

Examples of waste and incompetence in the administration of the mutual security program are regrettable. Some of them are incredible.

In the consideration of mutual security authorization legislation at this session, I believe the Congress must with care set forth careful guidelines as to what is authorized, and in what manner, and as to what is not authorized. Improper administration has occurred, I believe, in great part because of imperfect legislative guidelines or, indeed, because of the lack of any guidelines at all.

In addition, we need the most efficient administrative personnel to handle this legislative responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT ON FOREIGN AID

The President's earnestly expressed wish that a group of prominent citizens should go up and down the land to educate the people in the desperate necessity for foreign aid had led some of us to expect a request for a much larger appropriation than usual. But in his message yesterday, Mr. Eisenhower asked for no more than he did last year.

CONGRESS EYES CUT

But there was a reason for the urgent tone of his message: Last year he asked for a little less than \$4 billion, as he does now, but Congress appropriated only \$2,800,000,000. This year he asks for \$3,942,100,000 as if this were the rockbottom price. There are, however, Senators and Representatives of both parties who believe the price can be cut, particularly in appropriations for economic aid distinguished from military foreign aid.

The President's tersely reasoned sales talk to Congress—buy this, he says, or pay more for the alternative defense of isolated America—will unsettle some of the people who were firmly dug in. The fact is that some of the diehards were somewhat shaken in advance by the President and his associates and by the confused feeling of insecurity evoked by Russian rockets. Congressional reaction up to this point has been to spend eagerly and hopefully.

COUNTERMEASURES

If the President's premises are granted his case for foreign aid is pretty good. The requests are based on a foreign policy which is almost old enough to be traditional and consistent. It assumes that the Communists are bent on conquering the world with any available means and that we must counter their fire with a backfire of our own. It is not a passive policy or simply a policy of defense; it is a policy of action and reaction. It hasn't pacified the world but it has—so far—prevented the Communists from conquering a much larger part of it.

If one is to argue against foreign aid, one must go to the premises, not to the requests for appropriations. There is an assumption in our policy that the Communist pressure will continue more or less constant and that our counterpressure can for this reason be planned in advance. Some foreign-aid proponents seem so sure of this that they want Congress to appropriate not from year to year but on the long term.

Perhaps we should expect cold war of fairly even temperature for decades. But no commander, as Mr. Eisenhower would tell us, dares repose the fortunes of a campaign in a single plan, that is, to assume the enemy will move in only one way. Moreover, there have been some small signs that the enemy

is planning a countermarch that would affect the position of some of the pins on our war map.

Premier Bulganin's unusual and persistent correspondence with President Eisenhower is hard to parse in the common grammar of the cold war. The Russian passivity during the Egyptian-Syrian wedding ceremonies is another curious circumstance. There should have been more dancing at that nuptial. Subtle changes, hard to explain, seem to be occurring in the relations of the European satellites and the "mother country." And just before President Eisenhower dispatched the message to Congress, the Red Chinese announced they were withdrawing their troops from Korea, where our foreign aid has been urgent and costly.

COLD WAR CHANGES

Such stirring may presage cold war changes that will call for great revisions in military foreign aid. There may have to be more of it, there may need to be less. Even Mr. Dulles can't really know.

In his plea for economic and technical aid for the undeveloped countries, which is much less than the military aid asked for, the President makes his best case and the one which could have the widest appeal to Americans. Spreading our know-how and our faith in self-help is a congenial activity to most of us. The opposition to this kind of foreign aid, and occasionally the open disgust with it, rises from its administration.

If we are going to stay in this business of improving the world materially, we must acquire a corps of civil servants who know how to carry the word. We need such people quite as much as we need scientists and engineers. The waste and blundering in this area of foreign aid is due to the ignorance, crassness, even the deceit of the carelessly recruited bureaucrats who go abroad to spend and teach, far enough away to hide their mistakes and their offenses against the foreign peoples until it is too late to correct the first or punish the latter.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FREE TRADE, FREE IMMIGRATION, AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a great editor, Mr. E. F. Tompkins, of the New York Journal-American, has written five important articles regarding the relationship between free trade, free immigration, and world government.

