mediterranean Basin. That, to my mind, is an unthinkable course to take, or rather an unthinkable piece of inaction.

Even after the last war we pursued the policy of having a sanitary cordon about Russian communism. The forces

of recovery operated much more quickly after the last war and the danger of Communist aggression were much less. You will remember that it was France which in 1920 sent Marshal Weygand to Poland and helped the Poles to preserve their freedom from Russian domination. Some of our other adventures in Russia may have been less well-advised, but despite Communist activities in the twenties and thirties, I think it cannot be said that Russia became definitely an aggressor state until after the victory of 2 years ago.

I am perfectly aware of the many considerations which cause us to shrink from pursuing this course. A constituent writes me that it is power politics for us to pass this measure. I think it is. There is no alternative to power politics except collective security, and you cannot have collective security really operative in the world while the dominant power of the Eurasian Continent is willing to pay it only lip service.

I hear it said that the Governments of Greece and Turkey are not democratic governments, that the Government of Greece is a corrupt monarchy and that the Government of Turkey, although stronger, is not what we should fancy. I have no first-hand knowledge about either of these governments and the bits of information which one receives do not always harmonize. However, our official observers at the Greek election said that it was a fair election. Over and beyond that, it seems to me that the important thing to us is that the Turkish Government be Turkish and the Greek Government be Greek. We have suffered the Polish Government to be non-Polish, the Rumanian Government to be non-Rumanian, the Bulgarian Government to be non-Bulgarian, and the Yugoslav Government to be non-Yugoslav and the Czechoslovak Government to be only pallidly Czechoslovak. There is a limit to which we can go in ignoring and appeasing and I believe that that limit has been reached.

I do not enjoy seeing my country walking a tight rope over disaster. There has been very little enjoyable about the world since Hitler came into power in Germany nearly a half a generation ago. However, we must face the facts. Hindsight makes it crystal clear that in the period from the Japanese entry into China in 1932 until the passage of the Selective Service Act in 1940 we did everything wrong. We could not get cooperation in stopping Japanese aggression in China so we did nothing. We made no serious attempt to stop Italian aggression in Ethiopia, we allowed the Axis powers to treat Spain as a proving ground for their ordnance, and we raised not so much as an umbrella when Hitler in swift succession entered first the Rhineland, then Austria, then Czechoslovakia. Even after the British and French declared war on Hitler, millions of Americans thought we could stand by while Hitler invaded Denmark, Norway and the Low countries, then France, then the Balkans. If the familiar pattern of totalitarian aggression is being pursued by Stalin as it has been for 2 years then I think the correct course is to consider what we did in Hitler's case and do the opposite.

I hear it said that Greece is a British chestnut which we are pulling from the fire. Have no illusions about that. When we pass this legislation we shall have acted for America and not for Britain. But I make bold to say that the weakening of British power in the world is a catastrophe for the United States. If, unlike Winston Churchill, Clement Attlee became the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, it will mean that the ideas we live by are losing power in the world. Inveigh as you will against the British imperialism, it has been useful to us from Waterloo on.

I hear it said that we should not try to check communism in Greece and Turkey until we have put a stop to it at home and in other countries. That, I think, is a sophistical argument. We cannot squander our resources by waging war against communism wherever it appears any more than we could send an expeditionary force to every island in the Pacific where the Japanese had landed a few soldiers. We wisely did not try to do that. Instead, we took the few vital places that took us to the gates of Tokyo. We are fortunate, in my estimation, to have the strategist of that campaign to guide us now. What we oppose in Greece and Turkey is not communism per se but the threat of Russian aggression.

Lastly I hear it said that this bill will get us into war. I do not think so. Russian aggression flows like a river downhill. If we oppose it by a dike, I think the dike will be effective. It is about the best investment we can make in flood control. In any event, this bill seems to me to afford our best chance of averting war. Our vote this week will go echoing around the world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman would agree to yield to a couple of Members who wanted to speak who had been promised time to speak under the agreement, but have not been able to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the time is being charged to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlemen to make statements. I yield 1 minute each.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Under the agreement the opposition still has 21 minutes. Are we going to have it or are we not? I have two or three gentlemen here who would like to speak for 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. On this side we have only 22 minutes remaining. Obviously it would be impossible to yield the gentleman the 22 minutes. However, if the gentleman has two speakers for 1 minute each, we will be happy to yield them that much time. We regret that we do not have any more time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to accept just that much. However, it is in violation of the understanding.

