

WSM, December 14, 1947  
Rep. Albert Gore

Good Morning, Friends:

After almost another full week of intense debate, the House on Thursday passed the bill authorizing an appropriation for interim aid to Europe. It should be understood that the ~~appropriation~~ <sup>bill</sup> of interim aid is to tide ~~these~~ hard-pressed countries through the winter and until the long range European recovery program, generally referred to as the Marshall Plan, can be put into effect.

Of course, the passage of this bill does not commit the Congress to enactment of the Marshall plan, but unless the Marshall Plan is to be adopted, then passage of this bill would be, indeed, questionable.

The debate on the bill was quite interesting. Not many Members would come flat out and say that they were opposed to giving relief to the hungry and cold people of France and Italy and other places, but they would say, "I am for <sup>countries</sup> home people first." Well, who isn't for home people first? For years now we have had an organization in this country known as America First and many public men cry ~~out~~ with stimulated sincerity that they are for America first. Well, so is every other loyal American. I hear this sort of demagoguery so much that I get sort of tired of it. For days on end, we debated one amendment after the other offered with this idea. ~~They~~ In effect they would say, "I am for giving aid to Europe provided it does not entail any sacrifice on our part." For instance, an amendment would be offered prohibiting the shipment of wheat, and the author would make a nice speech explaining how his heart bled for the starving people of Great Britain or France but he was for having plenty of wheat here first. Well, of course, the truth is that unless we <sup>do</sup> send some of our wheat abroad ~~now~~, whether for relief purposes or otherwise, there would very soon be a surplus <sup>and</sup> ~~now~~ of wheat here at

home. In fact, despite all the talk of shortage, we produced last year nearly twice as much wheat in the United States as we will use in the United States.

Scarcities and high prices are severe problems, of course, but so much has been said about them that a lot of people, including several Members of Congress, seem to have gotten an entirely erroneous opinion about the real situation.

Then someone would offer another amendment to prohibit the shipment of oil or fertilizer or coal or some other commodity, and many, many speeches were made about being for America first. Well, ~~then~~ no one who was supporting the bill, and I was one of those who supported it, wants to create shortages

here at home; nor do we want to waste the substance of America. That isn't the question at all. But speaking of wasting America's substance, I recall that during the war we were spending 250 million dollars per day in dollars to fight a war. This bill for 500 and some million dollars to take a real forward step

in bringing about stability and we hope peace in the world doesn't loom so large, *when*

*We recall* ~~the~~ ~~just~~ ~~two~~ ~~days~~ ~~of~~ ~~what~~ ~~we~~ ~~had~~ ~~spent~~ That in just two days of war we would spend that many dollars. But dollars were not all we were spending.

We were spending the tears and heartaches of fathers and mothers because sons were away from the fire side and we were spending, too, many of the lives of those young men. And I recall that this America First crowd opposed appropriations for national defense before Pearl Harbor. I remember they opposed giving aid to

Great Britain when we desperately needed her to hold back the Nazi hoard until

*in which*  
we could have time to prepare. Yes, in their words, they were for America first, *then, too, were they?* but if we had followed them, America might now be under the heel of a conquering dictator, *and I wouldn't call that putting America first.*

I became so exasperated at all this yelling about being for America

first on this bill that I remembered the old adage that even the devil <sup>can</sup> quote scripture to his own purpose.

The debate on this bill, however, bodes ill for the so-called Marshall Plan when it comes before the regular session of Congress. This debate actually turned out to be somewhat of a dress rehearsal for the fight <sup>on the</sup> ~~on the~~ Marshall Plan. Many people are disillusioned about our aid to Europe and are disappointed that the state of world affairs should take such an unfortunate turn. I should say <sup>except the Com?</sup> that everyone is. Who isn't? And a lot of questions are raised as to whether the program will be successful. No one can guarantee that it will be successful. But of one thing we ~~are~~ <sup>can be</sup> sure, that unless we do undertake to do what we reasonably can, we can be sure that world peace will fail. And if another war comes, we <sup>expect</sup> can have no right to ~~hope~~ that the United States would remain as unscathed as it was during the last war. I ~~have never been one to try~~ <sup>George</sup> to frighten people because of <sup>the awesome power of</sup> atomic energy and the recent development of bacteriological warfare, but I think it is time that everyone of us was realizing that according to the present scientific opinion, it would not take over a few hundred <sup>atomic</sup> bombs, if that many, not only to destroy the ~~citizens~~ <sup>cities</sup> of the United States but to <sup>for man or beast.</sup> make the whole continent of North America uninhabitable. I am told that ~~fix~~ some of the greatest battleships that were in the atomic test at Bikini are still so contaminated with radio activity that no living man or animal can remain on them. All wars have been disastrous and history shows they have been progressively worse. <sup>Just</sup> ~~Compare~~ <sup>World Wars 1+2.</sup> I shudder to think of what another <sup>war</sup> would do. We must do our utmost to save the ~~leading~~ nations <sup>+</sup> of mankind from destroying themselves. We must leave no stone unturned <sup>in our efforts</sup> to build and preserve world peace. That must be our constant objective.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation because I also am thinking first of America. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Michigan that it is just a question of how we all feel we can serve America best.

