Exclusive Interview with

CHIANG KAI-SHEK

A New Era
for
INDIAN
AMERICANS

Should Our G.I.'s be Tried in Foreign Courts?

Page 2

Enter Our Young American ESSAY CONTEST
104 AWARDS
A Message from the President

This is your Facts Forum.

Conceived in the minds of a small group of dedicated men and women born of their desire to more adequately fulfill their obligations as American citizens. Facts Forum came into being with the hope of encouraging the formation of neighborhood groups that would meet to discuss current events and topics of national importance.

Others were quick to recognize the merit of meeting together for a free exchange of ideas. Only by open debate, by exploring both sides of the major controversial questions of the day, could one be certain of supporting the policy that would result in the greatest good for all.

The idea matured; the desire to be better informed caused it to grow. Soon Facts Forum discussion groups were springing up at all points of the compass until they were meeting regularly throughout the forty-eight states. To assist these organizations to insure their having the tools for enlightened debate a new kind of publication evolved.

Facts Forum News was unique in journalistic circles because it presented pro and con arguments covering the vital issues of the day. In place of an editorial department seeking to interpret the news, Facts Forum News editors continually sought out the individuals who were most qualified to express informed opinions both for and against the subjects under consideration.

The impartiality, the completeness of Facts Forum News rapidly gained the respect of a growing circle of persons far beyond the original discussion groups. In the comfort and convenience of their homes, while commuting to work or traveling to distant parts of the country, individuals were able to witness some of the liveliest debates of the day. And, most welcome of all, they realized that the decisions the final answers were in their hands.

The original Facts Forum group, encouraged and supported by hundreds of public-spirited individuals throughout the country, sensed this enlarged opportunity. Every concerned American could not join a discussion group, but all could read and tune in a radio or television program.

The present Facts Forum News and our four radio and TV programs are all designed to further your knowledge of the events and issues of the day, and present outstanding Americans direct from the nation's capital in Washington.

The skeptical, as well as our new friends who have not had the opportunity to become intimately acquainted with Facts Forum, may rightly question, "What's in it for Facts Forum?" or "Just what does they stand for?"

Indeed we do have an "axe to grind." We share the concern of many Americans over the dangers that threaten our beloved land from within and without. Unless each citizen is aware of these dangers, unless he has the opportunity to weigh the merits and the effects of each line of action, the American way of life and the ability for each individual to have a share in government will perish.

And we're keeping that axe particularly sharp to chop off the encircling tentacles of communism. Facts Forum is well aware, from first hand experience, that the danger of communism is very real and sinister. The minute our voice began to be heard, a vicious smear campaign was launched against this organization by the Communists. If you'd like to know all of the facts behind this, we'll be happy to send you a copy of "Case History of a Smear Campaign." We have been accused of being anti-Negro, anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, anti-Semitic, anti-American. In fact, anti-everything except anti-Communist.

Here is what Facts Forum actually stands for:

1. Facts Forum is strictly nonpartisan and nonpolitical, supporting no candidate or party. Facts Forum seeks to present, in equal space, the Republican as well as the Democrat, the liberal and the conservative view.

2. Facts Forum does not editorialize or express an opinion on any subject other than communism. We believe that each individual is given the full facts and the opportunity to arrive at his own conclusion, he will choose wisely and well.

3. Facts Forum believes there is no room for debate on the subject of communism, and that socialism is an integral part of communism, as is implied by the very name of Russia. "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.")

4. Facts Forum supports and endorses the free enterprise system.

5. Facts Forum subscribes to the principles written in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as written by our Founding Fathers.

Every American who believes in those principles, each individual who would like to have an active part in preserving the American Way of Life for our children and the generations yet unborn, can help.

Facts Forum's manifold, nonprofit, public service activities are reaching an ever-enlarging audience. But it is still far short of the goal shared by the many who have said, "Facts Forum should be in every home in America."

To achieve this objective, to continue all of the radio and television programs (now carried weekly by more than 1,068 stations!) and to expand Facts Forum News requires enormous sums of money.

You can further this work in the following ways:

1. By placing, or interesting others in purchasing, advertising in Facts Forum News. Our rates are attractively low for reaching one of the most alert, responsive audiences in America.

2. Many of the radio and television programs listed on other pages of this magazine are likewise available for local or regional sponsorship. Interested persons need only to contact the appropriate stations for full information.

3. Individual contributions in any amount are most welcome, and are tax-deductible. Facts Forum's status as a nonprofit, educational organization has been attested by the Internal Revenue Bureau.

And your comments, your suggestions, and your criticisms are always most welcome. We of Facts Forum solicit your letters; we will be happy to serve you in any way possible. If you are coming to Dallas, or passing through, come in and get acquainted. We'll be richer for your visit.

Robert H. Dedman
President, Facts Forum
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Typical scene at the Cheyenne reservation, Lame Deer, Montana.

Some say the present unfortunate plight of the Indian American is indicative of what will happen in the United States if present trends toward an all-powerful welfare government continue, and each citizen becomes a "ward of the government." This reason alone, critics claim, is enough to warrant termination of federal supervision and control of the red man.

Spread across the United States from Puget Sound to the Florida Everglades, there are about 300 Indian tribes, bands, and other identifiable groups—living descendants of the continent's original inhabitants. A few of these clusters of Indians are living today much as their ancestors lived 300 years ago. Others are practically indistinguishable from their non-Indian neighbors, both economically and socially. The greatest majority are somewhere between these extremes.

There is great diversity of Indian life. Yet there are basic facts about these people and their relationship with the United States government which are essential to an understanding of their present situation.

Indians vote, hold office, and take part in many ways in the life of the community, county, and state in which they live. They are as free as anyone else in their movements; but in most of the decisions affecting their lives and welfare, Indians are frequently referred to as "wards of the government." Many persons claim this term is misleading, since the government exercises no control over their personal affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, however, does function as trustee for about 35 million acres of Indian land (both tribal and individual), and performs a number of other functions designed to meet special needs of the Indian people.¹

¹Your Government and the Indian (Lealet) — Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Navaho Indians, of northeast Arizona, inside a sand-floor hogan, where one of them lives.
In view of the controversy regarding recent legislation on Indian affairs, this article will give the reader a better understanding of the very serious problems faced by this large American minority group and by our government in finding a just solution.

Pictures on this page indicate a forward trend, showing progress and improvement in the lot of our modern-day "red man." Pictured is a classroom of fifth graders on the Oglala Sioux reservation of Pine Ridge in South Dakota; and shown voting for the first time in the state of Maine, Indians line up at the ballot box on the reservation at Oldtown. Also pictured, on the Menominee reservation in Wisconsin, is the interior of an Indian home. The Menominees are one of the wealthiest tribes, but still their standard of living is below that of comparable white communities.

individually owned. An individual Indian may request a patent-in-fee to his land; and, if considered competent to handle his own land, his title is changed to fee simple, and he is given current appraisal of the value of his allotment. His land is then no longer subject to control by the government, and is subject to state and local taxes. Some Indian funds are also managed by the government as trustees.

Education is now being provided for over 100,000 Indian children, in public schools operated by the Indian Bureau, and in schools sponsored by denominational missions on or near reservations. More than one-half of all Indian children are attending public school. Many of them attend boarding schools. Unstable communities in remote sections of large reservations and in Alaska still present a problem in providing school facilities.

For several decades the government has worked to improve Indian health. Hospitals have been established, and in recent years preventive medicine has been stressed. Many problems remain, but significant progress has been made in controlling the eye disease known as trachoma, in reducing deaths from tuberculosis, and in cutting down tribal rates of infant mortality. On July 1, 1955, the Indian health responsibility of the federal government was transferred from the Department of the Interior to the United States Public Health Service, under an act of Congress supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Department of the Interior.

Education plays a basic part in preparing the Indian, as well as the rest of the population, to take advantage of existing economic opportunities. However, inadequate

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

* Essie Quaid Skillern is well qualified to write about Indian Americans. Born in Indian Territory before it became the state of Oklahoma, where she has lived all of her life and associated closely with many Indians, she has taught a number of Indian children during her thirty years of teaching experience in the elementary schools of Oklahoma. She holds her B.A. Degree from Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, whose school emblem is a "Red Chief," and has her M.A. Degree from Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma.
reservation resources in relation to a rapidly expanding Indian population are creating severe economic problems. As a result, many Indians have left the reservations to seek a livelihood elsewhere.

Some go out, and become self-sufficient from the beginning. Others need help during the transition period. For those needing help and requesting it, the Indian Bureau's voluntary relocation program provides assistance in settling families away from the reservation. This involves extensive counseling, as well as financial aid. It also involves mobilizing action on the part of the non-Indian community, which the Indian is joining, to help with housing, social adjustments, church affiliation, schooling, and a job.

Indians with special skills and talents in native arts and crafts are encouraged and assisted in marketing their products by the Indian Arts and Crafts Board of the Department of the Interior. Active efforts are also being made to encourage the establishment of industrial and commercial enterprises near the reservations, so that job opportunities can be made available to Indians on the reservations.

In a talk given in 1953 by Glenn L. Emmons, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs (Department of the Interior), he stated two major purposes: one was to review outstanding events of the year, which might provide a clue as to the standing of Indian affairs; the other was to attempt to look into the future and formulate plans for working out a program which might prove beneficial to the Indian people.

He said, "The year just past has been a highly significant one in Indian affairs — probably one of the most eventful we have had in a very long time..."2

When Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, was asked to define the broad policy objectives in the field of Indian affairs, he made the following statement:

Federal responsibility for administering the affairs of individual Indian tribes should be terminated as rapidly as the circumstances of each tribe will permit. This should be accomplished by arrangements with the proper public bodies of the political subdivisions, to assume responsibility for the services customarily enjoyed by the non-Indian residents of such political subdivision, and by distribution of tribal assets to the tribes as a unit, or by division of the tribal assets among the individual members, whichever may appear to be the better plan in each case. In addition, responsibility for trust properties should be transferred to the Indians themselves, either as groups or individuals, as soon as feasible.3

Men who have had long experience in Indian affairs, as well as many other people, doubtless agree with the basic goals set forth in the foregoing statement by Lewis. Both Indians and their non-Indian friends recognize that federal trusteeship for Indian property and federal supervision over Indian affairs must some day come to an end. It is hoped that the Indians will avail themselves of the opportunities the government is making possible, to fit them to assume full responsibility of their own affairs when they are put in charge of them.

**Anti-Discrimination Legislation**

Two bills have been introduced and passed, aimed at removing or modifying discrimination against the Indian people. One of these bills deals with such things as the purchase of firearms and the sale of implements of husbandry. The other repeals the long-standing federal prohibition against the sale of liquor to Indians outside the reservation and similar other Indian areas. Inside these areas it provides for local option wherever state laws permit it.

Both these anti-discrimination measures were signed by the President. There seem to be no other laws left on the federal statutes that can be considered as racial discrimination against the Indian people.

A major item of legislation that came out of the 1953 congressional session was Public Law No. 280. It has caused quite a bit of public controversy, especially two particular sections, which were added as measures during the latter stages of congressional action. These sections authorized any state to assume, by proper legislative acts, the same kind of jurisdiction in Indian areas which the law specifically conferred on five states.

In signing the law President Eisenhower indicated his concern about these two sections, which would make it possible for a state to assume jurisdiction without even consulting the Indians involved. He urged Congress to remedy this defect by an appropriate amendment as soon as possible.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 108 sets forth the congressional policy in Indian affairs: (1) Indians should be made subject to the same laws and entitled to the same services as are non-Indians within the same kind of jurisdiction in Indian areas, and the Indians will, to an extent as possible, be given primary responsibility for the formulation and administration of their own affairs.

2Ibid.
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These pictures show how Navahos utilize wool from their herds, which is the tribe’s principal source of livelihood. Indian women card wool for weaving purposes, and primitive artisans weave rugs on their portable looms.
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Privileges as other citizens of the United States as rapidly as possible, (2) nine specifically-designated groups of Indians should be freed at the earliest possible moment from federal supervision and control, (3) the resolution calls upon the Department of the Interior to submit recommendations for legislation that will accomplish this purpose for these nine designated groups.

There are many people, both in Congress and out, who have an honest and sincere interest in the welfare of the Indian American, who believe that House Concurrent Resolution 108, as passed by the 83rd Congress, was meant to benefit the Indian. They say it will cause the Indian to become independent and self-supporting, give him a feeling of equality, and a desire to become a citizen of the United States of America rather than remain a member of a small tribe of Indians.

The groups involved are Indians of California, Florida, New York, and Texas, in addition to the confederated Sauk and Kootenai tribes of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, the Klamath tribe of Oregon, the Potawatomi, Sac and Fox, Kickapoo, and Iowa tribes served by the Potawatomi Area Field Office (Kansas). Also included are the Turtle Mountain Chippewas of North Dakota and the Menominee tribe in Wisconsin. These tribes made a statement adopted by the Osage Council to the effect that they are already carrying most of the expenses of administration of their own affairs, and that they already have a “withdrawal” program with which they are very well satisfied. Disagreement among Klamath Indians over land-use policy may make a sound withdrawal plan for them very difficult at this time.

The President, in a letter to Commissioner Emmons, asked him to go into the home territory of the various tribes of Indians, to meet with the major tribes, and emphasize to the Indian people the President’s sincere desire for their opinions regarding the future administration of Indian affairs.

He said, “Please express to each of the Indian groups you meet my warm personal greetings and my heartfelt personal assurance that our ruling aim in Indian affairs is to meet and deal with them justly. . . .”

Commissioner Emmons fulfilled his assignment, and traveled many thousands of miles. He met with more than 150 different tribal groups in 15 western states. In talking to them he stressed the theme that all the tribes and groups couldn’t be judged alike. Additionally, the differ-
ences among various tribes were so profound that any one plan for all Indian people which ignores these differences would be almost certain to produce bad results. He advocated using several different avenues of approach, with the long-range welfare of the Indians constantly in mind. It is a point of fact that a great deal of progress has been made in this direction, especially in the field of education. He said, "I am heartily in favor of the trend toward decentralization of responsibilities for services to the Indian people, and intend to continue and accelerate it wherever feasible and practical."

In August, 1956, Commissioner Emmons, at a conference in El Paso of all Indian tribes of Arizona, stated that he wanted to get the government out of the business of playing nursemaid to its present Indian wards. He said that he offered a three-point program to better the health, education, and economic position of the Indians. He pointed out that the purpose of such a program is to enable them to stand on their own feet.  

**Indian College Attendance**

Indians of most of the tribes are more conscious of the need of an education today than ever before, and the federal government is encouraging and helping those who are willing to apply themselves.

According to Commissioner Emmons, a nationwide survey showed that more than 2,300 young Indian men and women are taking courses in institutions above high school level. Twenty years ago the total was about one-third that many.

Many of the Indians are paying their own way, while others are either working their way through college, or are being aided by scholarships and grants.

Commissioner Emmons reported that a total of 512 Indian scholarships were provided by all sources, public and private, last school term. The Indian Bureau granted 114 scholarships. The Navaho tribes of Arizona took the lead in providing funds for scholarships. The Navahos set aside $100,000 for that purpose last year. As a result, 213 Navaho youths attended college, whereas, twenty years ago, only seven attended.

Emmons estimated that there were 1,500 young Indians in college in Oklahoma, and that about 600 received their degrees in that state during the last school year. Congress approved $50,000 for Indian Bureau scholarships and grants for the year ending last June 30. This is more than double the previous high of 22,935 made available in 1954-55. But it still falls short of filling requests for aid.

Twenty years ago the total available for Indian Bureau scholarships was only $10,000.

The tremendous interest that Indian youths are taking in education is encouraging, and indicates their willingness to prepare themselves to assume their responsibilities when the time comes for termination of federal controls.

The federal government is working with them in education, health, economy, and in every other way possible to help the Indian help himself to become independent.

**Klamath Preparation**

Section 26 of P. L. 587 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to undertake, within the limits of available appropriations, a special program of education and training designed to help the members of the Klamath tribe to earn their livelihood, to conduct their own affairs, and to assume their responsibilities as citizens without special services because of their status as Indians. Such a program may include language training, orientation into non-Indian communities, customs and living standards, vocational training and related subjects, transportation to places of training or instruction, and subsistence during the course of training or instruction.

The time is rather short for such a program, but the Indian Bureau intends to do its best. The Bureau can start with the knowledge that most of the Klamaths speak and write English. They have benefited from the training they have had in public school, but they know little about civil government at the level where they will soon need it most— at the level of the assessor, the sheriff, the county treasurer, the judge, the justice of the peace, the county agent, the school superintendent and commissioners for roads, welfare, sanitation, and so on. They need training in work habits and skills, and in understanding why punctuality and dependability are assets. All these things will constitute the subject matter of the adult education classes which the Indian Bureau have planned to start soon at the Klamath reservation. Elementary arithmetic will be taught where necessary, as well as the use of English in written and spoken form. Classes will be organized in health and sanitation, community and state civics, business and legal practices for Oregon citizens, consumer education, and agricultural extension. Nursing and child care will be offered, also. This program projects a stripped-down form of fundamental education, which should not only help the Klamaths but be of great interest elsewhere.

**Education of Indian Children in 1955**

In the fiscal year 1955 there were 115,631 Indian students, ages six to eight years, inclusive, enrolled in public, private, and mission schools in the United States and Alaska. This represents an increase of 10.7 per cent over the 1954 enrollment of Indian children.  

In 1955 approximately one-half (49.2 per cent) of all Indian children of school age were attending public school.
Indian Children Better Adjusted

Indian children are entitled to the same opportunities for public education as are provided for any other citizen living within a state; however, tax-exempt, Indian-owned land, as well as large numbers of Indian children within a school district, may create financial burdens which local funds will not be adequate to meet. Beginning as early as 1890 contracts providing for financial assistance to schools attended by Indian children were negotiated with individual districts. It was recognized then, as today, that Indian children became better adjusted to living with all people in a community when they associated with other children in public schools.

The Johnson-O'Malley Act, which became law in 1934, authorized the Secretary of the Interior, among other things, to enter into contracts with states for the education of Indians, and to permit the use of federal school buildings and equipment by local school authorities. As a result of the operation of this law, some states having large Indian populations do not have any federal schools within their boundaries.

In the fiscal year 1955 the Bureau of Indian Affairs negotiated contracts with 15 states and Alaska, and 15 contracts covering 30 individual districts within six states and Alaska. In addition to these, contracts were negotiated for the enrollment in public schools of Indian children residing in dormitories operated by the Bureau in six towns adjacent to the Navajo Reservation in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Of the 65,089 Indian children enrolled in public schools, approximately 35,000 attend schools receiving federal aid under these contracts. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is transferring the operation of federal schools to local districts as rapidly as conditions are favorable, and thus increasing the attendance of Indian children in public schools where they have the same opportunities as any group of Americans. Financial aid from the federal government should decrease as rapidly as Indians assume responsibilities as citizens.

For all areas, 87.5 per cent of the Indian children enumerated are enrolled in school. Not enrolled are 7.7 per cent. And definite information is not available for 4.8 per cent. It is believed that many of those for whom definite information is not available are in school.

Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation

The Navahos deeply desire education. Two years ago less than half of their children were in school. This past year all but 5,000 of their 24,000 children were in school. The Indian Bureau is making extraordinary efforts to make schools available to all Navaho children. The tribal council is spending $65,000 of tribal funds for 174 higher education scholarships.

Congress has adopted an $88 million Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program, to run over a period of ten years. Of this, $25 million is to be spent on education. Another $20 million is being spent on the improvement of roads. These roads are being used, and their revolutionary impact is not to be minimized. Indians are using these roads to break out of their isolation. It is perhaps well to mention that the Navahos and the Hopis are not among the nine tribes ready to be released from federal controls. They are among the more backward tribes. The Navaho is the largest tribe of Indians in the United States, numbering approximately 70,000.

Some $20 million is allocated to projects enlarging the opportunities for life on the reservation. A million dollars goes to the development of industrial and business enterprises, of which the tribe already has fifteen in operation. The largest enterprise is a sawmill worth $2.5 million, earning a profit of $300,000 a year. They own trading posts, motels, a coal mine, a wood products industry, one for clay products, another for wood textiles, and one for leather
products. They receive royalties from oil and uranium operations. All together the tribal enterprises earn $2.4 million a year.