Mr. JARMAN. I did not mean to violate any understanding.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, the great sovereign State of Illinois, eight and one-half million people, of which I represent over a million persons, the Seventh District of Illinois, largest in the United States, is allowed 1 minute. When I asked the chairman to yield, he said, "I won't yield. You ask too many questions." I asked five questions in 2 days, which took a total of about 1 minute.

I just wish to say that I think it is a mighty unfair distribution of time to give one-third of the 9 hours to those opposed, then take away 10 percent of that allowance, and permit a total of 6 minutes to Members from Illinois in opposition, when you gave a half an hour to a gentleman who represents less than 300,000 people in the State of Illinois, who spoke in favor of this abominable measure.

I want time to read just one telegram out of hundreds of communications I have received against this proposition. I did not receive one in favor thereof. I will read one telegram from a man in the State of Illinois who did as much as any other person in the United States to win the late war. It reads as follows:

GENEVA, ILL., May 5, 1947.

HON. THOMAS L. OWENS,
Congressman From Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

I still urge you to oppose Greek-Turkish subsidy and any other gifts or loans to foreign countries unless there is a definite and guaranteed basis of repayment with interest. History has demonstrated that most loans are defaulted. This Greek deal can be a precedent for others which can bankrupt us. It is entirely political and the Russian situation is not and will not be involved except as New Dealers try to involve Russia so as to secure public approval of themselves. Certain business interests and bankers approve of it for their own selfish reasons. This is demonstrated when the National Manufacturers' Association board approves loan on recommendation of John R. Suman, vice president, Standard Oil, New Jersey. Most members of NAM in downstate Illinois are opposed to action taken by NAM. My company is resigning its membership in NAM because of the un-American position assumed by NAM board in respect to this cheap political issue.

C. M. BURGESS.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman yield me one more minute?

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry. I do not have any more time.

Mr. OWENS. That is just what I would expect from the dictators who are proposing this bill, and depriving members of their right of speech.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, during the recent hearing which was held by two of our colleagues and myself in Milwaukee with respect to possible perjury in hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, I had occasion

to examine a young Communist about 22 years of age who stated that he had received only a common-school education and had become a Communist about 4 years prior thereto. He gave as his reason for joining the ranks the results which had been achieved by Communist leadership in Russia during a span of less than 30 years. While we realize the immaturity of this lad there were many remarks made on this floor yesterday and today which could easily lead one to believe that some of our brilliant members were of the same opinion as this young man, or else they are overlooking the true facts. At the time of hearing in Milwaukee, I called attention to the words of the young French noble, Alexis De Toqueville, who had visited our shores about the year 1829 and, after spending approximately 1 year here, returned to his native land when, within a few years, he completed the first volume of his remarkable work, *Democracy in America*. Because of the fact that certain newspaper correspondents at Milwaukee requested information concerning De Toqueville, after I had mentioned his prophecies, I shall read briefly from the last page of the first volume of that work:

The time will therefore come when one hundred and fifty millions of men will be living in North America. * * *

There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world, which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points; I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place among the nations; and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth; all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and with celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him; the adversaries of the Russian are men; the former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts; the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the ploughshare; those of the other, by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm: the principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting-point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Are we to believe that this prophecy of De Toqueville is completely a thought of his own creation? It was not. While he was here he read carefully of the expressions and utterances of our founders, including Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and Chancellor Kent, all men of great vision. They foresaw the future and left their thoughts, yes, even their prayers for our guidance with reference to that matter. I particularly call your attention to

the Farewell Address of our first President, which address is often acknowledged to be the combined work of Washington, Madison, and Hamilton, and particularly to these words:

In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded; and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The Nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred, or a habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable, when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed and bloody contests. The nation prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.