I am inclined to think that although we cannot justify this measure solely on the ground of relief we are doing ourselves an injustice when we deprive it completely of its humane considerations. We are a generous people, and our generous sentiments prompt us to do something for those who are afflicted, for those who are starving, and for those who are suffering. Furthermore, economic rehabilitation of these countries will be beneficial to all except those who seek to enslave the world.

However, in the brief time allotted to me I should like to address myself to the strategical aspects of this problem because I agree with my distinguished colleague on the committee who spoke yesterday, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], that this program can be justified entirely and rationalized exclusively on the basis of American national security.

We do not have one world politically but we have one world strategically, and we had better think on that basis, as we did during the war, or we are going to have a very dangerous time of it. In the field of strategy we are willing to use a very much curtailed cultural and information program to combat Russian propaganda, and we have been willing to use economic aid to combat the conditions created by the war and aggravated by Soviet agitation. In wartime we are willing to use flame throwers and atom bombs and we would have used poison gas if our enemies had used it. But we seem to have decided that we have no other weapon in fighting this cold war. We talk about a cold war but we do not act as if there were a war on.

I have suggested that there are three stages in this Soviet onslaught. The first is the effort to capture these governments by constitutional means; the second is internal force; and the third is war.

As I have said, I personally do not believe that war is imminent. The reasons for that belief are many, but there are two which stand out: First, I believe that the Russian Government thinks that it can capture these countries without war.

Secondly, I do not believe that they want a world war. But I do think that the questions that will be decided within the next 2 or 3 years are whether there will be another great war and, if there is, whether we will be in it. I think that the next 4 or 5 months are extremely critical.

I believe in this bill, but I do not believe that we can be absolutely sure that it will succeed as a war measure, which is the way the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUVERT] referred to it. He asked the question: Either this is a war measure or it is a relief measure. I would rather say it is a strategical measure,

with relief characteristics, and it may very well fall short of the mark. Therefore, I think that we should reassess the nature of the threat to which we are exposed and reexamine the means which we have to meet that threat.

Accordingly I have a concrete suggestion to make with respect to the Italian situation, which, at this time, is the most critical in western Europe. I believe that our troops, the withdrawal of which has been postponed from December 3 to December 15, should remain beyond December 15, and I believe that they should be increased in such numbers as are required to enable us to fulfill our international obligation. My reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

First, in the surrender treaty which we made with Italy on September 8, which was the eve of the Salerno landing, we agreed to guarantee the essential nationhood of Italy. If we betray Italy as we betrayed Poland, I leave it to you to decide where that leaves us as the greatest Nation on earth. We must maintain a posture which will allow us to live up to our obligations to guarantee the essential nationhood of Italy.

Secondly, we have a peace settlement which involves Trieste particularly. We must be in a position to assure that that peace settlement is carried out.

Thirdly, we have lines of communication and lines of supply to Trieste and to Austria. We must guarantee those lines of supply.

Fourthly, the very lives of our troops in Trieste and Austria and their families will be forfeited and will be at stake if we do not take steps to protect them.

A diplomat said to me during the trip I made with the Smith-Mundt committee, the fact that one side to a treaty violates it does not necessarily mean that we have the right to consider the treaty at an end. I have not gone into the technical legalities of international law in this connection. I believe that the letter killeth and the spirit giveth life. As a lawyer I realize that there are some breaches of contract which are de minimis, some breaches which do not absolve the other contracting parties. I do not believe that these breaches by the Soviet Union are in that category. In any event I think it is about time that we found reasons why we can do things in the national interest instead of looking around for reasons why we cannot. I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Soviet Union has violated, not only the United Nations Charter, the Potsdam agreement, and the Yalta agreement, but the satellite peace treaties which were ratified by the other body earlier this year. They have breached the Italian peace treaty in several ways. The present disruptions and strikes in Italy were, we know, ordered by the Belgrade Cominform on instructions from the Kremlin.

In Bulgaria the breach is even more obvious. One of the reasons advanced for the ratification of the satellite treaties before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year was that the Russians would have to withdraw their troops from Bulgaria. They did not have to withdraw them from Hungary or from Rumania, because they had a right

to keep an indeterminate number of troops there to guard their lines of communication with Austria. But they are bound to withdraw them from Bulgaria by December 15. It is estimated that the Russians have four divisions in Bulgaria. They have not begun their withdrawal. It is the opinion of our highest military experts that were they to begin now they could not withdraw by December 15. Furthermore, if they did withdraw, they would withdraw in the Russian manner. They simply take off their uniforms and put on civilian clothes. Over and beyond that, the Kremlin through its gauleiter Dimitrov has Bulgaria in its iron grip.