These Indians will also be benefited by the $9 million which the government is putting into irrigation projects, and by the $10 million which it is spending on soil and water conservation and range improvements.

**Federal Termination?**

Many informed people are saying that, all factors considered — no matter whether we do or do not favor continued government supervision of Indian affairs — now is the time to act in behalf of the Indian American.

The present seems to be the most important turning point in many years. Whatever we do may result in great gains. Inaction can create a serious human problem.

Because of the two recent wars — World War II and the Korean War — Indian life is changing rapidly. The effects of these wars have been felt in almost all families. Thousands of Indians left the reservations and went to work in industrial plants over the country. For the first time they knew the advantages of receiving an income comparable to other Americans, and enjoyed having some of the goods and services available to those who have a fair income.

Indian life is changing because new resources are being discovered on and off the reservations. These changes indicate that now is the time for action, and all the more reason why we should think seriously, care deeply, and act quickly.

---

**Many Indians oppose termination of federal trusteeship, affirming that they are not sufficiently educated for such a step. Moreover, they hold that reservation life has done nothing toward developing the individual initiative and independence necessary for survival in a highly competitive world. Their thinking, as well as that of many non-Indians, is depicted below:**

---

**Facts Forum News, November, 1958**
Few will argue that the spirit of a nation is reflected in its nomination and election procedures. Where there are dictatorships, the people can be herded like animals to the polls and forced to vote — without really giving them a choice as to a candidate. Moreover, they may even be required to rejoice later when their "candidate" is "elected." A free election, however, with free choice of candidates, actually tends to exalt the voter. When a citizen casts his ballot, he knows that his "voice" will be heard. A free election in this country, conducted with dignity, is symbolic of the American way of life. Elections are closely detailed, so as to guard against fraud. Yet at the same time the honest voter is not shackled. According to the Constitution, Congress may decide how and when its members shall be chosen. Also, it may determine the time of choosing presidential electors, as well as where these electors shall meet to cast ballots for the President. However, the federal government has always exercised minimum controls in this respect.

The individual states regulate elections to a marked degree, for not only are elections run by the states, but they are also paid for by them. In order to insure an honest vote, the legislature of each state has compiled a book of election laws and rules.1

Naturally, it is the patriotic duty of each American citizen to cast his ballot. His voice in the government may be small, but it will be heard. One who is an eligible voter, and who does not exercise his privilege, is shirking his duty to both himself and his country, and is, in reality, only half a citizen. Indeed, it has been charged that there is more voter indifference today than there has been in many years.

For example, the United States' estimated civilian population and votes cast for presidential electors are as follows:2

- In 1936 there were only 57 per cent of eligible citizens who voted.
- In 1944 there were only 53 per cent of eligible citizens who voted.
- In 1952 there were only 63 per cent of eligible citizens who voted.

Most people grow up with the thought that voting is now and has always been something of an inalienable right. However, this is not true. Certainly many of the early great men of this nation entertained no such idea. As a matter of fact, Alexander Hamilton so distrusted the motives of most individuals and all public bodies that he said the President and members of the Senate should be chosen for life rather than by periodic voting. There were others who believed that only a qualified majority should vote.

Property owners were the only ones allowed to have a hand in the selection of public officials in the early history of this country. However, after the American Revolution, the people began to demand greater voting equality.

Andrew Jackson was one of the early proponents of equal suffrage, and he campaigned as hard for his rough-hewn ideas as he did in the actual battles which he fought. From Jackson's time until the present there have been two strong forces at work. One force would extend suffrage to more and more people. The other force would improve the quality of voters by stipulating that the voter must have certain qualifications.

A striking omission in the Constitution concerns the issue of voting rights. Actually, the right is given to no one. The architects of the Constitution simply insisted that only those eligible to participate in selecting members of the more numerous branches of the state legislature shall be entitled to vote for federal officials.

A century and a quarter later the Seventeenth Amendment applied the same rule to the election of United States senators. The adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, at the close of the war between the states, provided.

(Continued on page 46)


IN AN EXCLUSIVE FACTS FORUM INTERVIEW WITH

CHIANG KAI-SHEK

the President of Nationalist China warns against the Reds' "new look"

Among other dire predictions, Chiang says, "If the United States is going to relax her present trade restrictions with Red China, it would be like giving her enemy a sharp knife with which to cut her throat."

Q: In your opinion, what will be the results in Southeast Asia, if Communist China is admitted to the United Nations?
A: The effect will be disastrous to the cause of freedom. It will deal a severe blow to the moral position of the United Nations as an international body for the maintenance of peace and justice. The United Nations is neither a sort of teahouse nor a glorified debating society. The qualifications for membership in this international body are clearly stipulated in the Charter. The Peiping Communist regime, by its oppressive rule at home and repeated acts of aggression abroad, has stood in open opposition to all the vital principles of the Charter. The admission of the Chinese Communists into the United Nations would be tantamount to giving aggression a collective approval, and the aggressor a final reward.

The emergence of Communist China is the source of all troubles in Asia in the past few years. The only way to restore peace in Asia is to rid the Chinese mainland of communism. To admit the Peiping regime into the United Nations would leave most of the countries in Asia which still want to remain free no alternative but to throw themselves behind the Iron Curtain, to be enslaved by the Communists.

Q: There is a good deal of sentiment in the United States for relaxing present trade restrictions with Red China. Will you give your view on such relaxations?
A: If the United States is going to relax her trade restrictions with Red China, it would be like giving her enemy a sharp knife with which to cut her throat. Even if the trade is to be confined to non-strategic goods, it would be most unwise to help the Chinese Communists expand their war machine by meeting their economic needs. Besides, the demarcation between strategic and non-strategic goods is no longer of a permanent duration. A non-strategic article can easily be of strategic value. Let us not forget the historical fact that the Japanese militarists attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941 with bombs made of American scrap iron and with planes which were propelled by American gasoline!
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Q: If Red China is admitted to the U.N., will your government accept the “two Chinas” idea and stay in the organization?
A: No. If the United Nations should violate international justice to that extent, it would cease to be the world organization which we respect. We would most certainly withdraw our support should it admit the Communist regime.

Q: A recent series of articles in the New York Times intimate that your government has, to all intents and purposes, given up the idea of returning to the mainland. Will you comment on this?
A: I am not aware of any series of articles in the New York Times to that effect. In any case, it is our sacred duty to restore freedom to our own people, just as it is the right of the people on the mainland to want to regain their own freedom by revolting against the tyrannical rule of the Communists. We are building up Taiwan as a land of freedom and prosperity, so that it may effectively serve as a base from which we can fight back to the mainland with the support of the free Chinese here and abroad, as well as of those behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot forget the sufferings of our brethren on the mainland, and of their desire to live again as free men.

Q: A number of people who have visited Red China recently give the impression that the Chinese people are now contented with Communist rule. Do you believe this to be so? Do you have any indication that the mainland people will still welcome liberation?
A: It is all very easy to say that the Chinese people on the mainland are content under Communist rule. However, certain facts are too glaring to be lightly brushed aside. Lo Jui-ching, Communist “Minister of Public Security,” recently revealed to the Communist “People’s Congress” that in the last six years there were 5,549,030 cases of “counter-revolution” on the mainland. Anti-Communist guerrilla fighting on the mainland is still active, and sabotage in both rural districts and cities has become more widespread in the last six months.

Thousands of people have fled the mainland to Hong Kong and Macao in recent months, and many have risked their lives in their dash toward freedom. Recently a young woman, under the shelling of Communist guns, swam a long way from her native village in Kwangtung to Macao to save herself from the fate of being drafted into the Communist army.

In recent months the world has witnessed with admiration the heroic resistance movement of the Tibetan people against the Communist oppression.

One does not have to visit the mainland to know that the people are unhappy there. The truth is that, living under Communist oppression, no one on the mainland dares to tell a foreign visitor that he or she is anything but content.

Q: A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post states that relations between Free China and Japan have deteriorated to an alarming degree. Will you comment?
A: I have not read the article. It is not true that our relations with Japan have deteriorated to an alarming degree. Of course, Japan has her internal difficulties, as we all have. The unfortunate thing with Japan is that she has to tolerate and protect, by virtue of her constitution, the Communist Party in her midst.

Q: We have heard reports of a massive Chinese Red “smile” campaign to win the support in Southeast Asia. Has there been any noticeable change in Red Chinese tactics? Are they following the lead of Russia in a supposedly new “soft” line?
A: It is true that the Chinese Communists have now put on a smiling mask. This means that for the moment they think they can get along better with a smiling campaign rather than with military aggression. As a matter of fact, their smiling campaign is just as much a form of aggression as their use of force.

The Communists will continue to spout sweetness and light in an attempt to hurl the world into a false sense of security. Then they will deal us the final blow to bring us under their domination. There is no justification to suppose that they have abandoned the use of force altogether, even for the moment. The recent Chinese Communist invasion into the border region of Burma is another indication that they are always ready to resort to the use of force when they can do so without running into too much resistance.

Q: Many young overseas Chinese have been going to Red China for college educations. Is your government doing anything to attract these students to Taiwan? If so, is there any appreciable increase in the number of overseas students coming to Taiwan?
A: Recently, there has been a sharp decrease of overseas Chinese students going to the mainland to study. On the other hand, more and more of them are coming to Taiwan. My government is doing everything to facilitate their return to Taiwan and to provide them with free education and lodging. There are now over 3,000 overseas Chinese students studying in Taiwan, as compared with a little less than 1,500 last year. We expect by next year the number will be increased to 5,000.

Q: Everyone who visits Formosa comments on the beauty of the island and of its tourist possibilities.
Is it possible that your government may ease the present difficulties placed in the way of American tourists obtaining visas? In fact, are American tourists welcome?

A: Foreign tourists are most welcome in this country. We are making it very easy for foreign visitors to obtain entry visas to Taiwan from our agencies abroad. The difficulty lies in the fact that we do not have sufficient modern hotel facilities to accommodate them. However, I am glad to say that my government is taking active steps to solve this difficulty.

Q: Now that several months have passed, do you believe your government lost international support by vetoing outer Mongolia’s application for United Nations membership?

A: I do not think that a country can lose international support through upholding a moral principle. If so, there is something radically wrong with the world. In vetoing outer Mongolia’s application for United Nations’ membership, we were not so much concerned with our own gains or losses as with the prestige of the United Nations as an organ based on the principle of international justice. We opposed the entry of outer Mongolia in accordance with our support of the principles and purposes of the Charter, and in consonance with the dictates of our conscience.

---

To the Editor:

Again, may I extend my heartiest and warmest greetings to the editors of Facts Forum News. I was so thrilled and speechless when I read the article “Freedom’s Fortress and Chiang Kai-shek” by Mr. John Caldwell [October issue]. This is undoubtedly one of the most interesting articles on the Far East published by your magazine in 1956.

1956 for Formosa is relatively quiet due to the Near East crisis over the Suez. But a great storm is no doubt brewing, and 1957 will be a hard year for the Free Chinese both in and outside of Formosa. This article will unquestionably boost our morale.

I don’t know whether it was a coincidence or that the editors had previous knowledge, but October was the most suitable month for publishing such an article, since October is the most celebrated month for the Free Chinese people. October the 10th is the Chinese National Day celebrating the 45th birthday of our republic. October 23rd is the Free Overseas Chinese Day. The 25th is the 11th anniversary of the recovery of Formosa from the Japanese. And October 31st is the 70th birthday of the Free Chinese President — Chiang Kai-shek.

I am planning to order twenty copies of your magazine from my news agent in order to send them to my friends all over the world. Your magazine is unquestionably the most authoritative publication in the war against communism.

I am beginning to love Facts Forum News as I love all things that symbolize freedom and democracy. Herewith I am enclosing a poor cartoon I drew for your fine magazine. Since I had only seven art courses here at the university, I expect the editors to throw it in the wastebasket, but truly the Facts Forum News article by Mr. Caldwell inspired me. [We liked it! See cartoon at right. — Ed.]

As far as fighting communism is concerned, the Free Chinese will stand side by side with the Americans. Like thousands of other Free Chinese in this country, I pledge myself not only to fight against the Chinese Red rebels, but also to fight against the greatest menace to the American people — the U. S. Communist Party. Facts Forum News will be my guide.

Thank you,

Yours truly,

/s/ GEORGE TSENG
905 South Eighth Street
Waco, Texas

---
Glimpses of Books
YOU WILL WANT TO READ

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STRUCTURES
By Bela Hubbard


"The Russian revolution of 1917-18," says this author, "following overthrow of the absolute monarchy, imposed on the nation a political oligarchy and a communist economy. Politically, it was a revolution; economically, it was a counter-revolution. It substituted one type of autocratic government for another type. It destroyed a relatively modern type of economy and, in substitution, resurrected one from the Stone Age."

He points out that Russian leaders "have stated clearly that the Russian régime must, for its own survival, communize the economy of every other nation on earth. And this can be accomplished only by worldwide political control . . . During their thirty-seven years in power, the Russian political leaders, including many highly intelligent intellectuals, have devised a method of political conquest which, in the main, is quite new to the world. . . . This new weapon is intellectual subversion, . . . a new psychological technique which may be described as the art of destroying men's power of rational thought and understanding; . . . mass dissemination of mental chaos."

The author neither deals in generalities nor traffics in semantic entanglements; he comes straight to his point in words crystal-clear, direct, uncompromising; and there is no waste of wordage. As advised in "Alice," here is a narrator who begins his story at the beginning, keeps on until he comes to the end; then stops.

It is a fascinating story that he unfolds — first, the bedrock distinction between government and economy; then, an architectural description of the seven political structures; then, a definitive picture of the four economic structures; finally, a logical account of their development and interrelation.

ship, from primitive forms to those of the most advanced nations of modern times. The book is not one to be skimmed carelessly and superficially; yet, the thoughtful reader, upon reaching Finis, may well realize, and perhaps to his own astonishment, that he has ingested a solidly-instructive and well-documented textbook — one so skillfully executed that it went down with no more effort than a properly-concocted dish of Christmas pudding.

The position of Russia in government and economic evolution does not dominate the book; it is but duly examined, tagged, and classified as a historical monstrosity and a menace to civilization. In no uncertain terms we are warned:

"The purpose of the Russian subversion campaign in the United States is to conquer this country by peaceful penetration. That there may be some violence at the end of this long softening-up process is only of secondary importance. The technique is not merely that of conventional propaganda, but that of the creation of almost complete confusion in understanding the significance of current events, and of impairment of the ability to reason normally.

"In this campaign, the Soviet has literally hundreds of thousands of unpaid agents, most of whom have become so confused mentally that they do not know they are agents. The Russians have already made great progress toward their goal.

"The vast majority of Americans of the present generation do not know what communism is; and are so confused in their understanding of government and economic systems, that this nation may be eased over into autocratic government and a communist economy before the majority of citizens can realize what is happening. A correct understanding of communism could go far toward stopping this trend."

THE POWERS THAT BE
By Edmund A. Opitz

Foreword by Adm. Ben Moreell, USN (retired). Foundation for Social Research, 1521 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles 17, California, 1956. 90 pp., $2.50 (cloth); $1.50 (paper).

Observes Admiral Ben Moreell:

"There is a vast difference between the church 'going into politics' and the church exerting its tremendous moral influence on men's thoughts and deeds and on their efforts to achieve morally sound solutions of the economic and social problems which beset mankind. If the church chooses to function as a political power bloc, it does so at the expense of its possible moral influence."

This author fully endorses a philosophy of separation of church from state, but does not interpret it as meaning that society or the nation is to be insulated from religious influence. He would, however, protect the church from dangerous affiliation with "politicalized" religion.

In earlier times, Constantine, even though he "still stood with one foot in paganism," made an alliance of expediency with the church, after which men's ambitions governed conduct, while the splendor of ecclesiastical ritual often blurred considerations of morality.

In America, the Constitution, to abolish privilege, forbade the formation of an established church. Until rather recently, American churches prospered in an atmosphere of freedom; but today, asserts the author, there are encroachments on that liberty.

(Continued on page 21)
Something Must Be Done About...

The Unfortunate Status of Our Forces

By FRANK T. BOW, M.C. (R-Ohio)

Congressman Bow's amendment to the Mutual Security bill, defeated by a vote of 93-30, would have resulted in the modification or denunciation of the Status of Forces Treaty.

Charging that "astute management" caused the absence of many congressional representatives who would have supported this amendment, Congressman Bow pledges a continuance of his time and effort to remedy the injustices and dangers he feels are represented in the Status of Forces Treaty.

Advertisements with the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Japan which gave them criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen for offenses committed when off duty have now been in effect for over three years.

In spite of cumulating news reports of trials of our men, editorial comment, and hearings before congressional committees, a great many Americans still have no cognizance of what is meant by the Status of Forces Agreement. This is not surprising when I consider that my office very recently has had to explain to staff members of several colleagues what their correspondents were asking about them.

The NATO Status of Forces Agreement is a treaty between members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization seeking to define the rights, obligations, and responsibilities of the respective military forces stationed in any NATO country. A similar agreement between the United States and Japan is not a treaty, but depends on the Security Treaty with Japan for its validity, if any. Executive agreements have been made with many other countries so that we have arrangements with fifty-four countries respecting the status of our troops in those countries. For convenience I refer to all these generally as Status of Forces Agreements.

The particular provision of the original NATO Status of Forces Agreement which gives concern to all of us is Article VII, which in effect gives criminal jurisdiction to foreign authorities for any offense committed by one of our servicemen when not on duty. The Japanese agreement, and most of the Executive agreements, also surrender this jurisdiction, although a few retain exclusive criminal jurisdiction in the United States.

This treaty and the agreements are another instance in which our State Department has ignored the rights and intentions of Congress. The Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the power to make laws for the government of the land and naval forces. Congress adopted the Uniform Code of Military Justice for this purpose. It placed our men on the same footing wherever they were. The status agreements ignore this and make an inferior class of citizens out of those serving abroad, by subjecting them to the vagaries of foreign injustice.

As a mass of information piles up as to the negotiation of these agreements, the trials in foreign courts, the sentences imposed, the prisons into which our men are incarcerated, it appears inexplicable and inexusable that representatives of our government, trusted by our people to further our national interests, could make these agreements. I do not criticize the senators who advised ratification of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement because I believe they were furnished with incomplete or even false information. It is shameful, however, that, in spite of the evidence that has piled up in three years showing the evil results of the agreements, officials in the State and Defense Departments refuse to seek a modification of the agreements that will restore exclusive jurisdiction to us in all matters affecting

(Continued on page 16)
IN FOREIGN COURTS?

The National security requires that
Allies of the United States have jurisdiction over
The off-duty misdemeanors and offenses of
Our forces overseas, through the . . .

Status of Forces Treaty

By JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, M. C.
(R-Maryland)

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reports that no instance has been cited where an American serviceman has been imprisoned by a foreign court for an act which would not be considered a crime in the United States, nor has any case of unusual or excessive punishment been cited.

Congressman Devereux (R-Md.) points out that sovereign nations are unwilling to grant the United States complete jurisdiction as they did under war conditions; that host countries must enforce their own law on everyone, or they will have no law.

In considering the merits of the Status of Forces Agreement and related treaties and international agreements, each of us should ask himself whether or not he believes that the United States bases which we have established in foreign territory in various parts of the world are essential to the defense of the United States. To anyone who is convinced that it is important that we retain combat forces in friendly nations to repel invasion, air bases within striking distance of the Soviet Union, and that we maintain installations for the service of our Navy at various strategic locations, the issue involved is whether or not the Status of Forces Treaty is proper and justified.

To those sincere Americans, on the other hand, who believe that it would be a good idea to bring our forces back to the United States in any event and to rely primarily on a defense based within our own continental limits, there is no issue. Let me summarize briefly just what has been done.

The United States has entered into a formal treaty with most of the nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has been ratified by the Senate, which provides that (1) United States military courts are given primary jurisdiction over offenses committed by our military personnel or civilian employees while on duty; (2) our authorities have primary jurisdiction over off-duty offenses committed solely against American government property, members of our forces, civilian employees, or dependents; (3) foreign courts have primary jurisdiction over off-duty offenses when our citizens are on their own; (4) foreign governments agree to give "sympathetic consideration" to requests from the United States for a waiver of their rights in cases where the United States considers such a waiver to be of particular importance.