So likewise a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions; by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate, in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray, or sacrifice, the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity: gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

There are some who would scoff and say that the years have changed the situation. However, they have not. The prophecy of De Toqueville seems to be realized, and it appears that natural location and resources are more responsible than is any individual governing body. Russia does sway the destinies of that half of the globe in which she is located. Are we swaying, or even influencing, the half in which we live? If not, it is time that we begin, and not make our destiny the attempt to conquer the entire world. If we will only look about us we shall find that there are subversive influences which we should overcome on our own soil. The same is true in the lands of many of our Latin-American neighbors. What are we doing about it? Very little. Nevertheless, we would take the step on which we are about to embark before we have even received a

report from the Etheridge Commission, which was assigned by the United Nations to investigate the Greek border incidents. Without any proof of an act of aggression by Russia, we would now commit an overt act, one almost as insane and unnecessary as the use of the atomic bomb on Japanese land. As I said yesterday, when I asked a question of my distinguished colleague from Illinois, which question was not answered, "If the Soviet Union has offended us, why should we not sever diplomatic relations instead of taking the same pusillanimous actions which side-stepped us into two previous wars?" But we know that we do not have any ground for offense, so we shall take the first overt step, just short of war, as we have done before. I say to you let us pause. Let us act within our own sphere, our own orbit, and show that we know how to take care of our interests over here.

The very record of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs shows a statement, page 216, by the eminent Samuel Guy Inman, guest professor of International Relations, Ohio Wesleyan University, where he said:

Every man who travels outside the United States today knows that people everywhere—even in Canada, the Scandinavian countries, Holland, and England—talk of fear of American dominance. The other great fear is of communism. The way to throw the weight of the public opinion of the world on the side of Russia is to follow the President's plan to start arranging the affairs of other nations for them.

Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church, also told the same committee, at page 266, that the commission had voted unanimously that it opposed the use of relief funds and the making of loans for the purpose of political war against the Soviet Union in Greece, Turkey, and the Near East, or for supervised training of armed forces in Greece or Turkey.

Monsignor Sheen, well known for his radio addresses on the Catholic Hour, said:

War is not the answer to communism. We must not hope for the extinction of Communists, but must pray for their conversion.

It appears, however, that we are men who would be God. Are we going to disregard the advice from the past, and the mistakes of the past, and launch ourselves upon a campaign which may mean the destruction not only of our own Nation but that of the world? Do not give me an answer that opposition to such a program means appeasement, because that word is just as trite as the word "isolationism," which has been used so frequently on this floor. I inquired yesterday if the antonym of the word "isolation" is "intervention," and I did not receive an answer. The answer is that it is the antonym. That is, those who are casting the word "isolationism" at the persons who would think of America first are those who would intervene in the affairs of the other nations and thereby bring us into another world conflict. It is time we place our trust in divine providence, and at the same time mind our own business in our own sphere. We

have the means of extinction at hand. We also have the United Nations organization, which we virtually created for the purpose of bringing about world peace and order. Omar Khayyam asked if the potter would destroy the pots which he marred in the making. I ask a similar question. Are we going to destroy the instrument of peace which we created, and put in place thereof an instrument of destruction and horror? Which shall we use? That is the question. The answer lies with us. May God guide our decision.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is my idea that we are in a sad hour when today this Congress is taking action that may plunge this country directly into war, and because some of us have an honest difference of opinion we are denied the right of free speech in the well of the Congress of the United States. I say if this action prevails today, then we are short-circuiting and destroying the United Nations. The proponents of this bill say that their people oppose it. If they oppose it, why do we not have the courage to take the story directly to the American people and tell them we are leading them down the road to a third world war?

Mr. Chairman, today we have before us for consideration a new international world policy. The President and the State Department have recommended that the Congress appropriate \$400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey. First of all we should understand that this is a gift from the taxpayers of America. The American people look to Congress for the preservation and safeguarding of the finances of this Government. I have listened carefully to the discussion throughout the course of this debate. I cannot see how we can base or predicate a vote upon any facts that have been presented to this Congress. We have discussed legislation in the Eightieth Congress touching important domestic problems and volumes of testimony have been produced for our guidance and consideration. The proposed legislation before us is based upon a small, brief document which is in itself full of contradictions. I cannot understand that it is my duty to cast a vote upon secrecy and upon a diplomacy that no Member of this House has explained to the Members. The ill-fated misunderstanding of the State Department in days gone by has led this Government down a road of international chaos and involvement.