The first article is entitled "Imported Dangers," and was published in the New York Journal-American on February 4. The second article, published on February 6, is entitled "The Purpose of Tariffs." The third article, published on February 11, is entitled "Killing Our Industries." The fourth article, published on February 13, is entitled "Free Trade Approach." The fifth article, which was published on February 18, is entitled "A Form of Protection."

FREE TRADE NOT A SEPARATE ENTITY

Mr. President, in a letter addressed to me, Mr. Tompkins stated:

The free-trade movement is not a separate entity. It is related in this country to the opposition to immigration regulations, and both by adoption or devolution are parts of the world government movement.

Mr. President, on Saturday, June 28, 1952, I said on the Senate floor—and my remarks were reprinted under the title "Free Economic System Versus Fabian Socialistic Program":

Mr. President, the international socialism plan calls for—

(a) Reduction of all barriers to the flow of international trade.

(b) Access to raw materials of all sorts for all nations.

(c) Access to markets for all nations.

(d) A world organization through which the nations can share freely in the supplies and the markets of the world.

At that time, I also said:

Mr. President, there can be only one result and only one final solution if these objectives are allowed to obtain, and that is, of course, the leveling of the living standards of the United States of America with the sweatshop-labor nations of the world.

FIVE ARTICLES BY E. F. TOMPKINS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the five articles to which I have referred, which were written by the distinguished editor, E. F. Tompkins, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of February 4, 1958]

UNMAKING AMERICA: IMPORTED DANGERS

(By E. F. Tompkins)

President Truman startled the Nation in 1948 with his point 4, a program for non-military foreign economic aid.

The Eisenhower administration now has a point 4 of its own which is an ideological counterpart of the Truman concept—point 4 in the President's state-of-the-Union message advocated mutual trade.

The Truman plank called for an immense distribution of American resources to develop the backward areas of the world—a multi-billion-dollar process with no terminal date. The Eisenhower phrase "mutual trade" is actually a euphemism for unilateral free trade. And the demonstrated effect of free trade is to deliver to competitive foreign products our domestic market, on which our industries, and our standards of labor, and living depend.

Closely related to the free-trade idea is the persistent campaign to liberalize our immigration statutes. In its inception and temporary aspects, this continuing effort is actuated by altruistic motives. Civil responsibility requires, however, that the ultimate consequences of a proposed policy be considered. And even a cursory examination of worldwide ethnic trends brings forth a dual warning:

1. This country, with an explosive increase in native-born population overcrowding its schools and highways, cannot receive, year upon year, millions of new inhabitants from elsewhere;

2. An open-door immigration policy, which is a one-world objective, must eventuate in a vast increase in immigration which possibly could swell our population faster than our labor market could absorb it.

GHOST TOWNS

This two-sided question—free trade and unlimited immigration—must be surveyed from two directions:

(a) An imported competitive product necessarily displaces an American product in the domestic market, thus displacing American labor. Large-scale importation of competitive commodities may displace whole industries, such as textiles, and make ghost towns out of one-industry or single-plant communities. The only way for unprotected industries to combat alien competition in the home market is by reducing prices; and American prices cannot be reduced without reducing American wages.

(b) In a country as heavily settled and highly developed as this country has become, with permanent or frictional unemployment

of some 3 million persons, in such a country, even limited immigration tends to displace native-born workers, since immigrants need jobs. Large-scale immigration would create large-scale unemployment pools, with millions of idle workers on relief doles.

Unfortunately, relatively few of our politicians and publicists apprehend the problems inherent in mutual trade and liberal immigration. It is time they did, if the United States is to retain its national character and fulfill its manifest destiny in the leadership of mankind.

[From the New York Journal-American of February 6, 1958]

JOB INSURANCE: THE PURPOSE OF TARIFFS (By E. F. Tompkins)

Is the United States to become a free-trade country—the only one in the world?

Are we to destroy even the vestiges of a system which for nearly 150 years shielded the American home market from destructive invasion by low-wage alien competition?

Do we want to import unemployment under an illusion of improving foreign economic conditions?

Should we internationalize our resources and means of livelihood?

These are questions that Congress must answer in passing upon the administration's point 4—its mutual-trade program.