In addition to this formal treaty, the United States has entered into similar, although not identical, agreements with a number of other nations. If it were not for the treaty and agreements we would then be obliged to operate under International Law which is much less favorable. The only point of controversy appears to be the agreement that United States personnel are subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts for off-duty criminal offenses.

Let me make clear that my background is primarily military. I am not a lawyer. I am not qualified to engage in legal hair-splitting with those who profess to be experts in that field. On the other hand, I began my military career as an enlisted man in the United States Marine Corps, and my service with the Marine Corps has included a number of foreign assignments. I believe that I am qualified to discuss the military aspects of the Status of Forces Treaty. I know from first-hand experience what it means to be a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in a foreign country. Let me say further that I have great concern for the rights and the welfare of American servicemen who are stationed overseas.

(Continued on page 17)
ing our troops. They were forced by order of the Senate and by publicity to pay more attention to the trials and the places of imprisonment being used, and some improvement in the lot of the accused has resulted; but trying to sugar-coat a bitter pill is the most they have done.

The question of why criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen was surrendered in this way has never been satisfactorily answered. State Department witnesses in congressional hearings say it was necessary, although no showing has ever been made as to what nations demanded it. There is some proof that if proper request had been made to retain such jurisdiction it would have been granted us.

In 1943 the State Department filed a brief in the Supreme Court of Canada in a case involving our right to maintain jurisdiction over our forces which concluded the argument in these words:

To summarize, it will have been seen from what has been said above that by the almost unanimous opinion of writers on international law, and jurists that have dealt with the subject, members of the armed forces of a state on foreign territory with the consent of the territorial sovereign are immune from the local jurisdiction in criminal matters. These views are based on and supported by international practice as well as reason.

Allies Retain Immunity

This rule of international law was enunciated by Chief Justice Marshall in 1811. It appears today in the United States Manual of Courts-Martial. It has been quoted in cases throughout the world. Until the NATO Status of Forces Agreement was made we always asserted our right to exercise jurisdiction over our troops wherever they were. Our diplomats executed an amazing turnabout which appears to have had no justification except as an abasing gesture of friendliness to dependent allies. This gesture however did not include the surrender of their own immunity.

The defenders of these Status of Forces Agreements now want us to believe that our position through the years has been wrong, that there was no such rule of international law. They make this assertion now to support the claim that the agreements confer rights on our men they would not otherwise have, that without the agreements our men might even be tried for offenses occurring in the line of duty. Unless we are playing the role of an inferior and servile nation, the allegation is absurd. Even the courts of Japan, as recently as May, 1956, said that an armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity, and that it is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state. This Japanese court was trying to force an American Air Force captain to pay the wages of Japanese employees he had discharged from employment because he thought they were Communists. The court admitted that any right it had to act depended not on international law but on the administrative agreement. We have lost considerable face in Japan through this agreement. Once a conquered nation, Japan now has over fifty of our servicemen incarcerated there.

Concessions Indicate Self-Service

Tied in with the assertion that these concessions were demanded of us is the sly inference that this was a price we had to pay in order to send our troops abroad to other countries—that we are keeping them there for our benefit. This argument is rather shopworn. We furnished protection to countries that were then unable to defend themselves. The French took advantage of this protection by sending forces of their own to Indochina and Africa, leaving us holding the line. The Deputy Under Secretary of State told the House Foreign Affairs Committee last year: "In military terms, they represent a body of trained and skilled manpower for which no substitution from European sources is practical. They operate ports and airfields and other technical facilities which are vital to effective defense in modern warfare. Our allies want these troops to stay in Europe." This testimony from the State Department should place our benefit in proper perspective.

In making these agreements our diplomats showed a callous disregard of the rights of our servicemen and the position in which they would be placed. No investigation was made of other countries to which they were subjecting our men, or the prison conditions in those countries. No attempt was made to preserve the constitutional rights of our servicemen. The Senate ordered the Defense Department to have a study made of the laws of the NATO countries after ratification of that agreement. The Defense Department did not finish a study of the laws of Japan until October, 1955. Over fifty Americans were already in prison there and thousands had been fined.

Constitutional Rights Denied

The NATO Status of Forces Agreement, the Japanese agreement, and other agreements contain a list of seven guarantees which are claimed to be for the protection of an accused in a foreign court. Our Attorney General once said these guarantees provided "civilized standards of justice." I have always regretted this willingness to accept less than the full protection of our constitutional guarantees for our citizens, merely because they were in our armed forces abroad.

The fact that our servicemen lost many of the rights granted them by our Constitution in trials in foreign courts is not debatable. The Judge Advocate General of the Army has determined since the agreements have been in effect that some of those rights that an accused may lose are: the right to a prompt and speedy trial; privilege of suspect or accused to be silent; the presumption of innocence; burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt in government; guarantees of confrontation by witnesses; involuntary confessions prohibited. Other rights and even the guarantees contained in the status agreement are sometimes abridged by the action of interpretation of a trial court.

An accused is permitted, if the court acquiesces, to have a representative of his government present at his trial. The Defense Department had made no effort to have the reports of observers sent to Washington for review until after I demanded last year that the reports of the trials of those men then in prison be furnished me. After
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OF FORCES TREATY

(continued from page 15)

Critics of the Status of Forces Treaty sometimes make it appear that we entered into these agreements either in ignorance, not being fully aware of what we were doing, or that we deliberately and needlessly sacrificed the rights of our servicemen in order to curry favor with foreign governments.

The fact is that we entered into the Status of Forces Agreements because of stern military necessity to meet a situation. Everyone understands that no nation welcomes the presence of foreign troops on its soil in peacetime. Aside from the injury to national pride that many people feel, there are the practical problems of human relations that arise when a large number of strangers, with different customs and living standards, are established in any community.

Mutual Sacrifice of Sovereignty

During and immediately after the war we retained absolute jurisdiction of our forces in Italy, Germany, and Japan because we entered those countries as conquerors and could impose whatever conditions we chose. The governments of our allies during the war were glad to give us exclusive jurisdiction over our forces in their countries because we were engaged side by side in combat. The situation the war is substantially different, however. Consider the situation in France, for example. In addition to the presence of foreign troops on French soil, the French people have seen thousands of acres of the best farm land of France taken over in order to build over a hundred NATO airfields. This meant the uprooting of hundreds of villages and thousands of farmers from holdings that have been passed down for centuries. Furthermore, the term during which the foreign forces are to remain is indeterminate, and in certain cases these forces come from smaller and weaker nations. It is important also that France and the other NATO nations have sacrificed sovereignty in other respects, such as permitting certain of their forces to be commanded by officers of other nations. Under these conditions France and the other countries in which it has been necessary to station United States forces for strategic reasons were not willing to give us all of the rights which we had enjoyed during wartime. In many cases our forces and our bases were permitted only after long negotiation.

The charge is frequently made that by entering into the Status of Forces Treaty we sacrificed rights which we would otherwise have enjoyed under International Law. This is contrary to the fact. Those who maintain that the United States would retain criminal jurisdiction over its individuals stationed abroad under International Law if it were not for the Status of Forces Treaty frequently cite the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall of the United States Supreme Court in a case decided in 1812, involving the Schooner Exchange (7 Cranch. 116, U. S. 1812). These citations, however, select certain phrases which appear to support the position taken by such persons and always omit the following words from Chief Justice Marshall's opinion, which go to the heart of the issue:

The jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. * * * All exceptions, therefore, to the full and complete power of a nation within its own territories must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. They can flow from no other legitimate source.

Host Nations Impose Conditions

To me, as a non-lawyer, it seems that the international law issue boils down to this: In the past, in nearly all cases, foreign troops have been accepted on the soil of a receiving country under circumstances such that the country was willing to consent to the sending state retaining full jurisdiction over its forces. The inescapable fact is, however, that this jurisdiction was retained by the sending nation only by the consent of the sovereign host nation, as Chief Justice Marshall points out. The fact which has confronted the United States since the war has been that it was necessary to station our forces abroad under new conditions and sovereign nations were unwilling to grant us complete jurisdiction as they did under war conditions. There is nothing in international law which requires nations to give such jurisdiction if they do not wish to do so. Therefore it has been necessary for us to enter into negotiations in order to secure their consent not only to station our troops in the host nation but also for that nation to relinquish criminal jurisdiction in certain fields.

While considering legal questions, let me say a word about constitutional rights. Some of the discussion of the Status of Forces Treaty implies that if it were not for our commitments under the treaty, American military personnel abroad would enjoy all of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. It is important to recognize that the personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States must actually forego certain rights guaranteed by the Constitution by the mere fact that they are members of our armed forces. Among such rights are: freedom of speech, trial by jury, habeas corpus, and protection against unreasonable searches and seizures. This situation is recognized by the Constitution for the Congress is given the right to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and Naval Forces." It is unfortunate that we find it necessary to draft the youth of America into the armed services with the resulting sacrifices borne by themselves and their families. We require this sacrifice because of the danger with which we are confronted. This is just one element in a complex, difficult, and dangerous world situation.

Serious Offenses in Minority

Let us not lose sight of what is actually happening to American personnel under the Status of Forces Treaty and related agreements. The following tabulation was submitted to the Congress during the last session:

Exercise of criminal jurisdiction by foreign tribunals over United States citizens subject to military law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worldwide in area; all services for period December 1, 1954 to November 30, 1955</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenses subject to foreign jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses subject to foreign jurisdiction as to which a waiver of local jurisdiction was obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of offenses subject to foreign jurisdiction as to which charges were &quot;dropped&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Atomic Radiation's Biological Effects

A profound and intensive report by the National Academy of Sciences' Research Council. The findings in this report are significant enough to affect the lives and well-being of every living individual, creature, and organism on the face of the earth.

FACTS FORUM INTERVIEWS

PROminent PHYSICIST

Dr. Ralph Lapp, one of our leading atomic physicists, states that our atomic weapons testing has increased at an alarming rate over the past ten years. He claims that the fall-out of radioactive material is still spreading all over the world from an atomic weapons test made over two years ago in the Pacific. According to other scientists, the fall-out isn't as serious as the danger of radiation from the common X-ray is at present, but Dr. Lapp maintains that if the weapons tests keep increasing in size and number, the fall-out would become more and more dangerous to every inhabitant of the earth.

He further points out that as a result of fall-out from weapons testing, a radioactive acid in the bones called Strontium can now be detected in the bone structure of a patient in Shanghai, China, or equally in the bones of a patient in Boston, Massachusetts. Also, our food and milk supply is being infiltrated by fall-out to a certain extent.

Dr. Lapp suggests that President Eisenhower should make a speech at the next meeting of the UN's Court of World Opinion on November 12th, asking that the "sanctity of the atmosphere should be preserved" by limiting the number and size of all weapons testing throughout the world. He feels that with the President's previous experience in warfare, he could also urge a relaxation of all secrecy concerning atomic weapons and their testing.

It is Dr. Lapp's thought that the president could back up the argument that neither side would win in an atomic war since even if one side was completely annihilated, the fall-out caused by its destruction could also destroy the inhabitants of the winning side, thousands of miles away. By disclosing this view of looking into the face of a future war, the President might be able to convince even the Russians of the futility of atomic war.

No one can deny that the Atomic Age has arrived and is here to stay. Its problems will continue to have far-reaching effects upon the human race, as well as all other living creatures. An exacting study of the Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation is being carried out by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences with governmental approval. A preliminary report has just been completed by the academy's Genetics Committee. The people on this committee are comprised of the top scientists and research people in the nation. They have endeavored to make this report as understandable as possible for average comprehension by the public, as it is of great importance that these matters be widely understood.

The summary report stresses the hopes and fears of the Atomic Age, and goes on to explain that great advantages can be made by mankind's peaceful use of atomic energy. Spectacular achievements in medicine, science, engineering, and agriculture are possible. If used wisely, atomic power can raise the living standards of backward and impoverished areas of the globe and thus reduce world tension.

On the other side of the scale, the report mentions the fears of the Atomic Age. Of course, the major fear is that of a horribly destructive atomic war. Accompanying this is another fear, less serious as compared with total destruction but nevertheless with grave implications. . . . During atomic weapons tests, radioactive material is formed and released into the atmosphere to be carried by the winds and eventually to settle down at distances which may be very great. "Fall-out" in the term for this material at
rial after it finally settles down. There has been much concern and public debate about this fall-out and its possible dangers.

The report goes on to discuss a leading question. . . .

"Are we harming ourselves, and are there genetic effects which will harm our children and their descendants, through this radioactive dust that has been settling down on all of us? Are things going to be still worse when presently we have a number of atomic power plants, more laboratories experimenting with atomic fission and fusion, and perhaps more and bigger weapons testing? Are there similar risks, due to the other sources of radiation, but brought to our attention by these atomic risks?"

It has been medically proven that high energy amounts of radiation entering the bodies of human beings, are genetically undesirable. Even very minute quantities of radiation unquestionably have the power to injure the hereditary cells. Should immediate steps be taken to limit or at least reduce the amount of radiation which people are apt to receive?

**Scale of Risks Must Balance**

According to the committee, an elimination of all risks is not involved since that is virtually impossible. Rather it is a balance of opposed risks and of different sorts of benefits. Man must seek to balance the scale when the risk on neither side is completely visible. Scientists cannot say with exact precision just what biological risks are involved in various levels and degrees of radiation exposure, nor can anyone precisely predict the overall considerations of national economic strength, of defense, and of international relations.

However, this doesn't mean that geneticists do not have at the moment something useful to say on this subject. Naturally, there are some differences of opinion as to exact values, although there is no disagreement as to fundamental conclusions.

Though gradually learning more and more as the atomic age progresses, their knowledge of human radiation genetics is still fragmentary. What committee's report, the ordinary "body cells" which make up the body as a whole, are not comparably as important as the cells which exist in the reproductive organs, and which play the necessary function in the reproduction of children.

All the genes that a person starts out with when the original egg cell is fertilized are mostly kept unchanged as the cells divide and the person's body is elaborated and maintained. The dividing cells that duplicate the genes may not always produce perfect copies, but they usually do. However, at times genes are subject to change, notably by heat, by some chemicals, and by radiation.

It has been established that certain malignancies such as leukemia, and certain other cellular abnormalities can result from ionizing radiations. These radiations can substantially reduce the life expectancy of the individual receiving the radiation. The report states that these risks also have genetic aspects that should receive mention. All of these are for limiting radiation exposures to the lowest possible levels.

Medical authorities are now in a position to indicate why radiations can be so grave from the genetic viewpoint. The genes, as described above, normally remain unchanged as they multiply and are passed on from generation to generation. They rarely change or mutate, but radiation as already mentioned can give rise to such changes or mutations in the
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genes. This means that a completely altered gene then continues from generation to generation in its new or mutant form.

In most cases, the mutant genes lead to some kind of harmful effect. In extreme cases, the harmful effect is death itself, or loss of the ability to produce offspring, or some other serious abnormality. Of far greater ultimate importance, since they affect so many more persons, are those cases which involve much smaller handicaps which might tend to shorten life, reduce number of children or be otherwise detrimental.

**Damage Results Later**

People bearing harmful mutations are handicapped relative to the rest of the population in the following ways: They tend to have fewer children or to die earlier. Such genes are eliminated soon if they do great harm, more slowly if only slightly harmful. A mildly dangerous gene can in the long run do just as much damage as a harmful one, since the milder mutant persists longer and has a chance to harm more people.

The geneticists are in substantial agreement on the following points:

1. Radiations cause mutations. Mutations influence those hereditary traits which a person passes on to his children and to subsequent generations.

2. Nearly all radiation-induced mutations which have effects great enough to be detected are harmful. An almost unnoticeable portion of the harm would appear in the first generation of the offspring of the person who received the radiation. It would remain unnoticed for a shorter or longer time, in the genetic constitution of the successive generations of offspring. But the harm wouldn't disappear, and some of it would be expressed in each generation. No matter how small the harmful mutation appears to be, it will in the long run upset the balance against some descendant who carries this mutation, causing his premature death or his failure to produce offspring.

3. For all living things — animals, insects, vegetation, and bacteria — there exist mutations which have arisen from natural causes. These naturally occurring mutations are called "spontaneous mutations," and all living creatures carry a supply of these.

4. A larger amount of radiation produces a larger number of mutations. But within the limits of the radiation doses being considered in this report, there's every reason to believe that these additional mutants would be of the same general sort as those produced by the natural background radiation. In brief, mildly larger doses of radiation would produce more but not worse mutants.

In summary, the committee points out that we must be cautious about increasing the total amount of radiation to which the entire population is exposed. For example, if the whole population of the U. S. received a small quantity of extra radiation, there is good reason to believe that, among 100 million children born to these exposed parents, there would be several thousand who would be definitely handicapped because of the mutant genes due to radiation.

These several thousand cases on the surface might not get the public attention that a hundred completely handicapped children would receive. However, we shouldn't disregard this menace simply because it has aspects which would be of differing value to different people concerned.

**Tragic Effects Would Multiply**

If mankind were subjected to a double dose of radiation, then the present level of 2 per cent of such genetic effects would rise, and would eventually be doubled. (This includes such defects as mental disorders, epilepsy, congenital deformations, defects in vision or hearing, speech defects, etc.) Under normal conditions, roughly 2 per cent of all live births in the U. S. have defects of this sort. However, increased radiation would double the number of these tragic cases.

The report mentions the next 100 million births in the U. S. This is the approximate number of children that will be born to the present population. Of these 100 million children, something like two million will experience genetic defects previously listed. However, if the entire U. S. population were to be subjected, generation after generation, to additional man-made radiation, then this present tragic figure of two million would gradually be increased accordingly.

These figures by no means show completely all of the genetic damage that would be caused, but they do make terribly impressive the fact that additional doses of radiation would result in terrible personal and social distress.

The research council has studied intensively the effects on man of the Atomic Age since 1945. The human data include observations on populations irradiated by fall-out. Their data contain a study of a limited amount of accidents occurring in atomic energy work, also the results of more moderate exposure to various forms of radiation, as experienced by cyclotron workers. A whole field of experimental work is covered, with studies of acute and chronic effects on many species of animals.

**Strikes Older People More Severely**

The scientists agree that shortening of the life span can be caused by exposure to radiation. Skin cancer and leukemia have a greater chance to inflict damage due to radiation's damage to connective tissue. As a result there is lowered immunity and premature aging can take place. Older members of the population are more susceptible to these factors. The shortening of life corresponds roughly with the dose of radiation.

Other examples of radiation's effects have been received by workers in various industries. Bone disease in radium workers and lung ailments in miners of radioactive ores are well-known examples. However, these cases are in the minority. Fortunately, so far, the atomic energy industry through constant vigilance has managed to avoid exposures leading to this type of injury.

Some of the more serious results of radiation are those on the blood, since the vital blood-forming organs are particularly sensitive to radiation injury. The white blood cells are decreased in number soon after radiation, and in fatal cases they almost disappear before death. Other acute changes in the blood give rise to disorders in the clotting mechanism and a bleeding tendency. Thus the creation of antibodies against infection is impaired. These changes lead to acute illness in the second week (perhaps a little later in man) heralded by decrease in the white cells.

In the next few weeks after exposure, anemias may occur due to deficiencies in red blood cell formation and survival. Those victims surviving the first month usually recover, but some individuals, or where radiation is continued, there is a further serious breakdown of blood cell formation.

**X-rays in Medicine**

The report also cautions that X-rays in medicine are as harmful as any of the weapons. Any X-rays not absolutely necessary should be kept under control.

Natural radiation is complete, however, a danger which, if properly handled, need not multiply. X-rays cause mutations by the process of genetic exchange.

The gene exchange is as low as 3 per cent of the natural rate, as determined by the geneticists. The gene exchange means the normal or received is higher than the natural rate, much more than the undertaken.
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Leukemia may occur a few years after radiation. Although this disease is generally rare in man, it resulted among many cases of Japanese victims subjected to a nearly fatal dose at Hiroshima. Also those whose professional work has exposed them to higher than permissible dose rates are subject to leukemia.