The proponents of this bill admit that this is the most important decision that this Congress may ever be called upon to decide. We have been compelled to fight for time to briefly discuss the real issues involved. The American people do not favor this new and complete reversal of our long-standing policy in foreign affairs. When we launch upon this program we commit ourselves to a responsibility to assume the economic burdens of all nations that claim to be afflicted with the scourge of communism. Many others will appear upon the horizon with their hands out desiring relief at the ex-

pense of America. This is only the beginning. Before we launch upon this program, we would do well to take stock of our national assets. With a national debt of \$260,000,000,000, how can we place upon the brow of the taxpayers of this country a burden so heavy and great as this? How can we give something which we do not have? France, Italy, China, India, and many other nations will answer the roll call when Uncle Sam announces to the world that he is Santa Claus whose heart bleeds with compassion for all the world except the financial security and development of our own people. Under the Constitution of this country we are the representatives of the people and it is our duty to safeguard and promote their general welfare. A bankrupt treasury cannot promote the general welfare of the millions of people of this country.

If we allow a smooth delivery and mass propaganda to lull us into a false decision that will lead to a complete breakdown of our financial structure we can then look to a day of inflation. Inflation will bring higher prices, cheap money, and will compel this Government to institute controls. Controls may again forge the shackles of economic slavery and controls upon our people. To me the specter of such a reality in the future is a real possibility. When that day comes we can only blame ourselves for the hardships of tomorrow. I do not speak as one unfamiliar with the hardships, blood and sacrifice of war. I had the honor and privilege to wear the American uniform in World War II. I saw at first hand the devastating effects of war upon the whole civilization. It is now time that this Congress face the real issue in this proposed legislation. We should declare to the American people that what we are doing here today may easily lead to an immediate war with Russia. I am opposed to communism every day, every week, and every year of my life, and I say to the Members of this Congress that the mere spending of money will not stop communism. We have poured billions into countries and no man or woman can stand up in this House and say that communism has been stopped by the spending of money. I shall think seriously before I cast a vote that will send the young men of this country to don the uniform in a third world war.

In one generation we have fought two world wars and when the news goes out over America that we have voted to send food, supplies, equipment, and the military necessities along with the military strength to build up Turkey and Greece the mothers of this land, and the wives and sweethearts, will experience in their hearts and souls a sad feeling indeed. I am disturbed about this whole situation. Nobody has told the Congress how much money we propose to spend. No person has informed the American people just how far we expect to go with this policy. We have a United Nations with 51 member nations. Why should we short-circuit this United Nations and destroy it. We are undertaking to solve a problem that rightfully belongs to the United Nations. I submit that it is now time that we begin to look to and after our own

household. Charity begins at home. It is now time that we formulate an American foreign policy and stick to it. Much has been said in the course of this debate concerning the destruction of communism. We would do well to drive the Communists from the departments of government in America. People all over America are pointing to the fact that this Government is continuing to deal with Russia, continuing to send supplies to Russia, and at the same time proposing to appropriate money to stop the spread of communism.

In conclusion, it is my humble opinion that we can best promote the general welfare of America if we turn our attention toward home; if we spend our money to rehabilitate and care for the disabled and wounded veterans and orphans and widows; if we look after the education of our people at home; if we preserve and protect the financial integrity of this country; if we announce to the world that America will not establish a worldwide WPA but that the spirit of self-help, individual liberty, and determination must be reestablished in all countries in the world, and that no nation can look to America to save her from financial involvement and that it will not be the policy of this Government to come to the aid of any tottering empire; and that we here and now divorce ourselves once and for all time from such a policy. I would like to say that the strongest and safest course for America to take is to teach our people the spirit of self-help and to build ourselves strong and powerful and engage in military and scientific development so that no nation or combination of powers can inflict harm upon us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I regret deeply to detain you at this late hour. I would not now ask your indulgence if I did not feel so very deeply the moving hour in which we live, if I did not have a memory, if I had not been a Member of the Congress during the first great war, and, of course, a Member of Congress during the last great war. I saw us win a glorious victory in 1918. I saw us throw away the fruits of that victory. I knew that isolationism existed in the United States before that war. It was not evident to any great extent during that war, but after that war that infamy crawled out of the shadows and made itself very evident.

I hope that after more than a quarter of a century in which to find out our mistake we do not repeat that mistake and withdraw from the remainder of the world and not be willing to do a man's part in the world's great work of peace as our fighting men in two wars did a man's job on the battlefields of the earth. I trust that in our considerations here and in the other body this thing called isolationism may not again crawl out of the shadows and defeat the hopes of men and again break the heart of the world.

Woodrow Wilson came back from France many years ago with a dream of world cooperation, world concord, and world peace. That was spurned by the representatives of the people. He cried out at that hour and made a prediction that if we did not cooperate, if we did not do our part in the effort for permanent world peace, that the world within 25 years, a quarter of a century, would be shocked by a greater and a more devastating war than even that one. His prediction came tragically true. We stand today with the leadership urging upon us certain action. Whether we like that leadership or not we have it. It is the voice of America and whether that leadership is followed or spurned will have a tremendous effect upon our position and our influence in this world.

A few weeks ago our leader came to us and said:

The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress. The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

This bill was reported to the Senate. A great Senator in that body had this to say:

Mr. President, in response to the urgent recommendations of the President of the United States, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously reported the bill (S. 938) entitled "A bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey."

It could be alternatively titled "A bill to support the purposes of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security," or it could be titled "A bill to serve America's self-interest in the maintenance of independent governments."

Further on he said:

This is a plan to forestall aggression which, once rolling, could snowball into global danger of vast design. It is a plan for peace. It is a plan to sterilize the seeds of war. We do not escape war by running away from it. No one ran away from war at Munich.

Another great Senator of that body had this to say:

There is ample evidence that these armed bands are being encouraged, stimulated, and motivated from the states of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, all of which are under the domination of Russia and her communistic system.

Only this week our great Secretary of State, who is not a warmonger—God knows he has seen enough of war—in a letter to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EASON], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, had this to say, and I will read only one paragraph:

My strong conviction that immediate passage of this bill is a matter of the greatest urgency was made even more positive by the recent meeting in Moscow.

This bill, not mangled by amendments. He is talking about this bill.

That is the Secretary of State. That is the man who planned our campaigns and led our armies triumphantly to victory. Are his words to be taken lightly? He just returned from Moscow. He thinks this aid to Turkey and to Greece is urgent, and should be given now. Shall we listen to him, shall we listen to the head of the Government and to Senators who sat around these tables trying to

bring about world concord, world cooperation and world peace, or shall we listen to some one who is so scared of war that he is willing to allow conditions to again obtain in the world that brought us into two wars?

I remember not many years ago when we were trying to prepare this country for an eventuality and an emergency if it should come. I remember when we were trying to appropriate money to build 5,500 airplanes. Men took to the well of this House and said, "Whom are we preparing to fight?"

Pull down the map and look at Greece and Turkey. What does it mean if they are absorbed into the maw of communism and accept the leadership of Russia, which they do not want to accept? That includes Turkey, Greece, the Middle East, the Mediterranean, northern Africa Italy, and maybe France. If \$400,000,000 will help to stop that thing, I for one, am willing to appropriate it. Maybe if our vision had been broader, our insight keener a few years ago, and we had built up our forces, there might not have been a Pearl Harbor. They knew we were unprepared to fight and, frankly, they read speeches and newspaper articles, some of them from the United States, that made the Japanese think we would not fight. General Marshall said, "This bill."

Now, let me say just a word about one amendment that is going to be offered, as I understand, and that is about this thing of turning the matter over to the United Nations. The United Nations is impotent to handle this matter. The United Nations has not the money, it has not the power, it has not the organization to do this job. So, it would appear to me that the better thing to do and the more candid thing to do by the people who intend to support an amendment like that would be to rise upon the floor of this House and move to strike the enacting clause from this bill. If Greece and Turkey need help, they need it now; not 60 days from now, not 90 days from now or a year from now. It might be too late, my friends; it might be too late.

It is a trite expression that we stand at the crossroads. I think we do. We are the most powerful Nation that has existed on the face of the earth, comparably, since the Caesars bestrode the world like a colossus. Leadership has been offered us. People who love liberty and cry for a fair chance want us to assume that leadership and lead the world and not follow in this challenging hour, on this fateful day and in these fateful times. If we do not accept our responsibility, if we do not move forward and extend a helping hand to people who need and want help, who are democracies or want to be, who do not want to be smothered by communism; if we do not, I repeat, assume our place, God help us; God help this world.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is gravely doubtful, in fact, it is almost certain that I shall not be able to add much to this discussion. Every facet of this issue has been debated with ability and with sincerity. All that one can

expect to do in the situation in which I am placed is to try to pick up some of the points which may not have been overemphasized and to give as best I can the picture as I see it.

As I indicated in a 2-minute speech while the rule itself was under consideration, I am very strongly in favor of this bill. In halting sentences in conversation with some of my colleagues on last Friday afternoon I confessed to them that were I the master of my own destiny I should like to spend the rest of my life under the shade of a tree, comfortable and happy. I likened my own wishes in that regard to the wishes of the people of the United States. Indeed, we would be happy, our children would be, and our grandchildren would be, if we and they as they come after us could live that way. But fate apparently determines otherwise. The work of the world is never finished. The tasks of humanity are never finished. The struggle for liberty is never finished.

As I look across the face of the world today it strikes me that the struggle for liberty rather than having been won, or half won, is more acute than ever, and that means that instead of resting under the shade of a tree we must stand up on our feet and support our convictions.

May I look back, and I hope I shall not consume too much time, over some of our experiences? The gentleman from Texas has referred to some of them, and one or two speakers during the debate have referred to others. They have to do with the struggle for liberty and the mistakes which I believe those most devoted to liberty have made from time to time, mostly mistakes of neglect.

I wonder how many of the members of this committee have read a book entitled "The Far Eastern Crisis," written by Henry L. Stimson, who wrote that book after he left the office of Secretary of State, the office which he occupied under President Hoover. In it you will find the story of the beginning of Japanese aggression in Manchuria. In it you will find the record of his protests and his appeals to the democracies, not only to the people of the United States, but to the other great democracies of that day. In it you will find the prophecies which he made as to what the ultimate objective of the Japanese was and how it would undoubtedly affect us.

Neither America nor Great Britain nor France nor Belgium nor any other democracy rallied to his call. His was a lone voice, in a sense, crying in the wilderness, and the Japanese aggression prospered, starting from 1931, ever spreading its power and overrunning one section of Asia after another as the democracies of the world stood idle, we among them.

We know the results of that neglect—at least, I hope we have learned that lesson.

Coming on later, in the 1930's, after Hitler had seized power in Germany—I wonder if any of you have read the volume entitled "While England Slept." It is well worth reading. It is a collection of speeches of Winston Churchill delivered in the British House of Commons in the middle 1930's in which he, a voice crying in the wilderness, begged the Mac-

Donald government and begged the Baldwin government to look, to look and understand, what was brewing in Germany, begging France to wake up, begging Belgium to wake up, begging the League of Nations to wake up—speech after speech. But he was a member of a hopeless minority. France crouched behind the Maginot Line and you know what happened to her. Belgium was overrun. The democracies in those pre-war years did not meet the issue that confronted them. They dodged it.

I hope we have learned a lesson here in America, and I believe we have, that if freedom, if liberty, if democracy are to live, we must rise upon our feet and defend them.

The Hitler-Japanese combination represented an enormously strong and aggressive force. We defeated it at terrific cost. It may be partly our own fault, partly a misconception of our psychology as a people, indulged in by others, but, nevertheless, I think it is true and I think it cannot be denied that a new aggression is raising its ugly countenance; a new aggressor, strong, determined, employing tactics perhaps somewhat different from that of Hitler and the Japanese, but, nevertheless, employing tactics taught in its central school—make no mistake about that—calculated eventually to destroy liberty upon the face of the earth.

And here we are, after these failures of the past to understand the meaning of a menace launched by totalitarian powers, here we are facing the same sort of menace, and for one—and I can speak only for myself—I rejoice that for the first time in the history of what we might term modern days, America, spiritually equipped as well as materially supplied, through her President has announced to the world that she intends to defend liberty; and as she does that I am convinced from the bottom of my heart that we are actually defending our own liberty.

This bill to me signifies such an attitude on the part of the great United States; a forthright declaration in support of righteousness.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interests of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their Governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

(2) by detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however,* That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United

States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries; and

(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON H. R. 2616, AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have three legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. C. D. Jackson, vice president of Time, Inc., before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to include as part of the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today certain newspaper clippings and articles.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein an article from the New York Times.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked and obtained unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix a report entitled "American Economic and Technical Aid to Foreign Countries Since mid-1945," prepared by the Division of Historical Policy Research of the Department of State. This report is referred to in my remarks at page 4600 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 under the heading of Aid for Economic Reconstruction. Due to the fact that the manuscript was excessive in length for the leave granted, I now ask unanimous consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate of cost of \$177.50.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a bill he introduced some time ago and include a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. STEFAN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. PRESTON, for May 8, 9, and 10, on account of official business.

To Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. REEVES (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 560. An act to prohibit the operation of gambling ships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 583. An act to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 629. An act concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 640. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quarters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhardt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pre-

tenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 800. An act to make additional funds available for access roads to standing timber; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment.

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of belligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the

Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, 1947, 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:

661. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report as to the number of men on active duty on March 31, 1947, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945; to the Committee on Armed Services.

662. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 3362. A bill to amend the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 620) by adding a new title thereto to be known as title XIV, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3363. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, with respect to certain subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3364. A bill to provide for retirement at full active-duty pay for any individual who has served in the Army or the Navy on the active list for a period of 50 years or more; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3365. A bill exempting from tax cigarettes sold to certain organizations for distribution as gifts to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3367. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Federal Extension Service, to cooperate with the land-grant colleges and universities in carrying out a program for the collection and dissemination of information with respect to the supply of, the need for, and the effective use of agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3368. A bill to extend, for an additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3369. A bill to treat certain predecessor and successor railroad corporations as the same taxpayer for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3370. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than \$3.10 per 100 pounds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 3371. A bill to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3372. A bill authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3373. A bill to permit certain Polish veterans to enter the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate May 7 for annual observation as American Heroes' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution to invite Canada to join the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 3374. A bill awarding a Distinguished Service Cross to Tony Siminoff, veteran of the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3375. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Bowie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

452. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of 34 Elmwood, Murdock, and Eagle, Nebr., citizens, urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

453. Also, petition of 34 Weeping Water and Avoca, Nebr., citizens, urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

454. Also, petition of 28 Louisville, Nebr., citizens, urging favorable consideration and support to S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

455. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of A. E. Brown and 22 other signers, of Deadwood, S. Dak., requesting that communism be stopped and stamped out completely in this country; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

456. Also, petition of Carl H. Loocke and 24 other signers from Hill City, S. Dak., requesting that communism be stopped and stamped out completely in this country; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

457. By Mr. EATON: Concurrent resolution of the New Jersey State Senate, opposing ratification of any treaty or agreement with Dominion of Canada or passage of any legislation to provide for the construction of St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of women's division, American Jewish Congress, urging enactment of the Federal fair employment practice bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

459. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Touro Lodge, No. 814, B'nai B'rith, urging full representation for the Jewish people in all deliberations regarding Palestine within the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

460. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition signed by 22 citizens of Jane Lew and Kincheloe, Third District of West Virginia, urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

461. Also, petition signed by 29 citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging support for S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

462. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of twenty-first district council, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, adopted at a meeting held February 2, 1947, at Hollidaysburg, Pa., opposing any legislation that would permit the immigration of displaced persons from other countries in excess of present quotas, and requesting that present quotas be investigated in an effort to determine the possibility of decreasing the pres-

ent quota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

463. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of St. Clair County, Mich., expressing interest in proposed legislation which seeks to prohibit the transporting of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of Everett Townsend Club, No. 1, Everett, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

465. Also, petition of the Left Liberal Party of Greece, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to imposing the formation of a government of the center and the left in Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

466. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to supporting the program for Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

467. Also, petition of the Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

468. Also, petition of Puerto Rican Industrial Soldiers Association, of Guayama, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to compensation for the Puerto Rican industrial soldiers of the First World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We open our hearts unto Thee, our Father, and pray that Thy spirit may indwell each one of us and give us poise and power. We believe in Thee, O God. Give us the faith to believe what Thou hast said. We trust in Thee, O God. Give us the faith to trust Thee for guidance in the decisions we have to make.

Help us to do our very best this day and be content with today's troubles, so that we shall not borrow the troubles of tomorrow. Save us from the sin of worrying, lest stomach ulcers be the badge of our lack of faith. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 7, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hopkins, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

XCVI—300

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. A act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1922 (56 Stat. 862), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Cath-

erine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service;

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the session of the Senate after 3 o'clock p. m. today by reason of public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LABOR RELATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state the parliamentary situation. The Senate is proceeding under a unanimous-consent agreement, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered. That on the calendar day of Thursday, May 8, 1947, at the hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon any amendment that may be pending or that may thereafter be offered, to the pending amendment proposed to Senate bill 1126, the Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. SMITH) on page 54, after line 4, and then upon the said amendment, whether modified or amended.

Ordered further. That on said day of May 8 the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 12:30 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota will permit me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time taken for the roll call to be divided as usual between the two sides.