The issue occurs in this form:

Constitutionally, all revenue measures, including tariffs, must originate in Congress. But the last protective tariff schedule was passed in 1930. In 1934, Congress passed a Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, permitting the State Department to reduce tariff rates by making deals with foreign countries, without reference to Congress. For several years, this has been done through an unsanctioned General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), under which the State Department has reduced the Congressional tariff wall by 70 percent.

The administration's point 4 asks Congress (1) to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 5 years, with authority to reduce our remaining tariffs by 25 percent; and (2) to vote the United States into an international Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC), thereby sanctioning GATT.

In this controversy, the voice of history speaks loudly on the side of protectionism. "The Tariff Act of 1789," says Encyclopedia Britannica, "was the first legislative measure passed by the United States . . . The spirit of the act of 1789 was protective."

Since then, several tariff laws have been enacted over the opposition of free-trade theorists.

Consequently, under the policy adopted 169 years ago, the high-wage American home market was developed—a domestic free-trade area, guarded from low-wage foreign competition in vulnerable industries by suitable import duties.

The administration program contemplates the final leveling of our protective tariff system within 5 years. This obviously implies American unemployment and a debasement of American wages in some industrial areas.

Within the same 5-year period, Western Europe is to establish a common market—a free-trade area of its own comparable in population to the American home market, which will be girded by tariff walls to protect European industry and employment from American competition.

Thus Europe is adopting the very policy that we are asked to abandon.

[From the New York Journal-American of February 11, 1958]

FREE-TRADE VIRUS: KILLING OUR INDUSTRIES (By E. F. Tompkins)

Congress faces a bitter controversy over the administration's point 4—its mutual

trade program—because of the great damage inflicted upon American industries and American employment by tariff reductions under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which the administration wants to continue. One imperiled industry is mining.

Congress and the Tariff Commission have had from this industry numerous appeals for relief. Mining may seem to be a small segment of our economy, but, according to the Interior Department in 1957, when output was declining because of low wage foreign competition, total production of our mines amounted to \$18.3 billion.

"Problems of the Nation's mining industries," the Congressional Quarterly says, "although limited to a relatively small area of the country, are assuming the status of a major issue."

In fact, 19 States are included in the small area, and the metals principally involved are listed as strategic by the Defense Department.

Senator BIBLE of Nevada recently completed an inspection.

"At no time in recent history," he reported, "has the mining industry of our country been in such a precarious position. . . . Most of the mines in America are closed, or their production curtailed until they are practically in a standby basis."

Market statistics support the finding. Copper is an indispensable material in many manufactures. The big Phelps-Dodge Corp. has reduced its domestic copper production four times, to a total of 22 percent, since October 1956.

THREAT TO ECONOMY

"The industry now feels," it reports, "that foreign copper imports are a threat to the economy of domestic producers."

A bill has been jointly introduced in Congress by 14 Senators and 13 Representatives to impose an excise tax on copper imports that would offset ruinous tariff reductions made by the State Department under the Trade Agreements Act.

Other metallic industries are in similar or worse plights.

In 2 years, 719 out of 720 tungsten mines have been shut down, while lead and zinc production has hit a new low because of the great influx of cheaply produced foreign metals.

Without these domestic metals, the national defense would be maimed in war, and the great automotive industry might cease in time of peace.

Congress and the Tariff Commission know of many other industries, including textiles and fisheries, impaired by low tariffs.

All this grows out of the free-trade theory that international commerce can be magnified by abandoning the American tariff system.

[From the New York Journal-American of February 13, 1958]

WORLD GOVERNMENT: FREE-TRADE APPROACH (By E. F. Tompkins)

It is hardly surprising to find advocates of world government supporting the administration's point 4—its tariff-wrecking Trade Agreements Extension Act and the companion project for United States membership in an international Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC).

International free trade would be an early objective of a world legislature seeking to eliminate economic, political, military, and ethnic boundaries. Point 4 is obviously a free-trade program—hence it is a vestibule to world government. For—

Overt establishment of world government, by a single action, might be impossible. But world government can be brought about in stealthy stages, one at a time. Accordingly, Atlantic Union—a world government movement with some Congressional backing—rep-

resents a gradual process. Its purpose is to convert NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) into a regional supergovernment, which would provide a foundation, both political and military, for denationalized global rule. Similarly, an OTC, in conjunction with our Trade Agreements Act, would comprise a form of internationalized economic dominion, more widely scaled than NATO, which could be merged into a world government with military and political attributes.