Effects on the intestinal tract and central nervous system are critical during the early period. Vomiting and diarrhea happen within a few hours. After a few days (usually four or five) following radiation, more serious effects occur. Failure of the cells lining the intestine to replace themselves results in demuduation of the surface, with intractable loss of fluid and salts, complicated by ulcerations, spread of infection, and bleeding.

After large doses on the lungs, congestion and secretion appear. Fibrosis and development of cancer have been very common in mining areas where large concentrations of radon gas were inhaled.

Radiation can cause a marked change in skin. At first, what looks like a severe sunburn appears. When this has subsided, ulceration may occur. A chronically damaged skin can develop into cancer. The eyes can develop a cataract of the lens as a result of strong radiation. A small dose of radiation can also temporarily sterilize the male reproductive organs. A larger dose can permanently sterilize a male victim.

**X-rays Are Most Dangerous**

The report emphasizes that X-rays also cause radiation that can be harmful to humans. In fact, it stresses that X-rays have a far more serious effect as harmful radiations to humans than many of the fall-out caused by atomic weapons-testing in the Pacific. The report warns that X-ray doses should be kept as low as possible.

Naturally, this doesn’t mean the complete elimination of X-rays. Whenever a doctor or dentist definitely recommends X-rays, the patient should comply. However, excessive use of X-rays causing exposure to radiation by the patient can cause many of the genetic effects described in this report.

The geneticists say, “Keep the dose as low as you can.” Anything above the normal quota of ten roentgens received in a person’s lifetime from natural sources can cause tragic results. Besides recommending that much more exhaustive research be undertaken regarding the X-ray problem, the committee strongly urges that the following steps be taken:

A national system of record keeping on radiation exposure should be organized. Records should be kept showing every individual’s complete history of exposure to X-rays, and to all other gamma radiation.

Top U. S. medical authorities should institute a strong movement to lessen radiation exposure from X-rays to lowest practicable level necessary for medical purposes. Particularly, safeguards should be always taken to protect the reproductive cells from radiation. The report also advises that there should be uniform restriction of X-ray installations, weapons testing, disposal of atomic wastes that are radioactive, and all other humanly controllable sources of radiation. This is to protect our entire population from receiving more than 10 roentgens to the reproductive cells from birth to age 30.

In conclusion, the scientists who have prepared this report agree that their knowledge of genetics is still limited. Another more detailed report will be issued in the near future. Much more research in the field of genetics is needed. According to the committee’s analysis, time, brains, and particularly more money will be required to continue this vital research in genetics.
The Beleaguered A.D.A.

Through the Eyes of Its Chairman

"The liberals of the A.D.A. are prepared to fight both the right and the left," in the challenging words of Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, who feels that the liberals are really in the middle of a world fight in which the Communists on the left and the reactionaries on the right are equal enemies.

“Our job, as I visualize it,” states Mr. Rauh in a Reporters’ Roundup interview, “is to put a little idealism into politics and to try and persuade both of the parties to move over somewhat more to the liberal side.”

Riding the A.D.A.’s twin white chargers — civil liberties and civil rights — Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, often referred to as “Mr. A.D.A.,” courageously entered the field within range of the pointed questions of sharp-shooting newspapers Lyle Wilson, Chief of Bureau of the United Press in Washington, D. C., and Clark Mollenhoff, Washington correspondent for Look magazine and Cowles newspapers. This crack team attempted to pinpoint the aims and purposes of the A.D.A. under the able moderation of Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual commentator and Director of Washington Operations for Mutual Broadcasting System.

Mr. Rauh, a practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., was one of a group who in 1946 conceived the idea of a broadly based liberal organization which was to become Americans for Democratic Action. He was elected in 1948 as Chairman of the National Executive Committee. Mr. Rauh represents the United Auto Workers Union, and has defended persons accused under the federal loyalty and security programs. He is a recognized spokesman on civil liberties and civil rights issues. Graduated from Harvard Law School in 1935, he was later law secretary to two U. S. Supreme Court Justices. During World War II, Mr. Rauh served on the Southwest Pacific Army staff of General Douglas MacArthur.

“There are fundamental rights of American citizenship which the government of the United States has an obligation to uphold,” stated Moderator Hurleigh in preface, pointing out that some say the program of strengthened federal enforcement of civil rights in the United States is overdue, and that Mr. Rauh heads an American organization with the announced goal of defending individual rights.

“First I would like to ask about one of your very notable members,” said Mr. Wilson. “Is Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., still the Vice Chairman of A.D.A.?”

“No, he is not,” replied Mr. Rauh. “He asked not to be re-elected. He has withdrawn from political action, and for the present has more or less retired to his law practice, which has received some criticism, I fear, and as your question indicates.”

Mr. Wilson inquired whether the fact that Mr. Roosevelt’s law practice was involved in the representation of the Dominican Republic was related to his retirement from Vice Chairmanship of A.D.A.

“I don’t believe so,” replied Mr. Rauh. “The reason that Mr. Roosevelt gave us was that he was no longer active in political affairs. He still subscribes to all the principles of A.D.A. and he is still a member.”
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"Recently Senator Clifford Case of New Jersey has stated that he felt that the Eisenhower Administration was doing a pretty good job generally on the security program," put in Mr. Mollenhoff. "Do you feel that that is a good analysis?"

Mr. Rauh emphasized that while he feels that Mr. Case is a fine man, he would classify his analysis of progress on the security program as "poor."

"The Eisenhower administration has suggested," he stated in clarification, "that Congress reverse the Supreme Court decision and go back to screening people in the Fish and Wildlife organization, and the other non-sensitive agencies. It seems to me that when the Attorney General and the head of the Civil Service Commission take such a position — a position contrary to every bit of good sense in this country, and contrary to what nine conservative lawyers of the New York Bar Association wrote should be the position of this country — you can hardly say the Administration is doing a good job in this field."

"But how would you limit this?" asked Mr. Mollenhoff. "Would you limit it to the sensitive positions alone?"

"I would limit the loyalty security program to the sensitive positions," agreed Mr. Rauh, "and I would, in addition, revamp the program in the sensitive positions so that it would work more efficiently both for the government and for the individual."

Mr. Mollenhoff mentioned that it was his understanding that the Administration had the backing of people like J. Edgar Hoover in trying to broaden this program.

Are Janitors "Sensitive"?

"They put forward the argument," he pointed out, "that the charwoman or the janitor in a building is in as good a position to steal the secrets of our government as anyone else."

"I believe the charwoman in the Atomic Energy Commission building is a security problem," agreed Mr. Rauh, "and I would include everybody in this building. I'm talking about the buildings where there are no secrets."

 Asked by Mr. Mollenhoff if he felt that the Justice Department, where all types of papers float around, should be considered "sensitive," Mr. Rauh conceded that this would be in the same category.

"What about the Agriculture Department?" persisted Mr. Mollenhoff.

"I don't think that the bulk of the Agriculture Department is a sensitive agency," declared Mr. Rauh. "I can call there and get very good service about what to do with the cherry tree in my back yard, but I really don't feel that if the Russians find that out it is going to affect our national security greatly."

"But surely there must be some other thing," insisted Mr. Mollenhoff, Mr. Mollenhoff pursued relentlessly. "You would say that one is as bad as the other?"

"I wouldn't go quite that far," replied Mr. Rauh. "I would say that the Eisenhower administration took the Truman program and made it somewhat worse. That is about as far as I can go."

Pointing out that the A.D.A. was supposed to be nonpartisan, Mr. Mollenhoff asked, "Don't you find yourselves in the Democratic corner most of the time?"

To this Mr. Rauh agreed: "Yes, sir. We find ourselves most often aligned with the northern Democrats."

"Is this just coincidence," inquired Mr. Mollenhoff, "or do you have some kind of an alliance?"

Most Liberal Force in America

"It is an absolute coincidence," replied Mr. Rauh. "I don't think there would be any question in anybody's mind that the northern Democrats are the most liberal force in America. They are more liberal as a force than the southern Democrats. They are more liberal as a force than the Republicans. So it's natural that we would find ourselves most often in agreement with them."

"Was it just a coincidence that you happened to find yourself aligned with Clayton Fritchie in the Paul Emmett Hughes case against Senator McCarthy?" Mr. Mollenhoff inquired innocently.

Mr. Rauh's reply was emphatic — "I testified under oath that it was an absolute coincidence, and it was. I never knew Mr. Fritchie had anything to do with it until after it was all over."

Mr. Wilson asked, "Mr. Rauh, since the A.D.A., by chance or by design, or for some reason, uniformly does support Democratic candidates, how is it that it is so frequently critical of the Democratic party?"

"This is a world in which you live with the best you can get," Mr. Rauh said enigmatically. "I do not feel that the Democratic party is in essence fully a party of liberalism. When they do not act as a party of liberalism, we criticize them. But you can be more liberal than another party and still not measure up to our full standards."

"Do you have in mind — you, personally, or the A.D.A. as a political force — some new party?" Mr. Wilson asked.

(Continued on page 48)
The "SPIRIT of ST. LOUIS" Flies Again

Actor Jimmy Stewart playing the screen role of famed Aviator Charles A. Lindbergh poses near his plane before making the fateful flight across the Atlantic Ocean. Stewart who closely resembles the lanky Lindbergh in appearance and height, was a highly decorated bomber pilot serving in the 8th Air Force during World War II. Three identical replicas of the original "Spirit of St. Louis" were actually flown during filming sequences.

They said it couldn't be done, ... but a lone American's struggle against great odds showed the whole world that the Atlantic could be conquered in the air.

With a coughing-whirring start, an airplane motor suddenly roars into life. The grey dawn on May 20, 1927, barely lights the sky. Twenty minutes later, a small knot of spectators anxiously watch as the single-engined silver monoplane starts to taxi down the runway at New York's Roosevelt Field. Inside the "Spirit of St. Louis," a tall, lean, young aviator named Charles A. Lindbergh sits tensely in the tiny cockpit making a last-minute check of his instruments. His eyes scan the horizon, trying to pierce the blanket-like fog hanging over the field. As he voices an almost silent prayer, the clouds suddenly break above the runway, and with the pulse-tinging screech of take-off, the sturdy little plane begins its gallant flight with destiny.

Today, the average American hardly notices the news in the evening paper about another test pilot setting a new speed record or a new bomber making a longer-range endurance flight. The deeds of individual men are daily growing less meaningful as the men of aviation continually stretch the boundaries of speed and altitude even further.

However, there is one lone man who stands head and shoulders above the brave legions of flying men that now fly in his wake. Nearly twenty-nine years later, the incredible daring of Lindbergh's flight still remains an inspiration in the slip-stream of aerial achievement. As a legendary and genuine hero, Lindbergh's daring will never be forgotten.

No American, before or since, has ever received the overwhelming reception accorded to "Lindy" when thirty-three and one-half hours after his foggy take-off from New York, he landed his small Ryan airplane amidst the glaring searchlights of Le Bourget Airport in Paris, and blinking his eyes to stay awake, stepped out of the plane to be greeted by cheering, frenzied thousands of French onlookers. The news was soon flashed around the world that this shy flier had just done the impossible. For the first time in history, man had successfully flown across the Atlantic Ocean.

The "Spirit of St. Louis" flies again, this time with actor Jimmy Stewart at the controls, in the forthcoming motion picture about Lindbergh's historic flight. Based on Lindbergh's own personal narrative, Warner Brothers has just completed filming a completely authentic re-creation of every detail concerning Lindbergh's venture across the ocean in 1927.

After being beseeched by a score of actors who claimed they looked just like Lindbergh, it was decided to cast Jimmy Stewart in the much-sought-after role. There is actually a striking resemblance between Lindbergh and Stewart. Both men tower over six-foot-two in size. The only recipe needed was to dye Stewart's hair to a blonde shade to make the picture of the lanky flier come to life on the screen. Before starting his new role, Stewart looked at 50,000 feet of newsreel film of Charles Lindbergh so he could interpret the true character of "Lindy.

Stewart is not exactly a newcomer to aviation, since he himself has been a pilot for many years.

In 1940, foreseeing that the U. S. would soon be dragged into the war, James Stewart gave up his very successful movie career to enlist as an Aviation Cadet in the U. S. Army Air Corps. Cadet Stewart won his wings and a Second Lieutenant's commission just a few months before Pearl Harbor was attacked. Assigned to the Eighth Air Force in England, Stewart flew B-17 "Fortresses" on more than 35 bombing missions against the enemy.

He was decorated with the Distinguished Flying Cross for his bravery in action, and also was awarded the Air Medal with Oak Leaf clusters. By 1944, Stewart was promoted to the rank of full Colonel in command of an entire bomber group that helped cripple the Nazi defense with heavy daylight bombing attacks, thus hastening the final victory for the Allies.

During the preparation of the motion picture, the producers were in constant communication with Lindbergh. They talked to him literally hundreds of times by long distance phone—assuring themselves and Warner Brothers that many "Spirit of St. Louis" had been taken in the making of the movie.

During the preparation of the motion picture, the producers were in constant communication with Lindbergh. They talked to him literally hundreds of times by long distance phone—assuring themselves and the public that every detail had been accurately represented.
of an accurate account of his memorable feat.

It was of great importance that film duplicates be built of the famous little airplane that is on display permanently in Washington's Smithsonian Institution. To avoid the frightening possibility of a crashup, three precise duplicates of the "Spirit of St. Louis" were constructed, and two of them were before the cameras at the same time flying at different locales shown in the movie.

During the flying sequences, James Stewart spent two and a half times as many hours in the cockpit of the "Spirit of St. Louis" as Lindbergh did in actually making the flight. The star estimated he was in the plane a total of 80 hours. As recorded by history, Lindbergh flew the Atlantic in thirty-three and one-half hours.

The route of Lindbergh's flight was retaken by the camera crews. This included the myriad problems of transporting and housing planes, equipment and personnel over half the globe. Since hardly an airfield exists today as it was twenty-nine years ago, it was compulsory to re-create the fields where Lindbergh landed. The rebuilding of Le Bourget was done under the supervision of a French art director and his assistants, and it was here that seven thousand French extras were assembled for a week's shooting. It took over 100 buses to transport them daily back and forth to Paris.

During the filming in Hollywood, Lindbergh was a pleased and interested spectator on the set. A hushed silence fell over the entire troupe one day when Lindbergh himself climbed into the cockpit of the film's "Spirit of St. Louis" replica, and settling back into the strange little wicker seat, reached out and quietly made a small adjustment on one of the instrument panel dials.

Warners Brothers plans to premiere the "Spirit of St. Louis" in both New York and Paris at the same time. The Cinemascope production in color will portray to millions the strength of one man's determination which helped to shape the future of the world.

In just a few short hours, Lindbergh did more to cement a common bond of pride and understanding between nations of the world than ten years of diplomatic conferences would have accomplished. His heroic deed was another proof to the world of the worth of individual imagination and initiative.

END
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Upon landing at Le Bourget airrome on the outskirts of Paris, after being the first man to fly successfully over the Atlantic alone, Jimmy Stewart as the shy Lindberg is mobbed by a crowd of frenzied, cheering French spectators.

A small knot of spectators gather in the foggy dawn to witness Lindbergh's takeoff from Roosevelt Field, New York, on May 20, 1927. The scene is from Warner Brothers' Cinemascope technicolor production of "The Spirit of St. Louis."

First American woman aviator, Mrs. Blanche Stuart Scott, talks over early flying days with James Stewart on the "Spirit of St. Louis" location at Santa Maria, California. Mrs. Scott, now 63, first flew a plane in 1910, and kept on flying until a year ago.
ON THE ECONOMIC FRONT...

1956—"an Excellent Year"

The Honorable Sinclair Weeks, United States Secretary of Commerce, gives his authoritative opinions on various phases of the national economy which fall under his jurisdiction.

SECRETARY of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, who had earlier served a short term in the United States Senate from Massachusetts, brought wide experience in manufacturing, business, banking, and public service to the Cabinet post which he assumed in January, 1953.

On the Facts Forum radio program, Topic of the Week, Secretary Weeks was recently interviewed by Mr. Lyle Wilson, Chief of Bureau of the United Press, Ernest K. Lindley, Director of the Washington Bureau of Newsweek magazine, and Robert F. Hurleigh, news analyst and commentator, who served as moderator.

Q: Mr. Secretary, the spokesman for the Airlines Pilot Association says that his association believes that the Grand Canyon air disaster shows the need for an air safety board independent of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Doesn't a crash such as the double crash occurring over the Grand Canyon indicate that further action is necessary? Has this necessity for a complete air traffic control been actively investigated?

A: This last crash has not changed the pattern of air travel, although such a crash as this one obviously bothers everyone who has to do with air navigation and safety. We are pressing forward continually, and air traffic control is under continual investigation and study. We submitted, six or eight months ago, a $250 million program to improve air navigational aids and facilities. Sooner or later, when this jet age which is not very far away is upon us, we are going to have to do things a lot differently. At present half of the flying is military and half is commercial, which creates problems between the two departments directly concerned.

Q: What kind of economic weather are you forecasting for the election period this fall?

A: I stick with my previous statements that this is going to be an excellent year — probably a little better than last year.

Q: How much of America's prosperity under President Eisenhower is supported by defense spending dollars?

A: Less and less. On the average I would say between $10 billion and $15 billion less expenditures in that area than when this Administration came into office. It is probably more nearly $10 billion less than $15 billion less. In the meantime consumer expenditures have increased very much more than the drop-off in defense expenditures.

Q: Are you critical of the federal reserve system for restricting credit to the extent it has?

A: I was one of those who thought that their action in the last raise, which I believe was last April, was a little premature. There were forces in play that would have straightened things around without such action. In my opinion it had some effect in shortening the supply of money. However, when they started in June to operate in the market, it helped, and today I believe it is in much better shape.

Q: Do you feel that consumer credit should be left specifically uncontrolled to the extent it has been in recent years so that we have this heavy load of consumer debt building up in various lines? Don't these terms sometimes have an unfortunate effect on the whole economy as well as upon the people who buy too much?

A: I am one of those who believe basically that the government should not regulate every facet and aspect of our lives. I have opposed getting back into controls of any sort. On the other hand, I have continually
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INTRODUCTION

This month, Facts Forum News "beams."

First, it beams the spotlight of truth on our world, troubled just now with the terrors of communism.

Next, it beams a friendly spotlight toward all fourteen- to eighteen-year-old readers, each of whom is a potential prize-winner in the essay contest being sponsored by Facts Forum News.

It also beams with satisfaction because this presentation of a text for young people is so crisp and new. The book will be released by the publisher on or about October 31, 1956. Students, parents, and teachers will enjoy having these vitally important facts revealed in a way that is easy to read, easy to understand, easy to remember.

Communism in Our World is closely linked with Know Your Enemy, which follows it. The study of both should provide a well-rounded picture of the menace of communism.
The purpose of this book is to find out what communism is, why it is dangerous to all peace-loving people, and why it is especially a threat to America. We shall find out not only what communism is, but how it operates. How and when did it begin? Why, in little more than ten years, has it spread to nearly a third of the world's surface? What is our government doing to stop its march? What can we, as American citizens, do?

Today, more than one million American servicemen are stationed in forty-nine different countries. The United States maintains eighty-nine air bases, in Europe, Asia, Africa, even in the Arctic. In thirty-four countries groups of American soldiers are stationed to train the fighting forces of those nations. Years after the coming of "peace," our country is still drafting young men for military service. It is expected that the draft will continue for several, perhaps many, years to come.

All or parts of fifteen nations lie within the empire of communism. Nine hundred million people, 34 per cent of the world's population, live in those countries. It is the tension caused by this division of nations that leads the United States to spend so much to stay strong. As nations and people have fallen to communism, millions of innocent men and women have lost their lives. More millions have been made hungry or desperately unhappy. The leaders of communism have stated that they will not be satisfied until they control all the world.

The United States is the only nation powerful enough to stand in the way of a Communist-dominated world. It has, therefore, become the special target of the Communists. This has forced America to spend billions for defense in a time of supposed peace. At home we must be constantly on guard also. For the Communists have conquered many people by what we call subversion, as well as by outright attack.

Communism is [in theory] a system under which everybody has an equal share in factories, farms, stores. As it has turned out, people in those countries do not share alike, and are not in any way equal. Instead of being systems of government under which there is equality and sharing of all things, the Communist countries have become lands of oppression.

Karl Marx called this new order "the dictatorship of the proletariat." The Communists often use this phrase. It means a government dictated and run by the common people. At the same time, Communists stress that the government must be led by the very few who are Party members.

Russia was the most backward of all the great European nations. The czars were rich, powerful, and cruel. They ruled by means of a huge army and police force. Workers and farmers of Russia had few rights, were barely able to make a living. Reforms came slowly in Russia.

During World War I, Russia suffered many casualties. Near the end of the war, conditions became unbearable. Hundreds of thousands of people were starving. Sickness swept the land. The Russians what rebelled. The army, sick of fighting, refused to obey the Czar.

On March 15, 1917, the Czar was forced to abdicate. Russia became a free and independent nation. Thousands of patriotic Russians made the revolution possible. They wanted a democratic government like [that of] the United States. As soon as the Czar was overthrown, plans were made for free elections and democratic government.

Unfortunately, there was no discipline, no planning, no one to take over and see that order was maintained. That is, there was no one, or no political party, with plans as well organized as [those of] the followers of Karl Marx. There were only a few thousand of these in Russia but, as has happened in many other countries since, they were able to take control. With Lenin and Trotsky as leaders, the Communists (as they began to call themselves) had control of Russia within a few months.

Democratic government was overthrown. The new rulers quickly abolished freedom of the press. Leaders of all other political parties were arrested. People suffered terror worse than any experienced under the czars.

"The Communists ruthlessly wiped out people who opposed them. Both army and navy rebelled. But the Communist organization, with the help of its secret police (the Cheka), and with its own army, was able to defeat its enemies. Always, terror and secret police are an important part of Communist strategy."

In early 1921, Lenin's program had succeeded; Communists were in complete control of Russia. This does not mean that they had the support of the people. Many people hated their new rulers as they [had] hated the czars.

Our criticism of communism should not be directed at the common people. Many, perhaps most, of the people in Communist nations desire a different type of government. Certainly most of them have been caught in the Communist net.

Officially Russia is called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, shortened to USSR. The name suggests that the Russian system is somewhat like our own, in the United States. There are a number of republics in the Russian union, just as there are forty-eight states in the American union.

The "if" of the [Soviet] constitution is the statement that
the citizen's rights can be exercised only in the interests of the working people and "to strengthen the Socialist system." Think what life in the United States would be if our constitution gave every citizen the right to live as he wished, to work, worship, speak, and read freely, "as long as nothing he does interferes with the welfare of the Democratic or the Republican Party."

The Communist government has the right to decide whether a person's activities are in the interests of the "working class." Remember, it is a part of the Communist theory that a few people at the top shall make decisions. And the people at the top have a powerful weapon to enforce their decisions: Any person considered socially dangerous can be exiled even if he has been tried for a crime and acquitted.

All the supposed rights of the Communist citizen can be taken away at a moment's notice. For there is a big "if" in the Communist-style constitution.

You will remember that the early Communists used the secret police to gain control of Russia. The secret police has remained powerful. Originally called the Cheka, it has had various names. But the purpose is always the same — to keep track of every Russian citizen so that he will "stay in line."

There are only between six million and seven million Communist Party members among the more than 200 million people of Russia. The secret police helps accomplish what a small political party itself cannot accomplish. No one but the highest officials in the Russian government knows how many men and women are employed in the secret police. It is known that there are secret police in every army unit, factory, and school. It is their job to listen in on conversations, to read people's mail, to find out what books and magazines are being read, and if Russians are listening to radio broadcasts from foreign countries.

The secret police have even been helped by children. Since communism teaches that one's first obligation is to the Communist government and not to his family, there have been frequent cases of children denouncing their parents to the police.

At least 25 million people have been sentenced to slave labor. We cannot know how many are actually now in the camps. Estimates run from five million to 25 million. Working often in the bitter cold of Siberia, sometimes within the Arctic Circle, thousands of men and women have died for lack of food and medical attention, or because of brutal treatment. Slave laborers have been used to build great new air bases, to dig canals, to mine copper, gold, and uranium. Most of them are not guilty of criminal offenses. They have only been guilty of failure to agree with the Communist government. Perhaps the offense has been nothing more than a conversation overheard and reported to the police. There has been great material progress in Russia, much of it made possible by slave labor.

Robert Kennedy, Chief Counsel of U. S. Senate Investigations Subcommittee, says: "Sections of the population were banished or liquidated to achieve the domination of the State. The breaking down of family life is effectively carried out by mothers working for the State and depositing their babies in State nurseries, later in Pioneer camps and orphanages."

This is the way the people are bred to a life of submission. The Moscow girl is the daughter of the Moscow police officer. Even the children from the best homes want uniformity, and are trained to be loyal to the State. They are taught by the State how to appreciate it, how to hate the Communists, who destroyed their homes, their herds, their means of livelihood.

In Moscow, customers wait for melons, in short supply at a fruit and vegetable store. Lines of would-be buyers of many items which are plentiful in America, often extend half a block, three deep, in any Russian city.
and, ultimately, in the Young Communist League."

The secret police have developed methods of operation unknown in civilised countries. Communists believe that a terror-stricken people can be easily managed. So from time to time the police make arrests, or haul people off for questioning. Generally they act late at night. "The knock on the door at night" has come to millions of people in Communist-ruled nations. At two or three o'clock in the morning there is a sudden knock. The husband or wife is given barely time to get dressed. There is no warrant for arrest; no explanations are given. Sometimes the person is questioned briefly, then sent home; or, there may be hours of questioning and torture. Sometimes, the person simply disappears — his family never hears from him again.

The secret police have developed many torture methods, among them the mental torture we call brainwashing.

It is clear that rights granted by a Communist-style constitution do not mean much. It can be understood, too, why nearly 100 per cent of the people in Russia vote for the Communist Party. Not only are they afraid not to; there is only one candidate for each office. The candidate, national or local, is selected by the Party.

The vote of a Russian citizen means nothing because there is no choice. This lack of choice is one of the most important differences between Communist-style democracy and real democracy.

Normally, a Russian cannot quit a job of his own accord. The penalty can be a sentence of ten years at slave labor. A Russian boy can be drafted for labor at the age of fourteen. Each year, between 500,000 and 1,000,000 boys and girls are drafted into jobs. If the young Russian worker is absent for as much as twenty minutes, he may be transferred to a lower-paying job. He cannot strike. To do so might bring a death sentence.

Visitors to Russia report that it is a common sight to see long lines of people in front of stores, waiting for a chance to buy things. Although there is no actual rationing, the effect is the same. The government controls housing and food distribution, and can favor people who cooperate with the government. Always the government has the power to starve people.

**Life Is Harsh in the USSR**

Communists frequently boast that they have given their people a better life than that of workers in America. But Americans receive better pay, are better housed and fed, and work shorter hours than the people of Russia. More important, Americans need not fear secret police. With all the good things of life, we enjoy freedom that is unknown in any Communist country.

There is a greater difference between classes in Communist countries than in most other countries. Members of the Communist Party, high government officials, the secret police, and some skilled engineers enjoy luxuries unknown to the common people.

In Russia, millions of farmers have been forced into collective farms. A collective farm is a large operation, with all the land, buildings, and equipment belonging to the government. The Russian farmer, like the Russian worker, is controlled by the State. Without any right to his farm, the Russian peasant has little initiative. While farming methods have improved in most of the world, Russian farming is still inefficient.

The Russian constitution guarantees freedom of worship. But since the beginning of the Communist move-
Maps in geography books are usually done in colors, but here is a world map without colors. You may find it very interesting to color this map for yourself. This is the way to do it:

Red is for the Communist nations, which are: Russia, Communist China, East Germany, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, North Vietnam, Hungary, Yugoslavia.

Blue is for the anti-Communist nations, which are: The United States of America, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, France, Italy, Spain, West Germany, Nationalist China (Formosa), South Korea, Japan, Greece, Turkey.
Yellow is for the neutral nations: India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon.
Keep your map for future reference. Those other countries, which you are
now leaving white, may assume one of the three colors, as time goes on. It
certainly is to be hoped that you may not have to use the red pencil again, but
time will tell what policies the various nations adopt. It will be fun to keep this
up to date. Color Mediterranean, Red, Black, and Caspian Seas pale blue.
Reprints of this map, on paper better suited to pencil coloring, may be ordered
from Facts Forum News at the following rates: single copy, 5c; 50 copies, $1.50;
100 copies, $2.50, postpaid.
of course, visit other countries. But for the average citizen travel just for pleasure is impossible. People do get vacations. In all Communist countries there are "work quotas." If a worker goes over his quota by working overtime, he becomes a hero; he may get a free trip to a rest camp. But for the average worker or farmer there is nothing to break the monotony of hard work. There are experts who claim that Russians are no better off than when under the czars.

The Communists must conquer all the world if their way of life is to succeed.

The Communist plan for world conquest is not new. It was announced in 1919 when Communist leaders from all over the world met in Moscow. The aim of world communism has not changed since that time. The United States, richest and most powerful of the free nations, is the greatest enemy of the Communists. Before they can realize their goal of a World Soviet Republic, the United States must be destroyed. Over and over again, Communist leaders have made this clear. And so we cannot say, "Let the Communists run their part of the world; if some people want to live under the Communists, that's their business." As long as world domination is a Communist aim, communism has to be our business, too.

We call the Communist nations of Europe, outside Russia, satellites. All are actually governed by Russia, through her army and her vast secret-police network.

The Communists have another powerful weapon. The Russian-directed spy network is the largest in the world. It is estimated that there are 250,000 Communist agents at work. These men and women are helped by another 750,000 people. Many of these are called fellow-travelers. They are in every country. They know how to blow up railways, bridges, and factories. There is a special school in Moscow which trains agents in methods of murdering, in how to get false confessions from innocent people. Still other agents are trained in blackmail.

Along with the spies and agents, there is a powerful propaganda movement directed from Moscow [and radiating out all over the world]. Communists are especially anxious to win converts among young people. Special magazines and books are provided for high school and college students. Communist cells are organized in schools.

ED.'s NOTE: Russia's Universities of Revolution, the featured article in Facts Forum News, September, 1955, is well worth consulting.

Ivan lives and works on a collective farm in Soviet Russia. The State owns the land, the buildings, the livestock, the machinery, and gets most of the produce and the profits. Conditions are very hard, very discouraging. Ivan's outlook is a futile one, compared to that of our Future Farmers and 4-H boys.

Brainwashing is a method of making people lose faith in their beliefs, their religious convictions, their country. Sometimes physical torture is used. Frequently prisoners of the Communists are beaten and tortured for months, until they agree to sign confessions, or to cooperate. Often the torture is mental.

After days or months, the prisoner is weak from insufficient food. He has had no real sleep. He has been constantly threatened. Over and over again his captors have accused him of things he did not do. In his exhausted, starved condition, he begins to believe some of the things he is told. Or, just because he cannot possibly stand any more brainwashing, he signs a false confession.

Brainwashing takes many forms. The Communists first find out all about their prisoner. He is forced to write a long biography. From this they decide on his weaknesses, how best to break his mind and will.
Among hundreds of American soldiers captured in Korea by the Communists, some were thoroughly brain-washed. Some cooperated with the Communists in prison camps. Others refused to become traitors even after months of torture and brainwashing.

Since 1945, when communism became a constant threat to world peace, the United States has spent approximately $200 billion to defend itself and other free nations against Russia and China. American dollars do not necessarily stop the Communists. In addition, the United States has led the free world into mutual defense treaties and organizations.

Unless people want to be free, no amount of help can keep them free. In order to understand and want freedom, people everywhere need to understand communism.

America’s greatest defense against communism is education. It is largely because many did not understand Communist aims that much of the world is under Communist rule. The enemy we face does not play by rules. He is ruthless and scheming, makes promises that are not kept. Broken Communist promises have changed the lives of many people, even changed the maps of the world.

Because of communism the United States was involved in the Korean war, and must continue to spend billions of dollars for defense.

Many American soldiers knew so little about the United States, its ideals and traditions, that they could not answer arguments in favor of communism. They knew so little about their America!

But American history is not dull. It is a thrilling story of a great experiment that succeeded. Every American must know and understand that story. In so doing we can keep ourselves free, and give faith and hope to those who are not free.

END

Brainwashing: Here the artist, E. H. Gun­der, portrays the spirit of a man of strong faith and character deter­mined to resist the boring eyes and psychological pres­sure of the brain­washers. Soldiers and civilians captured in the Korean war got “full treatment” in brainwashing from Chinese Communists, who were trained and assisted by Rus­sian Soviet officers.
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On Guard, America!

Excerpts from an address by
of West Virginia

The Heart of Our Defense

Excerpts from an address by
Dean Clarence Manion

The organization against America never advertises itself as such. This pernicious wolf has a whole wardrobe of sheep’s clothing. At one time it may be disguised as a great instrument for the establishment of international peace and the brotherhood of man. On another occasion it may masquerade as the champion of civil liberties. At other times it has been known to wear the garb even of anti-communism.

But wherever it is and whatever it wears and whatever it does, you will see it avidly pursuing its purpose to destroy American independence by the establishment of world government; to destroy our economic system and our solvency by the destruction of the profit motive and the confiscation of our resources through taxation; but finally and foremost you will see that organization against America, behind its patriotic beguiling mask, striving to destroy the Constitution of the United States.

That is the target — that is its purpose; because these people well know what we have forgotten or refuse to recognize — that as long as the Constitution of this country is properly construed and militantly enforced, the organization against America is helpless.

Where government is limited, and where the limitations of that government are enforced, men are free; where government is unlimited and illimitable, men are slaves. It’s as simple as that. Over a third of the people in the world are enslaved by a thing we call communism, which is merely unlimited government on the loose.

Communism can attain no permanent victory anywhere on earth as long as the United States is free, nationally independent, solvent, and governed by the Constitution of this country.
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**INTRODUCTION**

General Donovan, who founded and directed our first national foreign Intelligence service, says of this book: "It should be read by every citizen. All high school students especially should read it in order to prepare to meet danger which will challenge their future. Against such a foe we must exercise sustained effort, perhaps for many years."

Delia Mares, a Texas teacher, gifted author of this book, describes Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, the three "architects" of revolutionary communism. Above, you see the three present-day builders who are completing the edifice.

This second book condensation brings piercing realization of an enemy dedicated to world conquest. It will be of value to readers both young and mature, and especially to students who seek background material for the Facts Forum News essay contest. As a companion piece to Communism in Our World, it covers somewhat different phases of the same general subject.
PART I: MARX (1818-1883)

Men have always been troubled by extremes of rich and poor, and have tried setting up communities where property was owned in common. These groups were called "communes," and the common ownership of property was called "communism." The word and the idea were familiar to German thinkers of the mid-nineteenth century — among them, Karl Marx.

Marx proposed a totally different form, which he called "scientific" communism. He supposed he was basing it on scientific principles. What interested Marx, however, was not so much how communism was to be worked out in practical life, as how it was to be forced upon the entire world. His emphasis was on revolution. Marx was the principal philosopher of communism.

He was born in the German Rhineland of a well-educated Jewish family which had become Christian; his father was a lawyer. From his teens Karl was determined to give his life to helping his fellowmen. Expelled from Prussia in 1849, he took refuge in England, where he lived and wrote freely for the rest of his life. A professor without a classroom, he made very little money, but depended on others for help — first on his wife's family, then on his friend and co-worker, Engels. The latter was the son of a wealthy manufacturer. Profits from the factory supported Engels and the Marx family for many years.

The nineteenth-century world in which Marx lived differed in two outstanding respects from the world of modern Americans: (1) Society was divided by sharp lines of wealth and rank; (2) The German philosopher Hegel had worked out a pattern for human history which influenced certain thinkers.

Marx found the following historical pattern entirely convincing: (1) Thesis — Every movement in history proceeds uninterrupted along its course until it is challenged by: (2) Antithesis, an opposite movement which has been developing within or beside the first movement. These two clash. After a struggle, there emerges: (3) Synthesis, which is neither the first nor the second, but a combination of the (so-called) best features of both.*

Hegel and later Marx believed that history could be explained in terms of Thesis, Antithesis, and Synthesis. They called this process the dialectic. To this day, every Communist shares that rigid view of history; propagandists for Soviet Russia refer to it frequently. Historians and philosophers of the free world do not believe in any such fixed pattern. The idea does appeal to people who want a mathematical explanation for non-mathematical problems. Marx was a student of mathematics. He applied the formula to human situations.

Marx's view of history, therefore, grew out of Europe's class society and Hegel's dialectic. Americans should understand it, because the Communist program of world revolution is built on Marxism. Marx explains history thus:

The past was formed by the efforts of various classes to get economic power and keep it. First a small group in the community obtains control (the nobility). Then a group immediately below them (the productive middle-class, called the bourgeoisie) becomes strong enough to overthrow the nobility in a violent struggle (class war). Having gained power, this group in turn becomes oppressors and must, in turn, be overthrown by the next class below (the working class or proletariat). According to Marx, only an uprising of the working class would force the bourgeoisie to give up the power taken from the nobility. He held that everything men do or think is determined by what class they belong to, and the interests of that class.

Government, he thought, is simply the tool of the ruling class, and private property the root of all evil. This view led Marx to regard all capitalists as grasping, selfish individuals who would wring every penny out of their wretched workers while — he thought — the working class, not having the temptations of property, would remain entirely virtuous.

To Americans who do not think in class terms, and who realize that all men have both good and bad within them, this Marxist — and Communist — view will seem ridiculous. But it has an appeal to many people in other parts of the world, made bitter by poverty and suffering.

The name given to Marx's interpretation of man is "materialism," because he claimed that men acted chiefly according to their material interests. He combined Hegel's "dialectic" with his own "materialism" to form the framework of communism: "dialectical materialism."**

In the educational system of Russia, dialectical materialism has taken the place of Christianity (and all other creeds) as a religious faith.

In 1848, Marx and Engels had written the Communist Manifesto, a flaming summons to the proletariat to proclaim a world revolution, or forcible overthrow of the whole existing world. They said: "Proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to gain. Proletarians of all lands, unite!"

*ED.'s NOTE: You may find it interesting and helpful to compare this explanation with another, which you will find under the word "Contradictions," from The Language of Communism, on page 50 of Facts Forum News, July, 1956.

**ED.'s NOTE: If you will take the trouble to study and to memorize these few important words: thesis, antithesis, synthesis, dialectical materialism, bourgeoisie, and dictatorship of the proletariat, you will gain a basic understanding of Marxism, which will place you ahead of many adults in a knowledge of communism's sources.
Who would actually run government and business after the world was won, was a question Marx never troubled to answer. His failure to do so had enormous consequences.

When millions of people in the world today accept Marx's ideas as gospel, it is essential that Americans examine them critically. As an American sees it, the very basis of Marx's call to revolution simply does not exist.

Capitalism,* Marx said, must eventually destroy itself. To us, capitalism means opportunity, competition, a complex pattern of society in which wages, prices, and profits shift constantly, depending on the interplay of unions, consumers, managers, owners, and government.

The most telling argument against Marxism is found in the Communist governments which claim to be founded on it. In Russia and her satellites, Marx's "kingdom of freedom" is a slave state.

**PART II: LENIN (1870-1924)**

Russia in the nineteenth century was still an absolute monarchy. Not until 1861 was the custom of serfdom as in the Middle Ages abandoned in Russia. Over both nobility and peasants the Czar had the power of life or death. There were no laws or constitutions to check his power, and how cruelly he used it depended on the personality and whim of the particular czar. Secret police, confessions forced under torture, exile in Siberia, and death blotted out the few brave men who demanded reform.

Written language in Russia is only a thousand years old. Language differences cut Russians off from the stimulating and vigorous life of the rest of Europe. Three hundred years after the English nobles had won important rights for themselves and all Englishmen in the Magna Carta, the Russian Czar, Ivan the Terrible, could display his power to a visiting Englishman by ordering one of his courtiers to jump to certain death. Efforts of Peter the Great to bring western discoveries and ideas to Russia resulted in new industries and a great new city, St. Petersburg (now Leningrad), but did not bring individual freedom or checks on the absolute power of the czars.