Can we justify the withdrawal of our troops from Italy when the Russians are not withdrawing from Bulgaria?

There have been other breaches of these peace treaties—the legalized murder of Petkoff, and the imprisonment of Maniu were not in the spirit of the preamble of those peace treaties. We know that those are violations. We know that the recent happenings in Hungary are not in the spirit of the treaty. We know that Nagy and Suloh and Pfeiffer had to leave the country. So there are very good reasons, in the realm of international law, why we should take this step.

Furthermore, if we do not, we run the risk that the Vatican, which is a vitally anti-Communist force and the spiritual comfort of millions, may become the prisoner of the Communists.

And last, and I think this is very vital, if we can put an end to these disturbances—and I may as well tell you here that the day it was announced that the withdrawal of our troops had been postponed, the disruptions in Italy diminished very appreciably—if we can sow a little political calm in Italy, we will be relieving the American taxpayer of a tremendous load. I do not have the exact figures of the cost of the strikes in Italy. I am informed that the cost of the strikes in France so far is three months' production. I say that we have a duty also in that connection to prevent higher prices, to curtail inflation, and to diminish the load on the American taxpayer by diminishing the economic needs of those countries.

First things first. First we have to dispose of these political disturbances, this civil strife, in order to rehabilitate those countries. That is the reason for this civil strife, to make it as expensive for us as possible. The Soviet Union knows that it is our desire to have a peaceful world, living in economic stability. Why should they oppose this thing? Why should they make the declaration which they made in Warsaw? Why should they declare war on the Marshall plan? Why should they not want peace and prosperity in Europe? We must not delude ourselves.

I think it might be helpful if we could revise our thinking a little in connection with these strategic problems. The word "isolation" has become a rather unattractive word in most circles in America, and since the war the word "intervention" seems also to have become unpopular. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is impossible to be an anti-isolationist and an anti-interventionist

at the same time. I do not believe it can be done. I believe that to the extent we are anti-isolationists, to that extent we are interventionists. To the extent that we assume the role of leadership in the world, a role which has been thrust into our hands, to the extent that we discharge our responsibilities, to that extent we are intervening. The point is, for what purpose do we intervene? We intervene not to impose our will on others, but to save others from domination. We intervene in the cause of freedom. We intervene in the cause of peace. We know that. No amount of Soviet distortions and lies, no quantity of Communist sophistries can change that fact. I believe, therefore, that we should recognize these things. Economic aid is, in a sense, a form of intervention. The conditions which we quite rightly attach to this aid are a form of intervention. An information program is a form of intervention. Almost any form of contact constitutes a sort of intervention. I repeat: The question is, for what purpose do we intervene? We had better help the police in these countries or they will become police states and then our investments will have been sacrificed. And so in answer to the question propounded by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], whose remarks I listened to with great interest, I would say that purely as a strategical measure this legislation is necessary. It may not be adequate to meet the challenge and therefore American troops should remain in Italy. Of course, it should be made clear that when, as, and if the Government of the Soviet Union is prepared to live up to her signature on these treaties we shall proceed with the implementation of our part of the agreement. It seems to me that there is no surer path to national disaster and war than for us to continue to feel bound by treaties and agreements by which the Soviet Union does not feel bound.

There is a second superstition which I think we might well get rid of and that is the idea that our choice is between war on the one hand and economic aid and an information service on the other. This is not our only choice as I attempted to point out in my remarks on the floor of this Chamber the other day. We have the means of safeguarding our interests, of safeguarding the peace, of protecting our national security, of protecting the essential nationhood of Italy as we promised, of safeguarding their freedom, integrity, and independence; and we are justified in so doing for the reasons which I have given.

Third, I think we have a tendency to feel that there is a sharp dividing line between war and peace. We talk about a cold war but we do not really quite believe it. The Russians do not fall into that error. They recognize that these disagreements are all part of the stream of human conflict, and they act on that basis. I think we must recognize that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. In fact, wars very often, as we have learned in the past, are not even declared. This legislation does not involve us in a conflict. We are already

involved. There is no reason why we should handcuff ourselves by the notion that because we are at peace we cannot act in defense of the very principles for which thousands of men gave their lives in World War II. I think also that we might very well ponder on the obligations imposed upon us of salvaging some of the things for which World War II was fought.

And so I believe that it would be good if we should revise our thinking along those lines and realize that we are faced with some relentless realities which no amount of theorizing can do away with.