The American people are insufficiently aware of the progress already made toward economic supergovernment.

The process began in 1934 when a depression-scared and economically misinformed Congress gave the New Deal its original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. That measure authorized the State Department to reduce American tariffs, which had been fixed by Congress, through diplomatic negotiations with other countries.

The earliest attempt to generalize the whole procedure was made at a Habana conference which produced a world charter for an International Trade Organization (ITO). The charter was denounced at Washington as a Marxist instrument and was thereafter ignored by Congress.

Next, GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) was set up, under State Department leadership, as a substitute for the discredited ITO.

Congress has likewise refused to recognize GATT. Nonetheless, tariff-reduction sessions of GATT have been held in Europe, with the United States making heavy tariff concessions to groups of foreign countries in the guise of agreements.

All GATT meetings are secret and the records are impounded.

And now comes the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation as a substitute for ITO and a police agency for GATT.

[From the New York Journal-American of February 18, 1958]

IMMIGRATION LAWS: A FORM OF PROTECTION (By E. F. Tompkins)

Opposition to tariffs is frequently conjunctioned with opposition to immigration legislation.

In fact, the conjunction is expressed in a political slogan of Marxist origin—"Free movement of goods and persons everywhere."

The composite idea confronts Congress in two separate propositions. One proposal is the administration's point IV program for free trade. The other is its recommendation that the selective immigration law be liberalized. And both are of prime importance, for tariffs and immigration restrictions have the same purpose—the protection of American jobs.

Of the two proposals, the second is the more dangerous, since it implies a permanent abandonment of immigration limitations at the very time when vast and unprecedented population pressures, abroad and at home, are making such limitations most necessary.

Competent students of the demographic problem are wondering today if the United States has the area and resources to support the native-born population that will be ours, and to maintain our standards of living, a few years from now, even if immigration were abolished entirely.

Last August, on the basis of official statistics, U. S. World & World Report presented an analysis of our domestic situation.

In only 18 years, it said, this country will have a population increase of 60 million persons—an increase greater than the present populations of the British Isles, France, West Germany, Italy or Spain. Our 1975 population will be 227 million, without immigration.

POPULATION SWELLING

At the same time, world population is swelling still more amazingly, according to a United Nations survey.

In 4 years (1951-55) world population grew from 2,519,000,000 to 2,691,000,000. The increase alone—172 million—exceeded the present population of the United States.

World population will be more than 3 billion in 10 years; unless checked, it will be 6 billion by the end of this century, and 13 billion in the year 2050.

The biggest growth is in overpopulated, underdeveloped regions, where few people are enjoying a decent standard of living and where the poor may be growing ever poorer.

"Unfortunately," the U. N. bulletin commented, "rapid population growth itself hinders programs of economic and social development in those areas."

All this presages vast migrations in a near future from overpopulated continents, if the migrants can find places to go; and hundreds of millions of them will want to come into this country, which itself is becoming densely crowded.

Obviously, the United States must rigorously maintain the principle of selective and restrictive immigration and restore the protective-tariff system—otherwise, the socialistic idea of free movement of goods and persons will simply alienize America instead of Americanizing aliens.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the letter, dated February 18, 1958, sent to me by Mr. E. F. Tompkins.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1958.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I acknowledge with sincere thanks your letter of February 6.

It relates to an editorial article published in the Journal American on February 6. Actually, that article was 1 of 5 on tariffs: attached is a reproduction of all 5.

The essential point which seems to be overlooked generally, and which I think you can emphasize, is this:

The free-trade movement is not a separate entity. It is related in this country to the opposition to immigration regulations, and both by adoption or devolution are parts of the world government movement.

Free traders do not seem to know that they have become passengers on a Marxist bandwagon. They are confused by their own special interests and an agreeable international economic philosophy which really belongs to their sociological enemies.