Marx had not expected Russia to take the lead in class war. Like many Germans, he regarded the Slavic Russians as his inferiors. During Marx's lifetime Russia was still in the agricultural Middle Ages. Marx was greatly surprised that his book, Das Kapital, was translated into Russian in 1868, even before it was put into English. Russian reformers, blocked on every side by the czars' tyranny and the peasants' ignorance, had begun to read Marx.

Among Marx's eager Russian readers was the son of a school inspector in a town on the Volga River. Although not of the nobility, the Ulyanov family were well educated and, like many educated Russians of the nineteenth century, were interested in bettering the lives of the people. The son Vladimir (known as Lenin) studied Marx and became convinced that class war was the only way Russia could be freed from the evils of czarism. His belief in Marx became his religion.

Lenin's first problem was to work out a revolutionary program to fit Russia and eventually the world. In his pamphlet, What Is To Be Done? (1902), he described the organization of a small, carefully-selected, disciplined, and secret group of men determined to overthrow the government in power, and set up a Marxist State.

Lenin saw the need of strong central authority. Each member must obey without question orders received from above. Only one or two at the top would know all the plans. This made the men at the top very powerful since they were not answerable even to their own associates. So began Lenin's Bolshevik Party — called Communist after 1917.

When the First Russian Revolution took place, in 1905, Lenin was in Switzerland. Soldiers, sailors, peasants, workers, educated men and women, even some of the nobility took part. For over a year they seemed successful. Then the Czar regained control and most of the reforms were lost. Lenin was more than ever determined to perfect his secret party.

The Revolution which broke out in Russia in 1917 was not a Marxist revolution. Three years of defeat in World War I had destroyed the people's faith in czarist government. The government collapsed. A group of nobles, professors, men of moderate views, hoped to change Russia into a democracy. But Lenin had not changed his Marxist plans.

Lenin was in Switzerland, on fire to go to Russia; but the new government knew his views and was not anxious to have him return. The German government arranged his passage in a sealed train across Germany back to Russia. From the moment of his arrival, in April, 1917, Lenin worked to bring about the Marxist class revolution. He organized the Politburo of six men to direct the Communist Party in seizing and governing Russia. They seized control on November 7, 1917. The Communist Party has controlled Russia ever since.

Lenin became Premier of the Soviet Government, Stalin the Commissar for Nationalities (non-Russian peoples like Finns, Ukrainians, Georgians, the Asians of Siberia). The new rulers knew everything about how to make revolutions, nothing about how to run a government. But they had complete faith in Marxism as an explanation for everything. They were sure that the "toiling masses of workers" everywhere would follow their example, overthrow all
capitalist governments, and unite with Communist Russia.

To the inevitable cruelty of all revolutions, Marxism's teaching of class war added fury. The Reds hunted down and murdered the members of the former upper classes. There were counter-revolutions. A Communist secret police — the Cheka — was organized to deal with opposition.

**PART III: STALIN (1879-1953)**

Stalin came from the lowest class, the peasant serfs; he came from the most remote part of Russia, Georgia in the Caucasus; had the most limited education, and the fewest contacts with the western world beyond Russia. While others studied Marx, Stalin was promoting strikes, organizing riots, always working in secret. He had studied to be a priest, but left the seminary in 1898 to become a professional revolutionary.

In 1912 Lenin named him a member of the Central Committee of the (then) Bolshevik Party. He had just begun publishing his own paper, Pravda, in St. Petersburg, when the police tracked him down. He was banished to Siberia in 1913 and did not return until the outbreak of the Revolution in February, 1917.

It was Stalin's good fortune to return to the scene of action before Lenin arrived. Not being well known, he wisely contented himself with holding things together until Lenin's return. In the new government he started as Commissar of Nationalities, with only a table for an office. Gradually he gathered a staff. He announced that the principle of self-determination (of races and nations) did not apply to any save those who acknowledged Bolshevik leadership.

Stalin sided with Lenin in making peace with the Kaiser. They were willing to give up immediate plans for world revolution in order to save the Communist revolution in Russia.

In the fall of 1918 when World War I ended, revolutions broke out in Germany, Austria, and Hungary. The Communist International (Comintern) was hastily organized to direct what they mistakenly judged to be "world revolution." With the new name of Cominform, or Communist Information Bureau, this organization has continued to direct the Communist parties all over the world.

Trotsky had hoped to be Lenin's successor, but in the struggle against Stalin he was hopelessly outclassed. Trotsky was expelled from Russia in 1929; and Stalin's rule was unchallenged.

In accordance with Marxist doctrine, industrial workers in the cities became a favored class. But the government could not collect enough food for factory workers. If the many small farms could be collectivized into fewer large farms, farm machinery could be used to raise more crops. But the peasants did not want to be collectivized. (This was forcibly done.)

The Russian people had simply exchanged the dictatorship of the Czar for the dictatorship of the Communist Party, and under neither had they learned to overthrow a tyrant. Because of the backwardness of Russia, there had always been comparatively few men with ability and training for leadership. Possible leadership from the former upper classes was wiped out. Leadership among the revolutionaries was narrowed down to the extreme Communist group led by Lenin. When Stalin destroyed these in turn, an entire generation of the most intelligent and aggressive Russians had disappeared.

With all opposition silenced, Stalin felt free to make Russian life and thought the reflection of his personal preferences. He and the high government officials had better homes, better cars, better food, and uniforms and ceremonies to divide them sharply from the common people. Intellectual life was frozen.

When Stalin applied to the satellite countries his techniques of exterminating leadership, destroying personal freedom, and collectivizing farms and factories, he wrecked in a few years the slow flowering of centuries.

Today, the threat of Communist activity spreads into every nation of the free world. In the United States, the Communist Party has concentrated on infiltration and espionage. The alarming success of their spies shows that communism is an all-purpose weapon.

Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism today make Russian communism a threefold menace.
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Why should he? It is asking much to expect that the Indian shall so soon become a civilized man, and we should not forget that we are insisting that he shall accomplish in a generation a measure of advancement which it took our own race some thousands of years to attain. Among the many tribes which are now cared for by the government, there are different degrees of progress. Some are as untutored today as they were twenty years ago; others, who have had their well-being looked after and who have had more intelligent guidance, have made long strides toward self-support.

This sounds modern, doesn't it? Yet it has been fifty-seven years since Grinnell made the above statements. He said, further:

While marked improvement has taken place in the Indian service of late years, the same old methods, long known to be inefficient, are still practiced in caring for them. ... Until men employed in the field service of the Indian Bureau shall be sufficiently intelligent to understand the mental attitude of the Indian and sufficiently interested to give special attention to this, his advancement must necessarily be slow. ... There is probably not an Indian tribe in the United States which could not, under the direction of the right kind of men and with proper educational advantages, become entirely self-supporting within ten years.

Today, many people are saying that Grinnell was either mistaken in the intelligence of the Indians, or the right kind of men were not put into the Indian Service Bureau; for, after fifty-seven years, many of the Indian tribes are still not able to be entirely self-supporting.

Example of Injustice

On February 2, 1955, Ira Hayes, a Pima Indian, was buried in a hero's grave in Arlington Cemetery. He was one of the six marines who, more than ten years ago, raised the American flag on the island of Iwo Jima. Today, he lies near the great statue depicting that scene.

After the funeral the National Congress of American Indians gave a luncheon in honor of Hayes' parents. Mrs. Hayes made a little speech at the luncheon. With tears coursing down her cheeks, she said haltingly, "I give you my son." Then she told of how her son had wanted to be buried in Washington, where his statue was. She concluded by saying, "What Ira did, he did not only for the Indians, but for all people."

Hayes' frozen body was found January 24, on the Sacaton Reservation in Arizona. He had wandered from his home in southern Arizona, seeking vainly to find for himself a place in the white man's peacetime world. His fate is a reminder that not all Indians on reservations are prepared as yet to face the struggle which awaits them if and when Congress wills to deprive them of their tribal status.

Resolution Passed

House Congressional Resolution 108, passed August 1, 1953, by the 83rd Congress, states:

... It is the policy of Congress as rapidly as possible to make the Indians within the territorial limits of the United States subject to the same laws and entitled to the same privileges and responsibilities as are applicable to other citizens, ... upon the release of such (specified tribes), ... from such disabilities and limitations, all offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (in specified localities) should be abolished.

Public law 280, approved on August 15, 1953, substitutes its own civil and criminal code and enforcement machinery for the tribal codes and customs, and names five states in which such action is authorized at once, except for special tribes.

In neither of these measures is there any requirement that the Indians directly affected shall even be consulted, much less be asked to give their consent. Both violate the principle of consent approved by Congress in the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which has been in successful operation for twenty years.

It has been charged that one more violation of another act shouldn't seri­ously disturb the conscience of Congress, however — not after so many violations of agreements and treaties made with Indians. This is based on our treaty record, as stated by Frank Tom-Pee-Sau, a Cherokee from Parsons, Kansas. He told the League of North American Indians, at a meeting in Wickford, Rhode Island, that less than three per cent of the treaties made by the United States with Indian tribes have been honestly kept.

Since 1789, he said, Washington has ratified 389 treaties with 89 tribes, but has broken 97.4 per cent of them.

Many people are saying — both Indians and non-Indians — the harsh truth is that treaties of all kinds between tribes and nations usually last so long as it is to the advantage of the more powerful party to honor and observe it.

The two largest tribes for which termination was voted by the 83rd Congress, the Menominees and the Klamaths, have been meeting such difficulties in trying to plan for withdrawal of federal services within the period and according to the methods specified in their respective bills, that both tribes are discussing the possibility of having the bills amended. A bill postponing termination of the Menominees for two years has already been introduced in the House (H. R. 5992), and a second bill (H. R. 6118) would authorize payment by the federal government of the cost of certain studies needed to help the Menominees prepare for termination. No such legislation as yet has been introduced for the Klamaths.

Indian Attitudes

During the winter of 1955 Harold E. Fey, editor of The Christian Century, circled the western two-thirds of the United States, visiting the major areas of Indian life and talking with Indians and whites about what the future holds for the 400,000 descendants of the original Americans. Almost without exception he found Indian leaders full of foreboding. They recalled other, similar, periods, and remembered what had happened then. Moreover, the recent actions of Congress had filled them with alarm.

When Glenn L. Emmons, United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, visited the Northwest on January 21, 1955, the official representative of the numerous Indian tribes in that area presented him with a written statement. One sentence read: "Indian affairs are in a crisis more acute than any that has faced the Indian at any time."

Pressures affecting all Indians have reached their greatest intensity in the resource-rich Northwest. But, even in the Southwest, Indians are aware that they will not be spared. They must make common cause or be overwhelmed. Near the Canadian border...
a tribal chairman said that Indians are preparing to fight with all their might against present trends in Washington — trends which reflect the attitudes of average Americans in all parts of the country. He said that until recently his people believed “they would do better simply to throw themselves on the mercy of the government.” Now, however, the results of such a philosophy have convinced them that the government “has no mercy.”

Most people will agree that the white man has largely bungled in his relations with the Indian. Almost everything has been tried during the past three centuries of association with this race. European invaders tried enslavement, and that failed. Others tried to divide and rule, and that did not accomplish the desired results.

From time to time there were local attempts at extermination. These did not succeed, although they came closer than many think. Missionaries and others tried to make the Indian over in their own image, without any lasting success. The policy followed by our government with most persistence has been to isolate the Indian, first in under-developed parts of the country, and then on reservations. But that has not worked, either.

Since the beginning of this century, the government has spent more than a billion dollars to improve the economic condition of this minority. The simple, materialistic faith that filling stomachs solves all other problems, which seems to underlie our policy toward under-developed countries threatened with communism, has not solved our relations with the Indian. The only policy we have not tried consistently, determinedly, and on a large scale is the policy of study of the Indian heritage, respect for the Indian as individuals, and for social groupings as essential to his way of life.

Klamath Indians "Terminated"

A law that may well become a classic example of legislative frustration is Public Law 587, passed by the second session of the 83rd Congress and signed by President Eisenhower on August 13, 1953. It is one of six laws providing for termination of federal supervision. On August 13, 1958, unless the law is changed, the government will give up all responsibility for supervision over the trust and restricted property of the Klamath Indians.

Oregon, will move out of its own building on the reservation, and will end all federal services furnished this tribe “because of their status as Indians.”

The assets of the Klamath Indian tribe consist of nearly a million acres of timber and grazing land. An Indian Bureau forester said that lumber from three trees of the size common there would be sufficient to build an ordinary two-bedroom house. He said that the Indian Bureau forestry service has managed Klamath forests for many years. Since 1913 its harvest of trees has been over four billion board feet of lumber from this reservation; yet the Klamath forest now has trees still standing sufficient to make that much lumber. This forest could continue producing lumber indefinitely if proper management were continued. The forester was unable to tell what would happen if the tribal assets were divided. Those people who are in a position to know realize that if the Klamath forest is slashed, as others have been, it may become another eroded wilderness, subjected to fires, droughts, and floods — thus shorn of productivity for at least 100 years.

What will this transition mean to the people of the Klamath tribe? Public Law 587 asks the Secretary of the Interior to appoint three "qualified management specialists" to guide their transition. The law requires these management specialists to appraise the Klamath assets within a year. When this appraisal has been made, the adult members of the tribe, who number about 1,000, are to be told what it reveals, and each is to be given his opportunity to "withdraw from the tribe and have his interests in tribal property converted into money and paid to him; or, he may remain in the tribe and participate in a tribal management plan, through a trustee corporation. The decision is irrevocable —

The responsibility which Public Law 587 imposes on each adult of the Klamath tribe is truly a formidable one. It is not surprising that the tribe is split and a bitter contest raging between the advocates of withdrawal and those wishing to maintain tribal status. The latter contend that they never favored the action taken by Congress, but that they were maneuvered into a position where they were misunderstood.

Members of the Klamath tribe who composed a delegation to Washington got the impression that the per capita payments they sought from tribal funds would not be forthcoming until they assented to Public Law 587. It is a fact that section seven of the law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to pay $250 to each member of the tribe as soon as practicable after the passage of this act. Per capita payments average about $800 per year now. Once they were larger.

Rolls Opened and Closed

When we recall that the assets of the tribe are estimated to be worth from $60 million to $100 million, and since the tribal roll determines who will get individual shares estimated to be worth $25,000 to $45,000 each, we can understand why the enrollment committee for the tribe was so confused when trying to determine just who was a Klamath. The rolls had been opened and closed so many times in the past that the task was complicated. People came long distances to plead that they or their children should be given places on the tribal roster. Many of them were white, living in cities, and seemed to have no characteristics which could be identified as Indian. Congress has never defined who is an Indian. When the roll
was finally closed, there were 2,070 names on it. Those opposed to termination of government supervision say that Congress could extend the time of termination if it chose. And, by so doing, it might avoid a very serious injustice to many people, and might avert a claim by Klamath survivors in court—a claim that could go against the government, as many recent Indian claims have done, and compel the nation to restore to these survivors their land and every cent of funds that will soon be scattered to the winds. Damages totaling more than $80 million have been awarded to Indians, and it has been charged that if Congress is indifferent to claims of justice, it should at least consider whether the nation can afford such acts.

The Pima Fight for Water

When Z. S. Cox, a young attorney, was asked to address a gathering of Protestant Church women in his native city of Phoenix, Arizona, he decided to talk about his clients, the Pima tribe of Indians. He told the group that the easiest way they could obey the Biblical injunction to love their neighbor would be to support an orphan in school or collect clothing for needy people far away. However, if they were really serious about loving their neighbors, said Cox, they could plunge into politics and work for justice for the Indians of their own state. He noted that several of Arizona's congressmen, sympathetic with Indians, had tried to legislate on Indian affairs. Mr. Cox pointed out, however, that such congressmen could not survive in politics unless they received votes, and the fact remained that most of the voters in Arizona are white people.

Mr. Cox admitted that it is far easier to hold a cake social to raise money so an Indian boy or girl can go to school, than it is to help the Indian child's father contend for justice at the polls or in court. But, if the Indians can secure the water to which they are entitled by prior possession and by law, they can and will be able to educate their own children. The attorney said that Indians prefer justice to charity. Like the Arizona congressmen, many Americans have an attitude kindly toward Indians. They are prepared to help him on occasion by appropriations in Congress to avert starvation, by gifts to missions, and by approving bills to end federal wardship. As a matter of fact, the Indians are helped in almost every way except in a way designed to help them help themselves.

The Pima Indians have lived on the Gila River and its tributaries for many centuries. Ruth Murry Underhill describes them in Red Man's America as "peaceful corngrowers." They developed a large-scale corn culture on this river. By 1,000 A. D. irrigation ditches had reached a length of from ten to sixteen miles, and "villages of pit houses stood near the cornfields." She said they dressed in coarse cotton, woven on horizontal looms. They made beautifully-painted pottery, figurines and shell ornaments. Their rights to hold their land and to use water from the Gila and its tributaries for irrigation were recognized first by Spain, then by Mexico. About 150 years ago they were joined by the Maricopa tribe, which settled peacefully to the south.

The Gila Reservation was established in 1850, for the sole use of the Pimas and Maricopas, by an act of Congress which specified that the water of the Gila and Salt Rivers should be for its wards, the Indians. After the Civil War white squatters—Mormons, first, then others—settled upstream and took the water of the rivers for their own use. In a few years the ancient canals of the Pimas' were dry, and for nearly forty years these peaceful farmers fought a losing battle against starvation.

Congress Passes Law

Finally, Dirk Lay, an earnest Presbyterian missionary, took up the case of the Pima Indians. He carried his campaign to Congress. In 1924, largely through his efforts, Congress passed a law authorizing the Department of the Interior to build Coolidge Dam across the Pima River. The Act specified that the dam was "for the purpose, first, of providing water for the irrigation of lands allotted to Pima Indians on the Gila Reservation, in Arizona; second, for the irrigation of such other lands in public or private ownership as in the opinion of the Secretary can be served by water from the dam without diminishing the supply necessary for Indian lands."

That should have settled the matter. The Indians had first rights to Gila water through immemorial use, and then through two acts of Congress. However, nothing was really settled. It has been charged that political pressure from the Arizona white man resulted in court action, wherein it was held that the Pimas did not need all the water Congress had given them. When the Pimas sought to protest, the Indian Bureau and the Department of the Interior refused to recognize their lawyer, and caused both him and the Indians to be thrown out of court. The resulting Gila River Decree, which is still operative, has been described as "one of the greatest crimes of water law."

White Farmers Combine

The white farmers combined in a landowners' agreement, which concerned the pumping of underground water to the surface for irrigation. The Secretary of the Interior had to approve before wells could be drilled. Indian priority in use of water was not recognized. Today, there are 144 wells on lands farmed by whites surrounding the Indian reservations. Mr. Cox and the Pimas insist that these farms are taking water which legally belongs to the Indians, or in which they have a share. Somebody said, "Why don't the Indians drill their own wells? Is this just another case of shiftlessness and lack of initiative?"

As a matter of fact, the Pimas tried to secure the required permission from Washington, and nothing happened. When, after many efforts, they could not secure official approval, Mr. Cox's clients decided to act. They drilled four wells on their own expense. When water was flowing into their parched fields, political pressure was applied by white people in the Department of Interior. Within fifteen days a telegram arrived, ordering the Indians to shut down their wells until the solicitor of the Department could give them a legal opinion as to whether they were entitled to use the water under their own land. This was in the summer of 1954. Threats were made that if they didn't comply, the limited supply of water from Coolidge Dam would be cut off, or that funds in Washington would be frozen. Meanwhile, the 144 wells around the reservation continued to pump, while the "Ira Hayes home" and many others sat in the dust of the desert. The Pimas finally received permission to operate their wells in the spring of 1955.

The Pima Indian Agency, at Sacaton, Arizona, is responsible for about 7,300 Indians; 6,700 of these are Pimas. In four areas their reservation consists of 465,169 acres, being mostly

---
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mountain and desert. Tribal ownership accounts for more than 340,000 acres. Reports show Indians farm 25,000 acres. Of this, 20,000 is leased to whites. Indians own 2,600 head of beef cattle, and about the same number of horses. The average annual income per Pima family is estimated at about $900. The average for the Maricopa family is about $540. Nine out of ten Pimas read and write English. Very few are intermarried with whites. Leases run from $20 to $40 an acre. In the Salt River area 70 per cent of the arable land is leased to whites.

The Indian Bureau has been accused of encouraging leasing, and that it is partly responsible for the fact that many Indians sit in idleness and drink up their meager incomes.

U. S. Indian Policy

An attempt to discover whether the Indians' feelings of distrust in Congress was justified led to House Concurrent Resolution 108, which was passed in 1953. It declares that Congress has decided to "make" Indians conform to the laws which bind everybody else, and "to end their status as wards of the United States" - this to be done "as rapidly as possible." When this process is completed, the Indian will have the same privileges, rights, and responsibilities of all other citizens.

The bills deriving from H. R. 108 not only withdraw federal trust from Indian property and place it on tax rolls, they also terminate the application of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, abolish tribal constitutions and corporations based on that law, abrogate federal-Indian treaties, and impose the break-up of tribal properties into individual parcels. The bases of these apprehensions are that these bills threaten the Indians' land. H. R. 89, which was enacted March 25, 1953, asks the Indian Bureau to supply a list of tribes ready for "full management of their own affairs," and for legislative proposals designed to promote the earliest practicable termination of all federal supervision and control over Indians.

House Report 841, of the 83rd Congress, states that the Indian bills then current had "two coordinated aims: first, withdrawal of federal responsibility for Indian affairs whenever practicable, and, second, termination of the subjection of Indians to federal laws applicable to Indians as such." It reported that the congressional committee had interrogated officials and that the Indian Bureau had held eight hearings under Resolution 89 in the West and Northwest.

Mr. Felix S. Cohen, a leading authority on Indian law and affairs, now deceased, pointed out that beginning in 1950, Indian freedom began to be restricted, his property was increasingly controlled by the Indian Bureau, and the arm of government was transformed into an instrument of power.

So it may be said that the "erosion of Indian rights" started several years ago. A similarly gradual turn occurred over twenty-five years ago, when the

From this background came the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which opened the way to about twenty years of Indian progress. Congress gave the Indians right to establish corporations, and two-thirds of the tribes took advantage of the opportunity. Indian tribal councils were given greater authority. They could veto disposal of Indian property by the Indian Bureau. They had access to a $10 million credit fund for developing tribal resources. Indians got preference for Indian Bureau jobs. This was only a beginning.

Timber Belongs to Indians

In 1935 Congress set up an agency to market Indian handcrafts. Indians began to use the right to vote. In 1938 Congress recognized that minerals and timber on Indian reservations belonged to Indians and not to the government. In 1940 Congress refunded the taxes Indians had been forced to pay when thousands of tax-exempt estates were terminated without Indian consent. In 1941 the Supreme Court upheld the right of Indians to lands they had long occupied, even without formal treaties or acts of Congress. In 1946 an Indian Claims Commission was set up to help Indians collect the debts they said the government owed them. In 1948 the Supreme Court helped the Indians as well as other minority races when it ruled that racially-restrictive covenants are unenforceable. In 1951 farm housing loans were made available to Indians.

An atmosphere of hope and optimism spread over the Indian reservations. For the first time in eighty years Indian holdings of land increased from 48 to 52 million acres. Real Indian income doubled. The death rate was cut in half, and the condition of the Indian improved generally.

This brief "golden age" was short-lived, however, for in 1950 the atmosphere began to change. The Indians were first to suffer from the shock produced by the fear of communism and the outbreak of the Korean War. Elections of tribal officers were interfered with on the Blackfeet Reservation in Montana. Land belonging to the San Ildefonso Pueblo in New Mexico was sold without Indian consent. The right of certain tribes to select their own legal counsel was challenged for the first time in years. Once the tide turned, complaints mounted. The Papago in Arizona said the Indian Bureau had refused to rebuild their
hospital, the only one on a two-million acre reservation. In 1952 a bill was introduced in Congress, asking authority for Indian Bureau employees to go armed and to arrest Indians, without warrant, if they thought it necessary. The bill was killed in committee, but it shows the trend.

There is good reason to believe and hope that the present Commissioner, Glenn L. Emmons, has done much to change for the better the tempo and procedures of the Indian Bureau administration. However, he is limited by the policies laid down by Congress.

The main focus of Indian apprehension is still on acts of Congress. If the past is any guide, Congress will follow H. R. 108 with a series of bills carrying out the policy it defines. Much will depend upon public opinion. It could slow up the termination process where it started, and halt passage of other such bills until the tribes affected give their consent. This principle of seeking and waiting goes back to our Declaration of Independence: "To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

When Congress enacted the bill which became Public Law 250, it empowered any state to impose on Indian tribes its own civil and criminal codes, and so negates tribal codes and authority. Although he denounced the bill, President Eisenhower signed it. He did ask that it be amended so Indians could be consulted before state authorities. Although he denounced the administration, and so negated tribal codes and authority, the law was not even good enough to protect the rights of a white person.

Our government seeks to help education abroad. But at the same time the Navaho, our largest Indian tribe, averages less than one year of schooling.

Farming seems to be the occupation that many Americans, in Congress and out, have settled on for the Indian. In a recent year the income of Indian farmers averaged nationally one-fifth of that of non-Indian farmers. And the Indian is not altogether to blame for the poor showing – 26 per cent of all Indian land has less than ten inches of rainfall per year. Actually, twenty inches of rainfall is barely enough to produce a crop, even if it comes during growing season.

On the Turtle Mountain Reservation in North Dakota is a tribe of Indians known as the Chipeways. They number about 8,928. Their reservation occupies approximately two townships of hilly, mountainous land along the Canadian border. Only one-tenth of their land is in cultivation. The rest isn’t even good grazing land. About one in fourteen of these Indians are “pure blood” Indians. Most of them have a high percentage of white (French) ancestry. All are poverty-stricken.

If all the tribal assets of the Turtle Mountain Chipeways, including their tribal land, were sold and the money divided equally, each person would receive a little more than $37. In 1953 the total earned income of the Turtle Mountain tribe was about $21,500.

Federal “general assistance,” education welfare funds, and other Indian relief costs the government well over a million dollars a year, and still this tribe lives in hopeless poverty. Many other Indian tribes live far below the general standard of even the poorer white people.

Largest Indian Tribe

The largest tribe of Indians in America are the Navahos, in Arizona and New Mexico. Numbering about 70,000, they constitute more than half of the 120,000 Indians in that part of the country.

Few people disagree that it will pose a grave problem if the Navahos, along with the Pueblos, Apaches, Hopis, and other tribes of the Southwest are overwhelmed by termination of government supervision before they have time to prepare for change.

Three hundred years of white-Indian relations would indicate that there will be tragedy. Individual and family demoralization and always follow attempts to change too rapidly from one way of life to another. This is not an argument against change, which must come to the Navaho Indians the same as to other people; rather, it is a plea by many sympathetic Indian supporters for understanding the Indian on the part of both races.

The Navaho tribe was once a strong, war-like and wandering people, who preyed on the peaceful, corn-growing tribes, stole sheep, horses, and women from the Pueblos, Hopis, Pimas, and the Spanish. Finally, they came to excel in farming, sheep-raising, weaving, pottery-making, and other things.

Slave Market at Santa Fe

The Navahos drove other tribes from northwest Mexico and northeast Arizona, establishing themselves in the area they live in today. Their present reservation of 25,000 square miles is above 6,000 feet in elevation, and is mostly high plateau, deep canyon, and vast expanse of sand and gravel. The rainfall ranges from five to twenty inches a year. Winters are very cold, springs windy and dusty, and summers hot and dry. At what is now Santa Fe there was once a slave market, where Navaho women and children were bought and sold. These people were never conquered by Spain, and when Mexico became independent in 1823, the Mexicans had no better luck with them. During the Civil War the army sent Kit Carson to subdue them. Their cattle and sheep were killed; their homes and food supplies were burned. By this means 8,000 of them were starved into submission. They made what is still called the “long walk” to Fort Sumner, in New Mexico. They stayed there for four years.

During this “Babylonian exile” their suffering was great. Professor Clyde Kluckholm, of Harvard, said, “One can no more understand Navaho attitudes toward white people without knowing Fort Sumner than he can understand southern attitudes without knowing about the Civil War.”

When the Navahos signed treaties, promising never to fight again, they were given 34,000 sheep and goats, and were given government rations for years. The government promised various kinds of assistance, including schools with a teacher for every thirty
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In 1955 this promise of 1868 was just beginning to be kept. Unlike many tribes of the Great Plains, the Navahos went to work to obtain a reservation living. The women wove blankets and rugs, and the men fashioned silver and turquoise jewelry. Education was not desired, for education was associated with the white man. For half a century the tribe's numbers doubled and redoubled. By 1893 they numbered 42,000, and continued to increase. As the population grew, their herds increased. They became so crowded they couldn't make a living in their dry, rough country. Many times their reservation was made larger until, finally, the limit was reached. When they had more cattle, sheep, and goats than they could keep on the reservation, the government bought their surplus. The Navaho looked on this as an intervention; however, improvement made by quality in the culling process of livestock and wool actually increased their incomes by 60 per cent in the fifteen years following this surplustrading program.

In the second World War the young Navahos were, for the first time, subject to draft, and the tribe was astonished and ashamed that so many of its young sons were rejected because of illiteracy and physical unfitness. However, some 3,600 of them entered the armed forces. The Navaholanguage was used as a code for sending messages, which neither Germans nor Japanese could break. The soldiers' pay and family allotment checks gave the Navaho an idea of what an income as large as other Americans received could do for them. They suddenly realized that the white man's life had advantages which they wanted for themselves, and that the key to this life was education. But when the soldiers' pay and allotments ceased, nobody had saved any money. Practically overnight the people became destitute — an unheard-of thing in the history of the Navaho. Their income dropped to about $400 per year per family. This was more than they could bear. There was a marked increase in drunkenness and delinquency, which, some hold, can be expected when people are overwhelmed by their troubles.

In 1948 the Navahos found themselves the center of attention. The press of the nation suddenly discovered that he was starving. Everybody became concerned. "Why go abroad to help the starving when we have plenty of them at home," was the widespread cry.

Congress heard the uproar of public opinion, and appropriated $80 million for a Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program, which is to run over a period of ten years.

Congress for Termination

Many people are saying it is extremely important for the Indian tribes that House Concurrent Resolution 108 be repealed, and that a new statement of congressional policy for Indians be made. The present policy of Congress states that all federal supervision of Indian affairs shall be terminated at the earliest possible date.

Pursuant to this Resolution, termination bills were passed for the Me-nominee Indians of Wisconsin, the Klamath of Oregon, scattered bands in western Oregon, small groups in Utah, the Alabama and Coushatta Indians of Texas, the Chippewas of Turtle Mountain Reservation, and some other small, scattered tribes or bands in California, Florida, and New York. Presented below are direct statements from men in Indian tribes, indicating their objections to immediate termination of government supervision without adequate preparation of the Indian people and settlement of their just claims. 5

Statement of the Cayuse, Umatilla, and Walla Walla Chiefs:

... In the years beginning in 1855 and subsequent years, by virtue of the treaty of 1855, with the various tribes of Indians in Washington and Oregon, the Indians relinquished their rights to large portions of land in both of these states (then the Territory of Washington), and, at this time, the Indians agreed to remove to portions of land called reservations, there to live under a beneficent wardship of the federal government. At that time it was clear to the federal government that the Indian was not ready for full citizenship, and that he must be protected from the commercial instinct and sharp practices of the white citizens of the territory. Today, we are being told that we are now ready for full citizenship; that we are mentally competent to buy and sell land, buy intoxicants, and generally carry on business practices without any restrictions whatsoever. Admittedly, the tendency of the white man to cheat and defraud the Indian has not changed over these last hundred years. If this is so, then how can it be argued, with any degree of sincerity, that the ability of the Indian to defend himself
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self against the white man's tendencies has changed? We still have today on the Umatilla Reservation essentially the same Indians that inhabited the reservation many, many years ago. He is just as susceptible to the sharp practices of the white man, and just as easily influenced by friendly overtures—aided...by liquid refreshment—as he was then. The educational facilities that have been made available to the younger Indians have largely been superficial. They have been more or less educated in theory, but certainly they have not been educated in fact, so as to be able to cope with a commercial and selfish world. For a hundred years they have been taught...that they were not competent to compete with the whites. All this training has instilled in the mind of the Indian a complex of inferiority that will not easily be eradicated....Now it is being recommended that the Indian be released from the restrictions of his wardship, and his reservation liquidated.

(Signed) LUKE SOWAFROO, Chief of Cayuse Tribe; TOM JOSE, Chief of Umatilla Tribe; JIM KANIE, Chief of Walla Walla Tribe; Andrew Barnhart, Interpreter; March 31, 1952

Keweenaw Bay Chippewa Indian Community, Michigan:

...While we wish to believe that congressional acts affecting our tribal affairs are intended to benefit our condition and straighten out our tangled affairs...our council feels that the proposed bill will be detrimental to the interests of the Indians in general and will adversely affect the operation of the tribal organization....The bill appears to us to lean very heavily towards releasing the government from its obligations and responsibilities ascribed in exchange for vast tracts of valuable mineral, timber, and fertile farm lands....

(Signed) CHARLES PICOARD, Community President, October 10, 1953

Kaibab Tribal Council, Arizona:

We want eventually to be free to manage our own affairs as full citizens. We want the government to help us get ready for this day, to give us full protection, to fully educate our children, and to aid us in economic development. It is as a fully responsible tribal council that we would move our people into full citizenship. We would like the government to accept the decisions of tribal councils, thus letting us try our freedom gradually.

(Signed) BILL TOM, November 18, 1953

Jemez Pueblo, New Mexico:

The end of federal trusteeship has been discussed thoroughly. We know it will be hard for my people. Over half of my people are not educated enough to handle their affairs. It is hard to believe...some of our members do not know who is our President or [who is] the governor of New Mexico. This shows we are still lacking.

(Signed) JUAN LUS PACOS, Governor of Community, November 23, 1953

Santo Domingo Pueblo, New Mexico:

(From a telegram to President Eisenhower)....We remember your promises that Indians would be consulted before you did anything important affecting them. H. R. 1063 (now Public Law 280) would destroy our self-government, seal our rights, and break up our way of life. No Indians were consulted about it. It was sneaked through when we were not looking. Therefore, we are trusting you as a great leader and man of honor to respect the wishes of the Indians and veto the bill.

(Signed) FERNANDO CORZ, Governor of Community, August 13, 1953

Choctaw Nation, Oklahoma:

I think this is another of those moves by Congress to get the government out of Indian business, another effort to shirk its responsibility to a people who owned the entire continent of North America when the white man first invaded this country.

(Signed) HARRY J. W. BELVIN, Principal Chief, November 29, 1953

THERE IS STILL HOPE

Winifred Scott's book entitled Tomorrow expresses the hope of many non-Indians for an improvement in today's status of our Indian Americans:

Is America oblivious To her neglect of the Indian?...Man has always learned From his mistakes. So America Was steadied under difficulties By the weight of its stability. Progress continued And always will If we hold high The banner of Christ values. The Indians' Day is coming. America is not finished.


The Privilege of Free Balloting

(Continued from page 9)

Democratic Convention to nominate a woman as a candidate for Vice-President of the United States.

The power to decide who shall vote and how elections shall be run is vested in the states. The state constitutions lay down the rules, subject to state constitutions.

The question of who shall vote is more or less uniform throughout the states. Voters must be citizens, twenty-one years of age, and must qualify as to a certain period of residence before voting. This period of residence, or "legal domicile," may vary from six months in one state to two years in another. Most states require from three to six months in a county, and from ten to thirty days in the voting precinct or district.
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Voting Disqualifications

Practically every state has a standard set of voting disqualifications. The insane, the feeble-minded, those found guilty of violating election laws, those convicted of certain grave crimes, etc., are among those who are disqualified.

Perhaps one of the most perennial and embarrassing problems existing in the country today is the indifference of the "should-be" voters — those who have adopted a passive role as citizens, preferring to remain spectators rather than participants in their government. Such persons are more dangerous to this country than guns in the hands of the enemy.

In 1952 an unprecedented effort was made to make the voters aware of their responsibility in voting in the presidential election. For example, only one-half of them cast their ballots in 1948. It is a matter of record that the effort in 1952 was partially successful, because the figure was boosted to sixty-three per cent. Yet this percentage is still relatively poor — especially when compared with the voting figures and percentages of other nations.

It has been said that America has the somewhat dubious distinction of leading the world in avoiding elections. Paradoxically, Americans as a whole are prone to criticize and examine, to study and judge — this includes everything from stocks to sports — on the basis of statistics. Indeed, some sections of the newspapers are filled with figures, which are pored over by the American public.

In the international "sport" of voting, however, should the results be shown in the newspaper, America would boast a very low score percentage-wise. Given below are percentages of eligible voters in various countries who went to the polls in past elections:

- Belgium, after being freed from wartime Nazi totalitarianism: 90%
- The crucial Italian election, which reburied communism: 89%
- The British election, returning Churchill to power: 82%
- In France, after nearly four years of Nazi rule: 75%
- In Japan, with its new "made-in-America" democracy: 70%
- In the United States, in the Truman-Dewey election of 1948: 51%

The above percentages speak for themselves. The lack of interest shown in the ballot in this country has been labeled our national disgrace. This is especially significant when one considers that America boasts the highest standard of living, and more opportunity not only for freedom and liberty, but for an equal voice in the government.

Americans have so very much more to lose than most countries. The very backbone of freedom is a free election, and yet all too many people "haven't time" to vote. Doubtless there are many people behind the Iron Curtain who would give their lives to be able to participate in a free election and vote their honest opinions. Casting a ballot isn't important in itself (this is done in the Soviet Union); rather, it is casting a free ballot wisely that is important.

It has been pointed out that the American people spend too much time criticizing the government and too little time trying to do something about it. If the government is inefficient, then the blame for this inefficiency can be placed squarely at the door of an apathetic voting public.

It is a truism that no one really appreciates anything until he is about to lose it — or has already lost it. Perhaps this accounts in part for a lack of appreciation of the advantages in the free, American way of life. Certain privileges have long been accepted in a matter-of-fact way.

If the people could be made to realize that this country is not invincible, that it is subject to change — that it is now and has long been changing — perhaps they would awaken to their duties and responsibilities as citizens. Other countries have drifted lazily with the prevailing wind, and with the most attractive political current, following the country of least resistance — until this disinterest landed them in a maze of restrictions and political slavery, bound helplessly by a totalitarian government. Had they been alert and sensitive to their responsibilities, this would never have happened.

It has been said that to vote blindly is fully as bad, and perhaps worse, than not to vote at all. Most agree that there is little excuse today for the voter not to be informed, what with all the newspapers, radio and television broadcasts.

Henry Thoreau once said, "Even voting for the right is doing nothing for it. It is only expressing to men feelly that it should prevail." On the other hand, if a citizen lives by his vote, then it does carry weight.

The year 1956 has brought the presidential election around again. And the fact remains that it is the duty of every citizen of voting age to cast his ballot and voice his sentiments while he can, helping to preserve the God-given heritage of his individual freedom and our collective American way of life.

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION?

"My fourth grader certainly has an easier time in school than I had at his age!" a mother was recently heard to remark. This worthy matron expressed relief that her child seldom brought work home to do.

"It certainly makes sense to me," she remarked, "that the school authorities today are concerned with the whole child — they don't believe in taking all the enjoyment out of youth!"

This mother actually knows very little regarding her child's scholastic abilities, or lack of them, for having relinquished by default the supervision of his homework, she is without a gauge by which to determine his progress.

How "Progressive" Is Your School? — a pamphlet written by Kitty Jones, gives point-by-point comparison of up-to-date traditional education with progressive education. Copies may be obtained from America's Future, Inc., 542 Main St., New Rochelle, New York, at 25 cents each.
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The Beleaguered A.D.A.

(Continued from page 23)

"Certainly not," replied Mr. Rauh. "The American political structure has been built on a two-party system for a long time, and there is no feeling on our part that that is wrong. Our job, as I visualize it, is to put a little idealism into politics and to try and persuade both of the parties to move over somewhat more to the liberal side."