In connection with the information program, I should like to say to those who have stated that the Italian people or the French people do not know where this aid comes from, that I hope that those who feel that way will vote for a large appropriation for USIS in order that we may obtain enough funds to tell the Italians, the French, and other people where this aid does come from. It seems to me somewhat inconsistent to complain that the sources of the aid is unknown and then prevent the effective publicizing of that aid by hamstringing the information program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have to think of this whole matter in terms of constructive alternatives. We have to think of the consequences if we do not do this thing. We have to think of the drain on our resources and the load on the American taxpayer if we are compelled, through inaction now, to turn our country into an armed camp. We have to think of our national security. We have to think of what would happen to the national security if Italy were to collapse.

We have to remember that the whole of the north of Italy is organized by the Communists, but that communism as a popular ideology has not spread. We in a sense have precipitated this second stage, that is the resort by the Soviets to internal force, by the general effectiveness of our aid. It is because of the effectiveness of our aid that Soviet Russia had to abandon the attempt to grab these governments by purely constitutional means. This resort to internal force is dangerous, but it is also a confession of weakness. I was in the French Chamber in Paris at the time Mr. Duclos made his attack on the United States. A more violent and vicious attack Mr. Goebbels never made. It was in effect a declaration: We have abandoned the attempt to capture this government, the French Government, by constitutional means. Now we are going to fight it out in the streets.

That was the night they had the first riots in France. Now, of course, if north Italy goes, Italy cannot hold on, and I believe that the collapse of Italy would unloose a chain reaction which would engulf Greece, Turkey, the vital Arabian oil fields, the Middle East, and probably north Africa. That theme has been developed here already and I cannot go into details. There can be no doubt that if Italy were to succumb to the Red infection, America is seriously threatened.

I think we should also make up our minds that the chances are that this ef-

fort which we are going to make will not be entirely painless.

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

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, I do not believe this effort will be entirely painless, although I am informed that, as far as this particular legislation is concerned, since the purchases have already been made, and this information was apparently withheld at the time, it will not have a material effect on present prices. However, of course, other purchasing will go on.

We have to recognize that this is not going to be painless, that this is going to involve a certain amount of discomfort, a certain amount of sacrifice, and I think we have to measure that burden against what would happen if we did not do it. A world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to prevail. We must make sacrifices for freedom. We must not be so bashful about preserving freedom in these power vacuums, because if we do not, the Soviet Union will fill them with oppression.

Mr. Chairman, this threat is much more a question of brute force than of an ideology. I think it is urgent that we recognize that. When we were in Bulgaria I was told a story about a Bulgarian girl, age 22 or 23. This story was told to me by one of our military people. The source, therefore, is quite reliable. This Bulgarian girl worked as a secretary for one of our American officers. Her only crime was that she worked for an American and that she worked well. One day she disappeared. Well, they looked for her high and low, and they could not find her anywhere. Six months later her mother received a large package. She unwrapped it and in it was a coffin. In that coffin, when she opened it, she found her daughter. Her daughter had been tortured to death. Her eyes had been gouged out, her nose had been cut off, her breasts had been cut off, her ears had been cut off. She had been defiled and mutilated beyond description. This is brute force, Mr. Chairman, and the sooner we recognize that unpleasant fact the better. There were 50 fresh graves next to that of Petkov's.

Mr. Chairman, we are up against a kind of a Genghis Khan with modern weapons. We have to be very realistic about our psychology in reference to this thing. I believe we can rationalize this bill entirely in terms of national security. Our national security is an essential pillar of the peace. The die is cast. Our failure to grasp this opportunity will be commensurate with the magnitude thereof. We know what we have to do. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, let us summon all the stern resolve, all the balanced judgment and spiritual fervor of which we are capable and do it. We must give a vigorous demonstration that freedom is not a stuffy plutocrat, materialistic and self-indulgent. Freedom is a vital, vigorous, vigilant, insurgent revolutionary force. Let us prove it and let us prove it now.

## For Peace in Two Worlds

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 17, 1947

MR. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of December 16.

I believe that the editor is correct in that we may have two worlds instead of one for the purpose of bringing about international security and peace. If Russia continues her obstructive and delaying tactics, I believe we should join with all of the other countries of the world who are willing to join us in trying to find some way of developing a system of international security. Only in that way can we feel certain that we are going to have reasonable assurance of security in the future. In the atomic and scientific age which we have entered we must find some means of avoiding a war. Otherwise, all of us may perish. The article referred to reads as follows:

## FOR PEACE IN TWO WORLDS

The London meeting of foreign ministers has ended in a bleak failure for a reason that is at once simple and obvious. As Secretary Marshall has said, France, Britain, and the United States were ready and eager to make it succeed, but Russia was not, and that is the sum of the story.

From the moment the conference opened, Foreign Minister Molotov seemed certain to adhere to a line calculated to kill it. That he did so is not really surprising, but it is instructive. It makes clear beyond doubt that the Soviet Union at this juncture—unless it can have its own way—has no desire to write an Austrian peace treaty or make a definite beginning on a settlement.

This policy can hardly be explained as being but a policy designed to keep the army deep in Europe as long as possible and to promote and perpetuate abominable conditions in order to make it easier for the Kremlin to entrench and spread its power as far west as it can. It is not a policy; it is a wrecking policy—a policy the western powers could never have surrendered the continent.

Moreover, that the Russians will pursue for a long time to come directly with their world-wide destruction, noncollaboration, and propaganda against the United States, France, and all other countries. The spirit that animates the same spirit that animates the Soviet position in Korea, the Soviet paralysis of atomic control, the Soviet boycott of the Balkan "watchdog" commission, and the violent Soviet opposition to such great undertakings as the projected long-range European recovery program. The collapse of the London Conference serves merely to round out the picture and to indicate that the men of the Kremlin, far from having a change for the better in mind, are bent on following a lone-wolf course, come what may.

In such circumstances there seems little or no reason to hope for a near-future bridging of the gulf between east and west.

if ever. The failure at London leaves scant room for doubt that the dream of collective security on a global scale, with all lands working together, is still only a dream, and a very remote one at that. This does not mean, however, that mankind has had its last chance for an enduring peace and has lost it. War is not inevitable by any means. America and the other free and independent countries of the earth have overwhelming power among them, and there are things they can do to insure their common safety.

France, Britain, and the United States, for instance, can now unify their three zones in Germany into a great force for the good of the Continent. The 16-nation European recovery program can be effectuated. We can see to it, through the machinery of the United Nations and our own American efforts, that countries like Greece and Italy are not robbed of their independence. We can cultivate powerful economic and political ties with our friends abroad, and with them we can intensify informational programs designed to spread more and more light behind the iron curtain. Above all, always leaving the door open for an agreement with Russia, we can maintain our military readiness at the level demanded by the present situation.

If a program of this sort is carried out by the United States and like-minded powers, at least part of the world—a large part—will be able to organize its own system of collective security, and it may even succeed in eventually persuading the Russians to come in. The "if" involved is a crucial one, of course, and there is no certainty that it will be met. Assuming the best, however, the cooperating nations can do much to guarantee their own safety even if the Soviet Union chooses to keep the globe split in two. Grave as it is, the London failure does not justify despair. We still can have peace if we work for it.

## Waging the Peace

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

## HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 17, 1947

MR. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of how to obtain universal peace is the most important one that faces the world. If we are to have an atomic or biological war, we know it will mean practically the destruction of civilization and will probably usher in a new dark age. Intelligent people throughout the country are thinking and speaking on this problem, to their friends and neighbors.

An article written by the Honorable Ralph C. Dills of the Sixty-ninth Assembly District of the State of California, has recently come to my attention. This article appears in the December issue of the California Teachers Association Record, southern section.

Because of the vital message contained in this article and because it will be read by many of our leading educators in southern California, and because of our high regard for the character and ability of Assemblyman Ralph C. Dills, under

## WAGING THE PEACE

(By Assemblyman Ralph C. Dills, Sixty-ninth District, California)

~~Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. (Matthew 5:9)~~

Nearly 2,000 years ago the Prince of Peace taught men how to live together as brothers. Yet man has not learned the lesson of the Master Teacher. We have with the centuries learned to wage war effectively; we have made little progress in waging peace.

A glance at the figures showing some of the results of World War II allied air raids demonstrates our warring ability: Killed 560,000 individuals; wounded 1,192,000 individuals; homes demolished or burned, 5,810,000; individuals made homeless, 16,700,000.

This amazing destructive power, however, is now as obsolete as the dreaded German Zeppelin of 1915 to 1918 which in raids over England in those years killed but 435 individuals and wounded 1,069 others.

But what of the future? Listen to the scientists! They tell us that there is no defense against atomic warfare. Even if we could be 90 percent effective in intercepting piloted bombers or pilotless missiles the 10 percent penetrating defenses could wipe out any target.

Bombs now available are fifty times more powerful than the primitive Hiroshima and Nagasaki type and, as if this were not enough to fill our souls with a sense of impending disaster, we learn from Rear Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias, USN (retired), the wartime Deputy Chief of Naval Intelligence, that there are other absolute weapons of chemical, biological, and climatological types capable of exterminating from the face of the earth the last vestige of human, animal, and even vegetable life. They are being manufactured now! They are not an American monopoly and are of such a nature that small nations with limited industrial facilities may develop them. (United Nations World, November 1947.)

Yes, there is no longer doubt of our ability to wage a war which will mean the extinction of civilization. The ordinary person in all lands knows this and his faith in the probability of ending all wars is at an all-time low.

teach, preach, and practice the belief that we are on the threshold of everlasting peace. We must understand that peace can no longer be a static or negative thing. We must wage peace in a new and dynamic manner.

A recent survey disclosed that 86 percent of those questioned indicated that they had a direct and active part in some phase of winning the war. Only 36 percent believed they were making contributions toward winning the peace. How can this situation be altered? Here are some suggestions:

First, we must attack the basic causes of war, the sources of irritation and friction. The existence or threat of starvation and want at home or abroad creates a fertile breeding ground for conflicts which grow into major international problems. Lack of food, raw materials, and health facilities must be dealt with on an international scale and with sympathy and understanding.

Second, the problem of ignorance which is the source of the malice, hate, distrust, and misunderstanding that lead to strife and war must be attacked with even greater resources, vigor, and vision than we employed in successful prosecuting the war. The Sermon on the Mount might well be a good guide for future action and attitudes. The elimination of educational inequalities in America which resulted in 350,000 draftees being unable to sign their names—could well be "operation immediate." Only by adequate Federal aid to education can we cope

s problem.  
we must believe that war is not in-  
and that man can live in peace.

The preamble to the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) declares that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." We must have faith in the United Nations Organization, in UNESCO, and all of the special organizations established by those who are endeavoring with ever-increasing success to lay a foundation for a new era of peace and plenty.

Fourth, we must undertake as a personal duty and responsibility a study of world problems, international affairs, and international peace organizations. We must daily strive to do something worth while and significant to promote true democracy, good will, and understanding among those with whom we come in contact. Above all, each of us should acquire a sense of personal responsibility for promoting in every conceivable manner the cause of world peace. None of us is too unimportant. We have to face the fact that we are in all-out fight to save our own lives and our civilization. Death and total destruction are the alternatives. An unknown author in the following words has caught the spirit of the need of our times:

"I AM ONLY ONE

"I am only one;  
But, I am one.  
I cannot do everything  
But I can do something.  
What I can do, I ought to do;  
And what I ought to do,  
By the grace of God,  
I will do."

The peacemakers of the world cannot draft your services. But what you can do toward waging the peace, they fervently hope you will do.

**August H. Scheid: 50-Year Veteran of School Boards**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, December 15, 1947

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the days of the little red schoolhouse have about ended in Ohio, and I want to pay tribute to a man who has served more than 50 years on boards of education in Erie County, having done much for rural education. I am including a news item from the Cleveland Plain Dealer covering the service of August H. Scheid:

STARTS FIFTY-SECOND YEAR ON SCHOOL BOARDS—OHIOAN ENDED REIGN OF LITTLE RED SCHOOLHOUSES

SANDUSKY, OHIO, November 22.—August H. Scheid, of neighboring Huron Township in Erie County, instrumental in bringing about the abolishment of the one-room little red schoolhouses today is entering his fifty-second year as a member of county and township school boards.

It was in April 1896, that he was first elected to a post in the county educational system and his service of more than a half century is believed to be unequalled in Ohio.

In the same year, he was elected township clerk and he also was *ex officio* clerk of the board of education. His opponent for the clerkship was the late John C. Drake of Kimball, a former State senator.

Scheid at the November 4 election was again reelected for his eighth 4-year consecutive

term to the Erie County school board and of which he is president. He and Dr. E. C. Alexander of Castalia were unopposed at the polls.

**CAREER STARTED IN 1896**

His first election to the county board came in 1919, and prior to that time he was on township boards. His educational career began with his election as an Oxford Township member in 1896.

He recalled that 50 years ago teachers in the one-room rural schools received a salary of \$22.50 a month, and remembers that instructors in those early days were more plentiful than in the present day. At one time he recalls 26 applications for positions as teachers in four one-room schools, 22 more than the number required.

He was instrumental in closing the first one-room school in Erie County, which had only six pupils.

He attributed the recent teacher shortage to the fact that salaries for teachers have not kept pace with those paid in private industry.

**Stabilization of Commodity Prices**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 17, 1947

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a radio speech made by me on Sunday, December 14, over Station WHP in Harrisburg, Pa.:

Last Thursday, December 11, President Truman held press conference at which he announced his flat rejection of the Wolcott bill to stabilize the national economy and to aid in curbing inflationary tendencies. He said further that he would send down

The special session is nearing its close. It could not last longer than early January of next year when the regular session is due to start. It is a legislative impossibility for the Congress to consider and act upon these proposals of the President's during this session. Mr. Truman spent 10 years in the Senate. He knows this just as well as does every Member of Congress. The purpose of his making such statements now—nearly a month after the special session began—can be rationalized only on the ground of being a purely political maneuver. When President Truman vetoed the price control extension bill in 1946 on the day the old law expired, he knew then it was a legislative impossibility for the Congress to enact a substitute bill without a gap during which prices would gyrate and go completely out of hand. As the leader of his party then, he knew his own party was split wide open on many phases of price legislation. He insisted upon disorder. He created it at the sacrifice of the national interest in 1946. He added to the flames when he threw all orderly controls out of the window by his own actions in the fall of 1946.

The Republican proposals in the Wolcott bill contain everything which the many Cabinet members, testifying before our committee, indicated the President would do at this time or in the immediate future. Even if the President were given the most unlimited grant of powers imaginable, the Cabinet members insisted that only voluntary controls would be tried for a considerable period of time. They said that any more drastic

future steps would only be taken if it developed that voluntary controls would not work. From that point on, the suggestions of the Cabinet members became increasingly vague and contradictory. No one could tell just what they meant. They could not tell what they would do, nor how they would do it. Remember this, the present bill does cover completely all that was to be put into effect during the next few months.

Mr. Truman took the occasion of this press conference to demonstrate his complete lack of knowledge of the bill itself. He criticized the provision permitting consultation and agreement between the Government and representatives of industry, business and agriculture in respect to the problems indicated below in the quotation from the bill itself. The President attacked this violently as a complete disregard of the antitrust laws. It might be well to read this provision in full so that you can judge for yourself just what it says and does:

"SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes declared in section 1 of this joint resolution, the President is authorized to consult with representatives of industry, business, and agriculture with a view to encouraging the making by persons engaged in industry, business, and agriculture, of voluntary agreements—

"(1) providing for allocation of transportation facilities and equipment;

"(2) providing for the marketing of livestock and poultry at weights and grades that represent the most efficient utilization of grain;

"(3) providing for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production;

"(4) providing for regulation of speculative trading on commodity exchanges; or

"(5) which will otherwise carry out the purposes declared in section 1 of this joint resolution.

"(b) The President is authorized to approve any such agreement which he finds will carry out any of the purposes declared in section 1 of this joint resolution, except that he shall not approve any agreement unless such agreement specifically provides that *shall cease to be effective* for approve any agreement which provides for the fixing of prices.

"(c) Parties to any agreement approved under this section are hereby relieved of the operation of the antitrust laws, all other restraints, limitations, and restrictions of law, with respect to the making of such agreement and with respect to carrying out such agreement prior to its effective date in conformity with its provisions.

"(d) As used in this section, 'person' means an individual, corporation, partnership, or association."

You will notice:

1. The representation of business, and agriculture are to consult with the President's representatives.

2. The President is to approve any such agreement which he finds will carry out the declared purposes.

3. He is directed not to approve any agreement which provides for the fixing of prices or which extends beyond the effective date, March 1, 1949.

4. The President is not required to approve any agreement unless he feels it is wise; therefore, no agreement entered into can ever be valid unless the President, himself, approves that specific agreement. The only possible way in which the antitrust laws could ever be infringed upon under this law would be if the President, or his designated authorities, attempted to violate them or connive in their violation. Presumably, the President would designate the Attorney General to perform this duty. The attorney general has the responsibility of enforcing the antitrust laws.

To Clarify the Public Mind Regarding  
Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 16, 1947

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include herewith a copy of a statement by F. R. White, chief engineer, Iowa State Highway Commission, regarding the national system of interstate highways as it applies to Iowa. There has been much confusion in the public mind regarding the national system of interstate highways and the so-called superhighways. Mr. White's statement will help to clarify the confusion existing in the minds of many people regarding the Federal road program. His statement pertains to Iowa, but it is equally applicable to other States since Iowa is an average State.

The statement follows:

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

On August 3, 1947, the Federal Works Agency (U. S. Public Roads Administration) announced from Washington the designation of the national system of interstate highways. In Iowa the routes so designated include U. S. Road No. 6, east and west across the State; U. S. Road No. 69, north and south across the State; U. S. Road No. 75, from Sioux City to Council Bluffs; U. S. Road No. 275, Council Bluffs south to the Missouri State line.

Numerous articles in the press and many inquiries addressed to this office indicate a widespread misunderstanding of this matter. This memorandum is written to set forth the facts.

1. DESIGNATION OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF  
INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Section 7 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides: "No State or group of States shall be required to provide more than 500 miles in total extent so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. The routes of the National System of Interstate Highways shall be selected by joint action of the State highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, provided by the Federal Highway Act of October 9, 1921, for the selection of the Federal-aid system. All highways or routes included in the National System of Interstate Highways as finally approved, if not already included in the Federal-aid highway system, shall be added to said system without regard to mileage limitation."

There is in the Federal laws nothing to this matter. The law merely provides for the designation of certain roads in the National System of Interstate Highways.

2. STANDARDS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Funds earmarked for the improvement of roads included in the National System of Interstate Highways. These roads are regular Federal-aid roads (not highways). They are, therefore, in agreement with regular Fed-

eral-aid road funds (primary-road funds) the same as any other part of the primary-road system.

3. PROGRAM OF CONSTRUCTION

There is no special program for the construction of the roads included in the National System of Interstate Highways. These roads must await their turn in the construction line-up, the same as all other parts of the primary-road system. If, as, and when necessity may require and funds may be available for improvement of any particular section of road included in the National System of Interstate Highways in this State, such section will be improved. The same is true of any other portion of the primary-road system. Inclusion of any road in the National System of Interstate Highways does not give that road any priority of improvement over any other part of the primary-road system.

4. NATURE OF IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED

Contrary to popular concept, there is no plan or proposal for the building of superhighways, or four-lane highways, or divided-lane highways, or military highways. Each section of the National System of Interstate Highways, when it is built, will be designed to conform to the traffic which that section of the road then carries or may reasonably be expected to carry in the near future. In other words, the improvements on any road included in the National System of Interstate Highways must be designed to fit the traffic on that road. That is just what is being done now on all primary roads. It would be foolish to put number 12 shoes on a 10-year-old boy. It would be equally foolish to build a four-lane road or divided-lane road on a highway where an ordinary two-lane road is sufficient to carry the traffic.

5. TRAFFIC

Traffic records of the State highway commission show that the roads in Iowa, outside of cities and towns, which are included in the National System of Interstate Highways, now carry traffic as follows:

- (a) Lowest traffic section, 560 vehicles per day.
- (b) Highest traffic section, 5,300 vehicles per day.
- (c) Number of miles on which the annual average daily traffic is 2,700 vehicles and the traffic is 2,700 to 3,300 vehicles, 26.
- (d) Number of miles on which the annual average daily traffic is 3,300 to 5,300 vehicles, 28.
- (e) Number of miles on which the annual average daily traffic is over 5,300 vehicles, none.
- (f) Total mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways in Iowa outside of cities and towns, 604.

6. WIDTH OF PAVEMENT REQUIRED

The standards adopted by the United States Public Roads Administration applicable to projects on the National System of Interstate Highways, require various widths of pavement and numbers of traffic lanes, depending on the amount of traffic on the particular section of road under improvement. Stated in simple, easily understood language, these standards require,

- (a) Where the annual average daily traffic is 2,700 vehicles or less, a two-lane pavement 22 feet wide, is required.
- (b) Where the annual average daily traffic is more than 2,700 vehicles and less than 3,300 vehicles, a two-lane pavement 24 feet wide is required.
- (c) Where the annual average daily traffic is 3,300 vehicles or more, but not over 5,300 vehicles, a 4-lane pavement 48 feet wide is required, but dividing the pavement into separate slabs for traffic moving in opposite directions, is not required.

(d) Where the annual average daily traffic is over 5,300 vehicles, a divided pavement of four lanes or more is required.

Applied to the traffic volume on the Iowa portions of the National System of Interstate Highways, as shown in the preceding paragraph, we find these standards require—

- 1. Two-lane pavement 22 feet wide on 550 miles.
- 2. Two-lane pavement 24 feet wide on 26 miles.
- 3. Four-lane pavement 48 feet wide but not divided, on 28 miles.

4. Divided pavement, none.

Total mileage of national system of interstate highways in Iowa, outside cities and towns, 604 miles.

Thus Iowa traffic is such that on 95.4 percent of the mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways in this State, only two-lane pavement is required by the standards adopted by the United States Public Roads Administration.

The Iowa State Highway Commission's standards for two-lane pavements on primary roads which carry 800 vehicles per day or more, call for pavement 22 feet wide. These standards have been in effect since before the end of the war.

7. WIDTH OF RIGHT-OF-WAY

On a road of the National System of Interstate Highways where the traffic is such that a two-lane pavement is all that is required (and that includes 95.4 percent of all the mileage of such highways in the State of Iowa) a right-of-way 120 feet wide is required as an ordinary minimum standard. That is the same width of right-of-way as is now being purchased, and has for the past several years been purchased for all primary roads. Additional width of right-of-way (over and above 120 feet) will be purchased on national interstate routes where necessary on account of deep cuts or high fills, just the same as additional right-of-way (over an above 120 feet) is purchased where needed, on regular primary road projects.

8. IMPROVEMENTS NOT MATERIALLY DIFFERENT

The kind and timing of improvements on the roads in Iowa included in the National System of Interstate Highways will not be materially different from the parts of the parable amount of traffic. The entire mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways in this State is now surfaced with pavement. Some of this pavement is badly battered by traffic and the elements, and must be replaced within the next few years. Some of this pavement is in excellent condition and may reasonably be expected to provide suitable traffic service for many years.

Improvements on these national interstate roads will be made as needed and as funds may become available. The kind of improvement on each portion of the national interstate system will be determined by the traffic requirements. There will be no building of four-lane roads to handle two-lane traffic. Nor will two-lane roads be built to handle four-lane traffic.

The same may be said with respect to the improvement of all other portions of the primary road system. In fact, the improvement of the national interstate routes and the improvement of the other parts of the primary road system will move along together. The type and kind of improvements built on both of these groups of roads will be based on the traffic requirements.

9. SUPERHIGHWAYS

In the press and in popular conversation the national system of interstate highways is frequently but erroneously called superhighways. They have never been so referred to by any official source. The term "superhighway" is a popular or catch term which