Advocates of more liberal immigration policies are concerned about temporary distresses in other countries and are unwilling or unable to look ahead for 25 to 50 years with respect to this country.

What we need is an American policy, comprising (a) a protective tariff system, and (b) selective and restrictive immigration laws. The combination will keep us from importing mass unemployment and an excessive unassimilable population, and from being merged in world government.

If you accept these ideas, and can popularize them, you may be called a great American.

Sincerely,

E. F. TOMPKINS.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the reprint to which I have referred shows that when I addressed the Senate on that

occasion, I also said—as appears at page 37 of the reprint:

FREE TRADE AND FREE IMMIGRATION

It is an interesting situation to find Congress overriding the President's veto of the immigration bill, which restricts the importation of labor, while on the other hand the same Congress is in accord with the trade agreement policy, which imports cheap raw materials to break down our price level and take away jobs from our own workers.

The junior Senator from Nevada yesterday voted to override the President's veto, because he is against importation of large numbers of cheap foreign labor from Europe and Asia. On the other hand, he also votes against free trade, which brings products of those same people into this country to compete with the higher wage standard of living of American workers.

The junior Senator from Nevada has said many times that one cannot consistently vote for free trade and vote against free immigration.

I commend this series of fine articles to the Members of the Senate and House for study and reflection.

Members of Congress must realize that this pincers movement to destroy our workmen and investors is of many parts—only one of which is presented to Congress at a time.

RACIAL INTEGRATION IN THE SCHOOLS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this afternoon's edition of the Washington Evening Star there appears an Associated Press news article, datelined at Little Rock, Ark., under the headline "Little Rock Asks Court To Suspend Integration."

The article reports that the Little Rock School Board has asked the Federal district court to permit it to suspend racial integration at Central High School.

Mr. President, the folly of forced racial integration has been clearly demonstrated.

I hope the Federal district court will realize now that it was wrong last September in insisting on immediate compliance with its integration order.

I hope, too, that the administration in Washington has learned that the use of Federal troops for local police duty can only stir up bitterness and resentment.

At a later date, I shall have more to say on this subject on the Senate floor. The action of the Federal administration in this matter was illegal and irrational.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Evening Star be included in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK ASKS COURT TO SUSPEND INTEGRATION

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., February 21.—The city school board asked a Federal court yesterday to suspend racial integration at Central High School.

A strongly worded petition requested United States District Court to stay an order

that allowed 9 Negro students to enter the previously all-white school last fall.

The petition virtually said that opposition to integration had made normal school conditions at Central High impossible. It said the school district, in its respect for the law of the land, was "left standing alone, the victim of extraordinary opposition on the part of the State government and apathy on the part of the Federal Government."

TERMS OF SUSPENSION

Suspension of the board's integration plan, which was put into effect under the protection of Federal troops last September, was asked until:

1. There is a clear definition of the concept "all deliberate speed" in the United States Supreme Court's 1954 ruling on school desegregation.

2. There are effective legal procedures by which the schools can be integrated without impairment of the quality of the educational program.

SERIES OF CLASHES

A series of racial clashes has occurred at Central High in recent months and Minnie Jean Brown, one of the Negro pupils, was expelled from the school last Monday for the rest of the current semester.

Minnie Jean, who plans to enter an interracial school in New York City, is the only Negro either expelled or suspended over racial incidents. Several whites have been suspended.

Gov. Orval E. Faubus said last night that he approved the board's action.

Virgil T. Blossom, superintendent of the school, said the status of the 8 Negroes now attending 2,000-pupil Central High remains unchanged pending possible court action.

United States District Judge Ronald N. Davies, of Fargo, N. Dak., holds jurisdiction in the integration case. Judge Davies enjoined Governor Faubus last fall from interfering with integration and rejected an earlier school board request for a stay in the integration order.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 24, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 19), 1958:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be Lieutenant

Clifford W. Tupper.

To be ensigns

Edward R. Babenco	Harold E. McCall
Anders E. Beyer	Wayne L. Mobley
Glenn DeGroot	Gordon N. Orr
Martin T. Egan	John S. Scarborough
David L. Kelley	Arthur E. Stark, Jr.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions