

have it today. Inheritance gave him nothing and education not much more. In Canajoharie, N.Y., he was the youngest of four children. He made a kind of living as a photographer, developing and printing pictures of visiting tourists and vacationists at Lake Placid, N.Y. In this way he met his bride, and through his prospective father-in-law, Edgar Fosburgh, a lumberman of Norfolk, Va., gave up photography—Fosburgh's idea—and struck out on what Fosburgh hoped would be a more dignified and more lucrative career. The area selected, farthest from Lake Placid, was the Pacific Northwest. The plan was for young Kaiser to make good on his own and talk marriage once his salary had reached a minimum of \$125 a month. Kaiser went and returned in what was for him the historic year of 1907 and claimed his bride. He had the job. He had the salary. Moreover, he had a house for his bride in Spokane, Wash., fully furnished and ready for occupancy—something of a modern-day Cinderella story.

Success is the Kaiser trademark.

The Northwest adventure was the beginning of Henry J. Kaiser's career in the construction business. The rest is the most fabulous individual chapter in the history of industry in the United States; and this country is rich in fantastic success stories. Kaiser altered basically the great machine workhorses of the construction business. Machine methods were revolutionized so that oil-and-gasoline energy and hard steel replaced human sweat and muscle and the backs of men. He made new and revolutionary use of the diesel engine. He could see that to which greed was blind. For instance, he could see that putting tires on wheelbarrows not only brought him greater cooperation and respect from his human work force, but yielded him greater profits because of more loads carried. For him humaneness became a helpmeet to achievement.

The fast-growing Kaiser human and mechanical machine paved whole communities in California better and faster for less.

Then came the massive breakthrough creating gargantuan construction projects that are the majestic monuments to architecture and engineering on the American scene in the 20th century: In 4 years he and associated contractors built Boulder Dam. This, on May 29, 1935, was 2 years before the date called for in the Government contract. Then Bonneville Dam sprang up across the deep channel of the Columbia River. On occasion whole cities were built to house the workers. I offer it as a purely personal opinion that under Henry J. Kaiser, construction as a science had developed more in the hands of this one man than it had developed in all the centuries before, back to the building of the Chinese Wall.

I ask: How can we estimate what it is that America owes to him?

I ask: How great, in terms of dollars and statistics, is the gratitude coming to Henry J. Kaiser from the whole free world?

It was after Bonneville Dam that Grand Coulee Dam literally changed the skyline of this continent. For here was something as monumental for its day as anything man had ever constructed in the whole history of time. The least that can be said of it is that it is the greatest dam ever built. Everything about Grand Coulee was unprecedented in terms of size, proportions, quantities, dimensions. It seemed to add new meanings to the ordinary digits in arithmetic. Kaiser and his fellow contractors employed hammerhead cranes weighing 368,000 tons. A Niagara of cement poured from these unheard-of giants of mechanization. In the concrete Kaiser and his associate contractors embedded, as if for eternity, supports for an 1,180-foot-high, four-track trestle. The concrete came from a mixing plant of a size never known before. Finally when Grand Coulee stood out, like a tamed monster for the good of man, there it was far ahead of the deadline date.

In my day I have wandered over many bridges and I am not sure how many of these Kaiser built. But I do find something personal and intimate in the knowledge, for instance, that when one drives over the San Francisco-to-Oakland Bay Bridge, the piers that form the base are the work of this greatest of all American builders in our age.

I could go on like this detailing an enormous inventory of 20th century construction that has meant revolutionary changes in everything from light metals to wheelbarrows, and from diesel engines to executive management, and that involve whole nations and continents. The story is a biography that has yet to be told in all its drama, its color, its intriguing human excitement, and the grand scale on which Kaiser operated. I have only to add one more point. For Kaiser had to overcome not only the merciless eccentricities of uncertain wild forces in nature: wind and rain, cold and heat, storms and floods; he had a far greater obstruction than all of these put together. Again and again and still again he had to overcome an almost impassable, and frequently an absolutely impassable, mountain of human stupidity. With the amazing drive that pushes him on he was able now and again, against high rank and uniformed prestige in authoritative places, to plow through this obstructive blunt wittedness. He did it like one of the best oiled of his great bulldozers pushing through a mountain of heavy sludge. In the end the doubting Thomases, the faltering addicts to the past, the simply deep-frozen minds of inferior men in magnificent offices, saw that Henry J. Kaiser had not only vision, but practicality. And the proof was there in steel and concrete as if for the ages.

Let me finally end this tribute with the simple observation that without the peradventure of a doubt Henry J. Kaiser is one of the greatest Americans in our history. He did what he did on character and understanding and his service to the whole of mankind surpassed the cumulative accomplishments of a whole 5-foot shelf of monarchs and world-shakers.

WHO IS DOING THE DEVIL'S WORK IN AMERICAN POLITICS?

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

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to put a question to my colleagues. It is a question which deserves sober consideration.

I ask: Who is doing the Devil's work in American politics?

The facts charge that it is being done by an organization called Americans for Constitutional Action.

We are all aware that democracy is under attack by the radical right. At his last press conference President Kennedy reminded us of this when he said:

It has always seemed to me remarkable that those people and organizations who are founded in order to defend the Constitution should seek to change it, and particularly to change it in such a basic way, either to affect the power of the Congress, or to amend the Constitution and put severe limitations upon the Congress—which after all represents the people most directly.

The President elaborated further and closed his remarks with this observation:

I would think that the efforts will come to nothing—and I will be glad when they do not.

I know that all my colleagues in the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, are joined with the President on this vital issue. Every man and woman among us—supported by nearly 180 million citizens throughout this Nation—hope the efforts of the rightwing extremists will come to nothing. We will all be glad when they do not.

But mere hope is not enough to thwart the goals of the radical right. Whether the lunatic fringe fails or prevails depends greatly upon such action each of us is willing to take as individuals. Each of us must search his own soul and come to terms with his own conscience. Each of us must chart for himself where he has been, where he is today, and where he will be tomorrow.

It is tomorrow that concerns me. For as I survey the national horizon I see dark clouds gathering. Sooner than any of us would like to believe, these clouds can be upon us, unleashing a torrent of suspicion and hate, fear and distrust, unlike anything this country has ever seen.

During the last election campaign—I waded through such a torrent. My opponent was a man who was for 2 years a member of this distinguished body. Not long after he took office, responsible citizens across the land were shocked with the disclosure that, through him, the John Birch Society had successfully infiltrated the Congress of the United States.

You found sitting among you the spokesman of Robert Welch, a man who has branded President Dwight Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles as dedicated Communist agents. But the Congressman denied that he was in fact in Washington as a puppet of Robert Welch.

He alleged that his only interest was in constitutional conservatism. As a

Congressman he hoped to clothe the John Birch Society in respectability, clothing which it desperately needs if the organization is to win new recruits for its army of panic and fright.

It is a great tribute to the American people that, once unmasked, my predecessor was no longer acceptable—as a constitutional conservative. But although he was defeated at the polls, Robert Welch did not abandon his young prodigy.

Gerald L. K. Smith, the arch anti-Semite sang the praises of the ex-Congressman in the May issue of the Cross and the Flag, and told of his present activities as the professional organizer for the John Birch Society in the seven Western States:

Recently he was invited by the leaders of the John Birch Society to become the chief director of the John Birch Society activities in the California zone. He is doing a wonderful work. Naturally, I could wish that the John Birch Society would go a little further in the discussions of the issues. They not only do not discuss the Jewish issue, but once in a while they are tempted to bite a little flesh out of some of us who have dared to discuss the Jewish issue. This does not antagonize me, because I feel that it is a symptom of naivete. It is impossible for a man to study communism and not eventually learn that the Jews, as such, organized, financed, and promoted the world Communist revolution.

Smith also offered these words of advice to his racist rabble-rousers:

Followers of mine who have access to our literature should attend the John Birch Society meetings in their communities.

Thus we have evidence that the parasites of religious and racial prejudice are crawling into bed with the John Birch Society. I shudder to think of the hideous offspring of such a mating. Yet, if we are to take Gerald L. K. Smith at his word, the Birch leadership—at this point at least—does not want to clutch the Christian Nationalist Crusade to its bosom.

Already rejected by the American people, the Birch Society is attempting to improve its ignoble image—not tarnish it further.

A major step in this direction will be taken in Washington on May 23 at what is being billed as a "gala reception." Sponsored by Americans for Constitutional Action, 153 Members of the 88th Congress have been invited to receive awards.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know who these Members are. While ACA has given wide publicity to its gala reception, it has failed to divulge beforehand the identities of prospective award recipients. I believe it is of utmost urgency that my respected colleagues be alerted to the true character of the Americans for Constitutional Action—and I therefore am taking this opportunity to bring the facts to light.

For their own welfare, for the welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country, I urge each and every one of my colleagues to consider seriously how ACA is attempting to use them; how ACA is attempting to clothe itself and the John Birch Society with an aura of respectability to which it is not entitled,

but through which it can secure the good names of honorable Members of the Congress.

I urge them to reject the so-called Distinguished Service Awards of ACA which are to be presented in the name of constitutional conservatism. These awards make a mockery of the very ideals they purport to salute.

For just as the John Birch Society sought respectability by putting its Members in Congress, so is it again seeking—through ACA—to clothe itself in the honorable political philosophy of conservatism.

Half the top officers of ACA are also John Birch Society leaders, and about one-fifth of ACA's financial support comes from Birch members. I know of no sitting Member of Congress who would accept a medal from the Birch Society. Is it then appropriate to accept a medal from an organization only half removed? I think not.

It is time that the American voters, political candidates and office holders, newspaper reporters and editors identified ACA for what it is—a mask for reaction. It is one thing for a Congressman to get a medal for being conservative, but it is quite another thing to be decorated by a reactionary, right-wing extremist group, for its own ulterior motives.

It is only because I have the highest regard for my colleagues that I bring these facts to their attention. I have great respect for the conservative philosophy and, while I often disagree with some of its interpretations, I realize that these beliefs stem from a genuine love of country.

My professional background as a certified public accountant frequently causes me to advocate what are considered conservative philosophies in the area of finance. These beliefs are the product of sincerity, and I have never found it difficult to reconcile them with what are considered more liberal positions on other issues affecting the future of my State and country.

It will be a great tragedy for the American people—and for our form of Government—if noble conservative concepts are allowed to become contaminated by right-wing fanatics.

Do not for one moment doubt that ACA is extremist-dominated, and extremist oriented. Its ancestor was The Campaign for the 48 States, established in 1955 to lobby for the adoption of five constitutional amendments, among them revision of the electoral college to weaken the voting power of urban areas. In my judgment this is one of the items the President had in mind when he expressed amazement that those organizations which are allegedly founded to defend the Constitution are most often those which seek to change the Constitution.

The chairman of The Campaign for the 48 States was Robert B. Snowden, who was initially the finance chairman of ACA and is more recently an endorser of the John Birch Society.

Retired Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers is presently vice chairman and secretary of ACA, and as recently as February 1962, he was listed as a member of the John Birch Society's committee of endorers.

In the May 1963 issue of Free Enterprise, a tabloid which cites Gerald L. K. Smith's "The Cross and the Flag" as suggested reading, General Fellers wrote:

You have set up a splendid program for the citizens' hearings of "We the People." Best success.

We, the People is an organization controlled by Rev. Billy James Hargis. On the national advisory board of We, the People there are or have been such extremists as Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, a member of the John Birch Society national council; Robert B. Dresser, a member of the society's committee of endorers; J. Bracken Lee, formerly on the national board of the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, a group described by Robert Welch as a Birch front; and Merwin K. Hart, formerly a member of this same front and leader of a John Birch Society chapter in New York City.

General Fellers was also appointed by the Reverend Billy James Hargis to the anti-Communist liaison steering committee. You will recall that Hargis and former Gen. Edwin Walker recently completed a cross-country bus tour, spouting their extremist slogans all the way. During their stop in Los Angeles my predecessor, on behalf of the Birch Society, and before 6,000 persons, presented General Walker with a plaque proclaiming him the "greatest living American."

The treasurer of ACA is Charles Edison, a member of the editorial advisory committee of American Opinion, the Birch Society's national magazine. It is worth noting that Westbrook Pegler is now a regular contributor to this publication. In an American Opinion article earlier this year, Pegler launched such a vile and vitriolic attack upon the late Eleanor Roosevelt that even regular readers were forced to protest.

Another ACA trustee is Howard Buffet, who has been identified as an enthusiastic member of the John Birch Society. In addition to his Birch activity, Buffet, like Snowden, has found time to serve in a leadership spot on the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee which, despite its name, is against all foreign aid. It is worth noting that seven key members of this committee, as listed on its letterhead, are also listed in Welch's "Blue Book" as members of the John Birch Society national council.

The Birch Society, of course, has not limited its ACA activity to merely putting its supporters and members into key leadership positions. Reports required to be filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives show Birchers have made substantial financial contributions to ACA.

In last year's campaign, for example, records reveal that the following identifiable John Birch leaders contributed \$7,200 to ACA and loaned \$12,000 more:

George W. Armstrong, Jr., a member of the American Opinion's Editorial Advisory Committee since 1957: \$1,000 contribution.

Howard Buffet, identified a moment ago as an ACA trustee and an enthusiastic Bircher: \$1,000 loan.

Robert B. Dresser, also on the American Opinion Editorial Advisory Committee: \$500 contribution.

Charles Edison, the ACA treasurer mentioned earlier as a member of the American Opinion staff: \$1,000 contribution, and a \$2,500 loan.

E. Ainsworth Eyre, a member of the Birch Society's committee of endorsers: \$1,200 contribution, and a \$2,000 loan.

William J. Grede, a member of the John Birch Society's national council: \$1,000 contribution.

Fred C. Koch, also a member of the John Birch Society's national council: \$500 contribution.

Thomas Parker, a member of the society's committee of endorsers: \$2,500 loan.

J. Howard Pew, member of the American Opinion Editorial Advisory Committee: \$3,000 contribution.

E. L. Wiegand, a member of the John Birch Society committee of endorsers: \$2,500 loan.

These contributions account for nearly one-fifth of the more than \$100,000 in total contributions reported by ACA for the 3-month period just prior to the 1962 elections.

Americans for Constitutional Action alleges that it has but one goal—"to elect constitutional conservatives to the Congress of the United States."

In 1961 ACA puts its stamp of approval on 136 Members of the 87th Congress. Yet I know of no Member of Congress who would knowingly accept the endorsement of the John Birch Society or a John Birch Society front group. ACA's 1961 awards were refused by one Republican Senator, one Democratic Senator, and six Republican Representatives. I am confident that had the recipients known the true nature of the donor, all ACA awards would have been rejected.

The main tool in selecting award winners is an ACA-Index which has been widely distributed. It has been reprinted in the reactionary "Dan Smoot Reports," and in Texas billionaire extremist H. L. Hunt's Life Lines. It has been circulated by the so-called Network of Patriotic Letter Writers, an operation which, I am sure, accounts for much of the fright mail being received by congressional offices.

The ACA-Index is a percentage rating of the standing of a Member of Congress based on how he has voted on specific rollcalls selected by ACA. The organization contends that this rating is a measure of the extent to which the Senator or Representative is "for safeguarding the God-given dignity of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government" and "against group morality and a socialized economy through centralization of power."

This actually says nothing about ACA's criteria for selecting a constitutional conservative. But analysis of the 1961 ACA-Index in the 1st session of the 87th Congress gives a clear picture of what ACA criteria is:

Members of Congress were expected to be:

Against programs to aid depressed areas by making available loans and grants.

Against raising minimum wages to \$1.25 an hour and extending coverage of wage and hour laws.

Against slum clearance and public housing.

Against funds for health research.

Against manpower training for the unemployed.

Against permitting the Attorney General to use injunctions and civil actions in civil rights cases.

Against establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Against increasing grants to aid in the fight against water pollution.

Against Federal aid to education and funds for school construction.

Out of 30 votes cited, ACA expected Members of Congress to vote against the majority, to vote against 27 of the 30 bills cited in their index.

I do not for a moment question the motives of any Member of this Congress who voted against these measures, but neither do I question the motives of anyone who voted for these measures. Whether for or against, I am certain that votes were cast on the basis of personal convictions and a strong desire to act in the best interests of this Nation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do question the motives of ACA in attaching itself, like a political leech, to the voting records of honorable men. For, in my judgment, ACA's only aim is to transfer the image of respectable conservatism to radical rightwing extremism.

The pipeline of transfusion is Human Events, a patriotism-for-profit propaganda publication which, in addition to publishing the ACA-Index, has a joint subscription arrangement with the John Birch Society's American Opinion. In his "Blue Book," Robert Welch writes that Human Events—

Feels also that we complement each other well * * * and American Opinion is, to the best of my knowledge, the first * * * magazine which they have been willing to join in such a combination offer.

A sampling of quotations from various issues of Human Events points up its extremist biases:

Item: "We will never have efficiency in the service of delivering mail * * * until the Post Office is turned over to private enterprise."

Item: "It is scarcely a secret that Reuther is a ruthless labor dictator and one of the most mischievous socialist leaders in the country."

Item: "It was Franklin D. Roosevelt who opened wide the door for Communist penetration of the peoples south of the Rio Grande."

Item: "After reading this handbook (and other Girl Scout publications) * * * I knew that I should hereafter advise all American mothers to discourage their girls from joining that organization until it stops the U.N. and world government propaganda and becomes a * * * real American organization."

I would be shocked and amazed, Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this Congress who has been marked for recognition by ACA claimed that the Girl Scouts is not a real American organization, or that Franklin Roosevelt invited Communist subversion of Latin America, or that the Post Office should be turned over to private enterprise.

Yet this is what the extremists would have the American people believe. It is the contaminated brand of constitutional conservatism which they are ped-

dling. They have changed the contents of the package but are making every effort to leave the original label intact.

My daily mail is grim reminder that the concepts of constitutionalism and conservatism are undergoing basic alteration. These ideals are being cunningly translated into word symbols—word symbols that have special meaning woven into them by those who use them. History has shown that Fascists and Communists pay homage to the symbols of freedom and democracy, but give their own interpretation to these words. The extremists of today are muddling communication between Americans by using the same methods found so successful by the tyrants of yesterday.

Some political observers hold the skeptical view that given power, the people will turn it over to the demagog with the most appealing line. All democracies have faced the threat of extremists—Fascists, Communists, and anti-Semites. In many cases the existing governments were ripped apart by the spread of this confusion and hate.

Under normal circumstances the appeals of demagogues have attraction only to the lunatic fringe. But during a crisis—such as the cold war in which this Nation is engaged—men with extremist panaceas become a real threat to democracy. It is under conditions of emotional insecurity that people from all segments of society are attracted by the extremist magnets.

Thirty years ago in Europe Hitler and Mussolini had all the answers—all the panaceas—and in the United States so did Gerald L. K. Smith and Earl Browder. Democracy succumbed to extremism in Germany and Italy. But in America, democratic leadership responded to the needs of the times and acted vigorously to reinforce our cherished institutions. In my judgment, the time for such action is again at hand.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented the facts and I have tried to present them objectively. To me they seem indisputable. They establish that Americans for Constitutional Action is doing the Devil's work in American politics. They establish that ACA has been infiltrated and taken over by Robert Welch's John Birch Society.

Birch leaders are ACA leaders.

Birch money is ACA money.

Birch propaganda complements ACA propaganda.

Birch ideology is ACA ideology.

But whether Birch or ACA, it is not the ideology—it is not the conservatism—acceptable to our forefathers.

It is not the conservatism acceptable to Members of this Congress.

It is not the conservatism acceptable to the American people.

It is extremism, a brand of political and social ideology not worthy of recognition in our Nation's Capital on May 23—or on any other day.

Whether the radical right fails or prevails depends greatly upon what action each of us is willing to take as individuals.

Each of us must search our soul, and come to terms with our conscience. Each of us must chart where we have

been, where we are today, and where we will be tomorrow.

I am hopeful tomorrow will find that: "No violent extremes endure; a sober moderation stands secure."

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

Mr. CAMERON. It is a pleasure to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague and friend from the State of California for a very forthright and courageous statement calling attention to a very serious, if not critical, development on the American political horizon and saying things that ought to be said and should be said. I am privileged and personally pleased to be associated in this discussion which the gentleman leads in the special orders for today.

I would like to give further details of the Americans for Constitutional Action to which quite some reference has been made by the gentleman.

The announcement of formation of the Americans for Constitutional Action was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD volume 104, part 12, pages 15899-15902, by Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, with a glowing tribute to its head, Admiral Moreell, and other leaders.

"I welcome wholeheartedly this new venture in our American political system," the Senator said, praising it as a contribution to clearing the lines of demarcation between conservatives and liberals as against mere party labels of Republican and Democratic. He then told the Senate the following, by way of explaining the beginning of the movement:

As long as 6 or 7 years ago, in association with the then Senator from Maine, Mr. Brewster, and others, I helped organize a weekend conference, held in the North Room of the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington on September 15 and 16, 1951, which resulted in the creation of what was then known as the National Committee for Political Realignment, which had the cochairmanship of former Senator Albert Hawkes of New Jersey, as a Republican, and Ed O'Neal of Selma, Ala., as a Democrat. Senator Hawkes had been formerly the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Ed O'Neal was known to all of us as the very effective national president for many years of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

So we see that part of the origin of ACA was in a meeting of leaders of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Farm Bureau Federation. Incidentally, Ed O'Neal, identified there as a Democrat from Alabama, appeared on a platform at Memphis to introduce the Republican candidate for President in the 1952 campaign and bolted the Democrat Party 10 days later. The man who succeeded O'Neal as President of the Farm Bureau, Allan B. Kline, is a trustee of ACA.

Another ancestor of the ACA was a movement called the Campaign for the 48 States, organized in 1955 to press for five amendments to the Constitution, including one to limit the rate of Federal income tax. It was headed by Robert B. Snowden, a Memphis businessman and farmer, who was initially the finance

chairman of ACA and later became an endorser of the John Birch Society.

In early 1959, when the Campaign for the 48 States was being liquidated, it turned over to ACA \$25,096.54, according to reports filed by ACA with the Clerk of the House.

Trustees listed in literature of the Campaign for the 48 States who later became identified with the John Birch Society include the following: Robert B. Dresser, Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, J. H. Gipson, Sr., and Joseph S. Kimmel.

In addition, the Campaign for the 48 States had a national advisory council which included the following who later became identified with the John Birch Society: Spruille Braden, Howard Buffett, Kenneth Colegrove, Kent C. Courtney, Frank DeGanah, Gov. J. Bracken Lee, Clarence Manion, Adolphe Menjou, J. Howard Pew, E. Merrill Root, and Robert H. W. Welch, Jr.

Moreover, the following officers, trustees, or advisory council members of the Campaign for the 48 States included the following men who are presently leaders of Americans for Constitutional Action: Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, Howard Buffett, and Adm. Ben Morrell; and three former ACA leaders—Felix Morley, T. Jefferson Coolidge, and Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired. Also the Campaign for the 48 States was actively supported by former Congressman Ralph Gwinn, who was a trustee of ACA until his death last year.

It is also noteworthy that the national advisory council included two of the founders of Human Events: Frank E. Hanighen, who is still the editor, and Felix Morley, who was its president from 1945 to 1950.

This was no small insignificant group. Congressional Quarterly reported that the organization was the top spender—\$81,922—among lobbyists in the first quarter of 1957—nearly twice as much as any other organization spent to influence legislation. Similarly, ACA is no small group. It is openly boasting of having helped 184 candidates last year and is starting next year's campaign 18 months ahead of the election.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for bringing this to my attention.

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

Mr. CAMERON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks today, and I want to associate myself with them. I would like to say I want to add some comments on the topic of Americans for Constitutional Action—comments which I think will demonstrate further that it is highly partisan in bias and is well-nigh ludicrous in its standards.

As is well known, under the rules and traditions of this House, leadership is in part a function of seniority. Without going into the perhaps controversial aspects of this fact, I believe that I can safely say that the leadership of the House, including the chairmen of the standing committees, is not radical and

could not legitimately be said to be in opposition to the spirit and principles of the Constitution. It is enlightening, therefore, to take a look at how ACA rates House leadership.

First, let us consider the Speaker. On the basis of his votes prior to election as Speaker, ACA rated him zero. This is so patently ridiculous that former President Hoover, himself an ACA trustee, personally assured the Speaker that he was distressed by the false implication that the Speaker had opposed economy in Government. This episode, by the way, raises an interesting and significant question for the ACA defenders who try to hide behind the respected name of the former President.

How about our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma? ACA rates him at 4 percent. The majority whip does only a little better on the ACA scale, with a rating of 13 percent, and the deputy majority whip, the gentleman from California, is given a score of 3 percent.

Let us turn now to the chairmen of the 20 standing committees of the House—men of great seniority and public service. Of these, no less than six are rated by ACA at less than 10 percent, another four fall below ACA's 30-percent mark, and only five manage to score above 50 percent. In other words, if we are to believe ACA, most of our leadership in this body is not even one-third devoted—and I quote from Mr. Welch's writing—to "the preservation of the spirit and the principles of the Constitution."

Now I turn with some amusement to my own personal rating by the Americans for Constitutional Action. This phony rightwing group has decided that I am entitled to a rating of 11 percent good votes and 89 percent bad votes for the years 1957 through 1962. I am a little bit ashamed of getting such a high rating, I might add.

My constituents, who were apprised of this rating during my last campaign, evidently thought as little of the ACA phony percentages as I do, because they gave me a majority of about 30,000 votes over my opponent, a Mr. Robert Ramsey. Incidentally, my opponent was endorsed by the ACA and recently has acted as master of ceremonies in a John Birch Society meeting whose speaker was our former colleague, John Rousselot, the then western regional director of the John Birch Society.

As a footnote to this facet of the ACA ratings, I call to your attention the fact that the majority membership of the Committee on Un-American Activities averages only 35½ percent with ACA, with the chairman scored as only one-fifth of a constitutionalist.

Two more points, Mr. Speaker, as indication of the partisan bias and the ultra-negativism of the ACA ratings of Congress. First, note that since 1957, ACA has chosen some 73 record votes in this body to use in its ratings. In no less than 49 instances—in other words, two-thirds of the time—ACA considers that the majority of this House has voted against the spirit and principles of the Constitution. Little wonder, then, that they are so hysterical.

As my final point, I give only the bare statistics of partisan breakdown. Of those receiving ACA ratings of better than 80 percent, all but 5 are Republicans; and conversely, all of those rated at less than 20 percent are Democrats. This seems to me to be sufficient answer to ACA's spurious claim to be a nonpartisan organization. Furthermore, the whole pattern of the ACA-index should leave little doubt that it is worthless except possibly to those who wish to repeal the 20th century completely and amend the 19th rather substantially.

Mr. CAMERON. I thank the gentleman from California. I am glad to have the facts brought out.

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

Mr. CAMERON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend him on his leadership in undertaking to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives and the country some of the remarkable activities of the leaders of the far rightwing in our country—many of them persons who are themselves un-American in their attitudes and methods rather than those they seek to impugn with some of their propaganda.

Only recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to talk to a distinguished Republican who shares, I am sure, the viewpoint which we are here this afternoon expressing on the floor of the House. I refer to Arthur Larson, author of the book entitled, "A Republican Looks at His Party," a distinguished lawyer in his own right, who taught law at the University of Tennessee, Cornell University, and was dean of the Law School of the University of Pittsburgh. Mr. Larson, moreover, served under President Eisenhower in the high positions of Under Secretary of Labor and Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and also as special assistant to President Eisenhower. At the present time Mr. Larson is Professor of Law and Director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University in North Carolina.

In talking with Mr. Larson, I found, as I say, that he shared the concern which we are here this afternoon expressing. I asked Mr. Larson if I could see a recent speech of his which had just been drawn to my attention and which is relevant to our discussion here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the text of an excellent address by Arthur Larson delivered on May 10, 1963, at Encino, Calif., on the subject of "An American Looks at the United Nations."

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT THE UNITED NATIONS
(By Arthur Larson)

A new era has opened in the history of the United Nations.

The principal milestone marking this new era was the peaceful occupation of Kolwezi

in Katanga Province by United Nations troops early this year. This event signaled the end of the acute military phase in the Congo. It demonstrated that the United Nations could put an army into the field in support of its peace-keeping objectives, and carry through to a successful conclusion, using its own resources and command, a suppression of a threat to the peace under almost indescribable difficulties. This event demonstrated, for all to see, that the United Nations could indeed take effective action in a situation where all the major powers considered themselves to have a vital interest, in spite of the fact that every great power except one, the United States, was in fact opposed to the action. Of course, the difficulties in the Congo are not over, but they are now of different character. They involve the process of nation building, with the United Nations continuing to play a major role in coordinating the strengthening of internal security resources as well as economic development.

The change in the Congo picture is, however, only one feature of the United Nations new era. If we look back only 18 months, we can see that the United Nations has emerged from an appalling series of crises with renewed strength and confidence. One byproduct of this change can be seen in the second edition of our booklet of questions and answers. The first edition was entitled "Questions and Answers on the United Nations Crisis." The outline of the book consisted of eight main causes of crisis of confidence in the United Nations. The new edition of this booklet has just been published entitled simply "Questions and Answers on the United Nations." The dropping of the word "crisis" is significant. Of course, the United Nations still has plenty of troubles. It is important for all of us, however, to realize that we need no longer approach a discussion of United Nations affairs in an atmosphere of crisis and imminent disaster to the organization. Let us look at some of these changes in the last 18 months.

THE CONGO

As to the Congo: 18 months ago many people were seriously worried that the United Nations would fail in the Congo and that the burden of the effort and of the failure would be the beginning of the end for the organization. Today the United Nations is in control of the situation, has freedom of movement throughout the Congo, and is proceeding with an orderly transfer of responsibility to the Congolese Government.

As to finances: 18 months ago the United Nations was literally bankrupt and there seemed to be some real doubt whether the U.S. Congress would deal virtually a financial death blow to the United Nations by an adverse vote on the U.N. bond issue. Today, although the financial plight of the United Nations is still unsolved, the bond issue has been adopted and reasonably well subscribed, and danger of imminent collapse has been averted. Prospects of a solution have been aided in the meantime by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice holding the assessments for the Congo and Middle East actions to be binding on all members in the same way as the regular budget assessments are, and this opinion has been adopted by the General Assembly.

THE SECRETARY GENERAL

As to the Secretary-Generalship: at the period of the United Nations deepest crisis we saw the death of Dag Hammarskjöld, the repeated insistence by the Soviet Union that it would demand a three-man committee and would refuse to accept any single Secretary General, and the resultant prospect that the U.N. would thereafter be forever paralyzed by a hamstrung committee or, at best, by a weak and cautious successor to Hammarskjöld. Today we see the Secretary-Generalship being handled with a superb combina-

tion of imagination, courage, initiative, patience and tact by Secretary General U Thant, ably assisted by such first-rate international public servants as Ralph Bunche and C. V. Narasimhan.

As to West New Guinea: during the crisis period active hostilities were in progress between Indonesia and the Netherlands, with the always imminent possibility that this spark might set off the explosive southeast Asia situation. Today, thanks to the creative courage of U Thant and the skillful diplomacy of Ellsworth Bunker, we have seen a United Nations regime exercise actual transitional political administration over the region, supported by a United Nations armed force of 1,000 Pakistani troops.

As to Communist China: at one time it was widely thought that, because of the increasing votes in apparent favor of seating Communist China in the General Assembly, this seating would soon be a reality, with no regard for the impact on Nationalist China. In the last General Assembly, however, the relative vote against the seating of Communist China actually increased for the first time, the increase being largely due to the new African members. This change, which reflected a realization that the problem was much more complex than had previously been realized and that it particularly required greater attention to the rights of Nationalist China, contained a reassuring reminder, if any was needed, that the General Assembly, enlarged as it is, does not stampede blindly on such issues as this but considers them on their merits.

CHANGE IN POSITION OF UNITED NATIONS

The change in the United Nations story from a period of crisis to a period of confidence is mirrored in the change in attitude toward the organization on the part of its friends and detractors alike.

It seems as though it was only yesterday that the main theme of the U.N.'s enemies was that the United Nations was too weak to be respected. Today the main theme of these enemies is that the United Nations is too strong to be trusted. The speed of this reversal is well illustrated by a poignant episode involving a rather excessively conservative Congressman. In common with the new trend among extreme conservatives, he had made the mistake of entrusting some of his views to print. Unfortunately there is a lead time in getting articles or books printed which sometimes runs as much as 6 months. This Congressman published an article ridiculing and denouncing the United Nations because its ineptitude and debility were demonstrated by its inability to handle even the resistance put up by Mr. Tshombe. At the very moment the article appeared, the same Congressman was on his feet roundly condemning the United Nations because its defeat of Tshombe proved that the U.N. was so powerful as to be dangerous.

FRIENDS OF THE U.N.

As for the friends of the United Nations, during the crisis period many of them found themselves saying, "It may not be very good, but it is all we have; at least it is a place where you can talk." Today this half-apologetic air is completely out of place, and the friends of the United Nations can point with renewed pride to its record of achievements against severe odds.

While I am at it, I might mention also that the in-between lukewarm friends of the United Nations may also be revising their attitude. During the crisis period, a number of people like Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator JACKSON were saying that, since the United Nations had run into so many difficulties, and was filled with such diverse interests, we should shift our emphasis to a concert of like-minded nations, beginning with the Atlantic Community. I sometimes wonder whether Senators FULBRIGHT and JACKSON are not asking each other who