He indicated that they were not having too much success at present with the Republican party.

Frowns on Party Realignment

Clarifying his question regarding a new party, Mr. Wilson explained that he did not have reference to a third party, but rather, he wanted Mr. Rauh's opinion regarding whether a cleavage, or some realignment of the parties which would find the "more or less conservative" group in this country on one side and the "more or less liberal" group on the other, would be advantageous to the people of the United States.

"I see," replied Mr. Rauh. "It is actually working that way now. When Senator Morse moved over to the Democratic party, and when the non-partisan league in North Dakota moved over to the Democratic party, you had the most liberal influences in the Republican party move over."

He expressed doubt that this was a good thing, since when the most liberal side of the Republican party moved over to the Democratic party, it defeated the aim of adding to the liberalism in each party.

"Would you contrast that, Mr. Rauh, to the movement in the South among some Democrats, to the Republican party?" inquired Moderator Hurleigh.

"That's right -- yes, sir," replied Mr. Rauh. "And I notice something on this school bill that was defeated that supports that. You probably saw that a lot of Southerners didn't vote against the Powell amendment. The reason was that they knew if the House bill passed, if the school aid bill passed in any form, it would ultimately be unsegregated aid. So what they did was to let the Powell amendment go through, and beat the bill."

"So you have a situation," he continued, "where southern Democrats are likely to oppose their own party more often in the future -- on housing, health, education -- because they fear that these things will be used to break down segregation in their own areas."

Mr. Mollenhoff picked up the gauntlet which Mr. Rauh had flung as an invitation to discuss the future of the American Negro. "Mr. Rauh," he stated, "many of the Republicans make the point that their party has done much more to advance the position of the American Negro than the Democratic party, and that the future of the American Negro would be better under the Republican party. How do you feel about that?"

Mr. Rauh's reply was in complete keeping with his position as spokesman for an organization whose stated aim is to liberalize "the most liberal force in America," the northern Democrats with whom they find themselves most often aligned. "I don't feel that way," he said decisively. "I feel that the Eisenhower administration played politics, and with the Negro issue I believe the Republicans have done a shabbier job than I have ever seen in our time. They have played politics (I can guess by your expression what your next question will be) although I don't mean to say the Democrats haven't played politics, too."

"Leap-Year" Liberalism

"But the Republicans have pretended that they were for these bills, when they really were not. For three years Brownell held up any action on civil rights bills, and in 1956, with this 'leap-year liberalism' of his, he comes up with some bills which he knows he can't get through. His sole purpose was to get the Southerners, the southern Democrats, to prevent it."

"These bills have been in the House and Senate for three years," he explained, "The Department of Justice has been asked for their views on it. They've even refused to come up and say what they thought about them until they sent up the same bills in the spring."

Mr. Wilson asked, "Mr. Rauh, since you mentioned the Attorney General and rather accused him of playing politics at the expense of a large racial minority -- would you attribute his recent determination to sue the General Motors Corporation as a political move in a political year?"

Mr. Rauh claimed insufficient knowledge on this score to warrant discussion. "However," he stated, "I didn't think it was such a hot idea to announce that on a television or radio program. It seems to me that the entire country is entitled to official action by the federal government."

"Don't you find yourself always in the position of opposition to Brownell and the Administration in some way?" inquired Mr. Mollenhoff. "It seems like on practically all of these issues you end up on the opposite side of the Eisenhower administration. Is it a matter of political viewpoint?"

Mr. Rauh acknowledged ruefully that he couldn't find as many occasions to compliment Republican action as he would like. "However," he continued, "I remember sending a telegram to President Eisenhower congratulating him on vetoing the gas bill which was put forth by the southern Democrats."

"Don't you think you liberals hurt yourselves as much as you help yourselves in your cause by espousing everything liberal just for the sake of liberalism?" asked Mr. Mollenhoff.

"I don't espouse anything, Mr. Mollenhoff, for the sake of liberalism," maintained Mr. Rauh. "I espouse points of view because I believe they are correct."

"Now, let me say one thing about that," he continued emphatically. "It used to be an old liberal cliché ten or twenty years ago, that liberals were for the same things that the Communists were. I think if there is one thing the A.D.A. has straightened out, it's that problem. The liberals have nothing in common with the Communists or any other left-wing group based on Lenin or Trotsky or any of this rubbish. The fact of the matter is that far from being sort of a litmus paper reaction, the liberals of the '50's, liberals of the A.D.A., are much more objective about the issues than they were."

A.D.A. Off To The Wars

"They are prepared to fight both the right and the left," he declared. "Probably the most important advance in liberalism in the last twenty years is the recognition that the liberals are really in the middle of a world fight in which the Communists on the left and the reactionaries on the right are equal enemies."

Mr. Mollenhoff's proclivity for "innocent" questioning reappeared in his next question. "In this question of liberal..."
warranted, I'd say it is the right thing to do. "The idea of protecting the right of labor union members to organize and to have a voice in the conduct of their work is not something that should be fought against."

Ignoring the implications of the issue, Mr. Rauh replied sardonically, "Absolutely, we will fight at any time, any place, against corruption."
Mr. Rauh indicated that he did not consider Mr. Pressman's testimony very forthcoming, to which Mr. Wilson agreed.

Asked by Mr. Mollenhoff for A.D.A.'s opinion of Stevenson, Harrim an and Kefauver. Mr. Rauh indicated that it was felt that all of these men had lived up to their promise as liberals. "We feel that all three would be liberal presidents," he said, "in the great tradition of the three Democrats in the twentieth century - Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman."

"What do you find against President Eisenhower?" inquired Mr. Mollenhoff. "Have you read his statements? He has a very liberal viewpoint."

"I would say that President Eisenhower's statements are a lot better than what is done to back them up in the Congress," declared Mr. Rauh. "For example, they talk about foreign aid, and the Republicans vote against it."

"Is this then President's responsibility, though?" persisted Mr. Mollenhoff. "Is he responsible for the actions of Congress?"

_Touché!_

Mr. Mollenhoff cannily called the turn on his guest with the charge, "Mr. Rauh, you are blacklisting the President, so to speak, for what the Congress is doing."

"Well, heaven help me for blacklisting anybody, Mr. Mollenhoff," Mr. Rauh disclaimed. "But I really don't feel that that is what I was doing. I do feel that the President is so popular, that if he insisted on things from Congress, he could get them."

"One reason the President has so much popularity in the bank," he continued, "is that he never draws on it to do anything."

Mr. Wilson requested information regarding the numerical strength of A.D.A.'s membership, and was told that it was approximately forty-five thousand.

"They are generally distributed," explained Mr. Rauh, "but I wouldn't say that down South it happens to be too popular a position since we take an all-out stand on civil rights. However, we are for all of the provisions in the 1952 Democratic plank - plus anti-segregation measures."

"The '52 Democratic plank was a mass of generalities, as was the Republican plank," Mr. Wilson stated flatly. "I read it just before this interview."

"Oh, no, sir!" exclaimed Mr. Rauh. "There is a provision there for the end of the filibuster, and I don't think you'd call that a generality. That's the greatest advance the Democratic party has made in a plank, it seems to me, in a long time."

Mr. Mollenhoff requested an explanation of what the A.D.A. has against Richard Nixon.

"That's a long story," Mr. Rauh stated evasively.

Pressed by both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mollenhoff for a thumbnail statement, Mr. Rauh obliged. "In a word, Mr. Nixon's action in 1954 in implying that the Democrats had put eight thousand Communists in the government and that the Democrats had tried to cover that up was about the shadiest piece of campaigning that I had ever seen!"

Mr. Rauh was asked how faster progress could be made than at present with respect to application of civil rights for the Negro without creating more harm than good.

"What we must do," Mr. Rauh explained, "is to use the influence of our leaders in this country to persuade the people of the South that this is the ultimate result, that it is going to come, that segregation is illegal, and that the law is going to be enforced. The leadership of this country, and I must say it has been true on both sides, has failed in its responsibility in this kind of crisis. We have to use moral force to put over the feeling all over the country that this is the way it's going to be, it has to be, and that whatever laws will be needed will create this result."

"I regret to say that we can't find very many," he stated remorsefully, "but we wish there were more. And insofar as we help persuade the party to put up more liberals, it would make us very happy."

He commented that there were some Republican candidates running for office in Kentucky.

"Does the A.D.A. favor the use of boycotts to obtain minority or individual rights?" asked Moderator Heublein.

"I would say that if that question is directed at the Montgomery, Alabama, effort to stop the bus segregation and the discrimination that was used against Negroes, we would support that," Mr. Rauh averred. "Our young group, the Students for Democratic Action, has raised money for the purpose of buying a station wagon to help them. I feel that in certain instances a minority group would have the right to withhold its patronage from some company that was oppressing them."
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Corn to Burn

The pendent and unique Jensen-Mundt bill offers concrete suggestions for possible elimination of part of the farm surplus.

Farmers who have been making mash from their surplus corn, for drinking purposes and otherwise, may soon be pouring it in their gas tanks instead.

The Jensen-Mundt Agriculture Alcohol Motor Fuel bill, H. R. 9522, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Ben F. Jensen (R-Iowa), and an almost identical bill, S. 3758, was introduced in the Senate by Senator Karl E. Mundt (R-S.D.), shortly before Congress adjourned.

The Jensen-Mundt bill provides, generally, for the use of farm surplus corn to augment, by volume, motor fuels derived from petroleum (the term "motor fuel" may include gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, benzine, crude oil, and other petroleum products). More specifically, the bill is designed to assist the American farmer by providing that motor fuels shall contain a certain per cent of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown upon farms in the United States. This would utilize grains in surplus, and on certain agricultural products would balance consumption with production.

The bill provides that it shall be unlawful for any person to sell motor fuel in the United States unless at least five per cent, by volume, is alcohol, manufactured from farm products.

Additionally, a penalty of five cents per gallon will be imposed on producers of motor fuel unless five per cent of the fuel consists of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown on farms within the United States.

The bill states that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to declare the plan inoperative for an indefinite period of time on any or all agricultural products declared in surplus. He would take this action when such surplus has been reduced to proper proportions as determined by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and after he has given all interested manufacturers, importers, exporters, and blenders six months' advance notice in writing of such a declaration.

It is a point of fact that the alcohol blend makes a premium-grade motor fuel from low-grade gasoline. Also, it is known that by adding five per cent agrol to low-grade gasoline, which retails at a national average of about 27 cents per gallon, such a mixture makes a smooth-acting, powerful, high-grade, and extra-mileage motor fuel, which would cost the consumer 30 cents per gallon, or almost to the penny the same as high-octane gasoline. These facts and figures apply equally to wheat and some other grains, as well as to potatoes.

Surplus Reduced

Taking into consideration the number of bushels of corn and wheat in government storage, and the number of gallons of agrol that these commodities would make, together with the gallons of gasoline consumed in a year, it has been determined that five per cent blend of agrol in motor fuels would result in exhaustion of the corn and wheat surplus in about fourteen months, if full production could be reached immediately. Unfortunately, it would require about one year to build the necessary processing plants for full production. But it is quite plain that in about two years after the bill went into effect, the corn and wheat surplus could be reduced, even below the ever-normal granary requirement.

Congressman Jensen and Senator Mundt direct attention to the fact that millions of barrels of blackstrap molasses are imported annually. This molasses is produced from sugar cane, from which most of the present supply of alcohol and synthetic rubber is produced. All of this, they claim, could and should be produced from American farm crops to further insure a stable economy for this country.

Nations Use Agrol Mix

Many nations of the world have for many years used an agrol mix in their motor fuels. One of these nations requires by law the use of twenty-five per cent agrol in all their motor fuel in order to keep their farm crops in good demand.

In the early 1930's bills similar to the Jensen-Mundt bill were introduced in Congress. At that time large gasoline producers vigorously opposed the legislation.

"If that is true," the legislators pointed out, "then they were plainly stupid and shortsighted, for certainly they should have known then, as they know now, that they are in the same boat with the farmers and the rest of us in any economic storm."

Be that as it may, one facetious critic pointed out that there may be some who will mourn the passing of the old-fashioned still if the Jensen-Mundt bill is enacted into law. If so, those who formerly drank their corn instead of burning it should draw some measure of consolation from the fact that the use of surplus farm commodities would do much to improve the agricultural economy, and thereby the over-all economy, of our country.
several months a good many reports were assembled. It became apparent that our men were not receiving fair trials by our standards, and in many cases not receiving fair trials by the so-called "civilized standards." I know of one Marine now serving a four-year sentence in Japan who was convicted on testimony described by observers as not only preposterous and fantastic, but in some respects patently impossible. His conviction was manifestly unfair and unwarranted. His original sentence of eight years was reduced on appeal but such a reduction does not cure the defects in the trial which denied him justice.

Proponents of the Status of Forces Agreements have tried to justify trials in foreign courts by saying the sentences imposed are less than would be given through court-martial. These persons have adopted the foreign presumption that an accused is guilty. Men now serving sentences have said they would have preferred trial in our military courts. They would have been tried by their compatriots and would have had all the rights given to them by our Constitution. Those guilty of crimes would be punished. Since our court martial sentences are adequate punishment for the offenses committed, foreign nations certainly have no reason to object to our trying our own men.

Right of Appeal Is Mythical

The provisions for appeal in foreign countries are somewhat of a myth. It has been shown that an appeal may subject the accused to double jeopardy. The higher court can reopen the case, hear additional evidence, and pronounce a different sentence. This is a second trial for the same offense. When a prosecutor is not satisfied with a sentence he may appeal. High courts have considered such appeals almost mandatory to increase the penalty. For these reasons there is general reluctance to seek justice in higher courts.

Contrast this procedure with the extensive system of reviews of a conviction by court-martial. A Board of Review automatically considers all cases after review by local command officers. The accused may then appeal to the Military Court of Appeals which is composed of three civilian judges.

Finally, in some cases, he can appeal to the President. Since an accused serviceman becomes an expatriate when he is turned over to foreign authorities, even the President could not pardon him.

It should be noted although there is no jury in a court-martial proceeding, trial is by a board composed of both officers and enlisted men, if the accused desires. He can challenge any member of this board for cause, as in a civilian court, and he has one peremptory challenge. Such protection is unknown in foreign courts.

**Bad Bargain — 3 vs. 10,000**

Another canard offered by proponents of the status agreements is that we wanted the right to try foreign servicemen in our courts and that in order to get this right we had to surrender our men to foreign jurisdiction. They call this a reciprocal agreement. If this were true we certainly made a bad bargain. Only three soldiers of other nations have appeared in our courts, but up to last November over ten thousand Americans had been accused of wrongdoing by foreign authorities. As a matter of fact, not more than two thousand foreign servicemen are on duty in our country at any time while we have a million or more scattered around the world. The reciprocity, if it exists, is very disproportionate.

The American Legion is on record as favoring the trial of foreign servicemen by their own authorities if we have jurisdiction over our servicemen restored to us. We do not have the feeling of animosity towards others that dictates a desire to prosecute erring visitors. In 1944 we enacted a law designed to help foreign governments administer their own justice in military courts.

A circumstance that may contribute to the large number of accusations, aside from the fact that we have more troops serving abroad, is the practice in most other countries of trying a claim for civil damage along with criminal prosecution. This is contrary also to our standards of jurisprudence which require a higher degree of proof to convict of crime than to support a money judgment. The army commander in France has found that this practice is a persistent source of irritation and dissatisfaction.

House Joint Resolution 309 was offered by me in the House of Representatives on May 18, 1955. It would have directed the President to seek a modification of Article VII of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, and similar provisions in other agreements, so that the United States might regain exclusive jurisdiction over its servicemen. If such modification was not secured, the President was direct- ed to denounce the treaty or agreements at the earliest date possible under the terms thereof. Fourteen other representatives introduced identical resolutions and it was also presented in the Senate. The House Foreign Affairs Committee held extensive hearings on my resolution but on March 8, 1956, voted not to report the resolution to the House for action.

The vote in the committee was 19-10, three members being absent.

**House Majority For Amendment**

By this action the Committee ignored the great weight of the testimony that had been offered in the hearings and thwarted an expression of the desire of the American people. I believe there is an overwhelming sentiment in this country in favor of requesting the President to modify this treaty. That the majority of the House would have supported my resolution was demonstrated the day I offered it. At that time I offered an amendment to the Reserve bill then being considered. This amendment would have prevented sending servicemen, enlisted, or inducted thereafter, to any country that exercised jurisdiction over our forces. It was adopted by a vote of 174 to 56, but died when the Reserve bill itself was called back to Committee. The supporters of the status agreements were thus alerted to subsequent attempts to amend other legislation in similar fashion, and have been able to defeat such attempts in the Committee of the Whole.

The NATO Status of Forces Agreement contains provisions for seeking a revision or denouncing the treaty, and my resolution scrupulously followed the language of the agreement. It was not an attempt to infringe on
There has been too much loose talk about cruel and unusual punishment of Americans, particularly in Africa and Asia. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives held extensive hearings on the Status of Forces Treaty and its operation, and invited and received testimony from those favoring the treaty and those opposed. At the conclusion of the hearings the Committee reported that—

The hearings did not bring to light a single instance where it is claimed that an American serviceman believed to be innocent has been imprisoned by a foreign court, or an American sentenced for an act which in the United States would not be considered a crime. Neither has any case of mutilation, flogging, or any other cruel, unusual, or excessive punishment been cited.

I would like to point out that in the Moslem countries, where under the law the punishment for theft is the cutting off of the hand of the thief, Moslem law is applied only to Moslems. Our government reports that it knows of no case where an American has been subject to the Moslem criminal code. We have agreements covering the Status of our Forces in Morocco and in Saudi Arabia. No cruel or unusual punishment of our service personnel has occurred in either of these countries, and I feel confident that none ever will.

American Offenders Well-Treated

I personally have had an opportunity to visit prisons in France and talked to some of the Americans who were incarcerated there. My observation was that our men were by no means rotting in French dungeons. On the contrary, I got the impression that the American personnel enjoyed a certain amount of deference on the part of their fellow prisoners and jailers alike.

My own judgment as to the military importance of the Status of Forces Agreement and other related treaties and agreements is confirmed by General Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Commander, Allied Powers, Europe, who made this statement to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, during its consideration of this subject:

In my opinion, the denunciation of the Status of Forces Agreement by the United States or any insistence by the United States for a major revision of this agreement would so undermine the spirit of the alliance as to cause its serious deterioration with the gravest consequences to the essential security of our country....

While all the other NATO countries are agreed that their soldiers will receive fair hearings in the courts of the others, the United States would be alone in maintaining that its people can only be tried by United States courts. We would thus seem to place ourselves in a unique category. I can assure you no alliance can efficiently and successfully function if one of the partners thus sets itself apart from the others. Our troops are not in wartime occupied countries. They are on the territory of sovereign friends who have willingly joined in a unique peacetime alliance to preserve our common freedoms and to prevent another and even more devastating world conflict. It would be impossible to explain to our allies why the United States would refuse to permit their jurisdiction over the more serious crimes committed off duty.

Indoctrination Offsets Handicap

Although I argue strongly that the agreements which are already in effect concerning the status of our forces overseas should not be denounced, I want to make clear that everything possible should be done to protect our people serving overseas. There is no question but that American personnel away from home, located in a country where the language and the legal system are unfamiliar, suffer a handicap. My investigation has convinced me that we are doing more than we did last year and the year before in offsetting this handicap by better indoctrination of our citizens in the laws and customs of foreign nations.
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(Continued from page 17)
Here's How You Can Help

The Cause of Freedom

☆ Tell your friends to tune in whenever Facts Forum is on the air. Make a list of the radio and television stations serving the home communities of your out-of-town friends and mail the list to them.

☆ Write a letter of appreciation to the stations on which you can hear Facts Forum programs. A favorable audience response will insure their continuing to carry these programs.

☆ Check your local newsstands for displays of Facts Forum News. If you do not find it, tell the manager he can secure copies each month from the International Circulation Distributors' local wholesale branch.

☆ Write your informed opinions on problems which must be answered for the future of America to editors, columnists, and commentators. Send clippings of all your published letters (containing 150 words or less) for entry in Facts Forum's "Letters to the Editor" contest.

☆ Suggest that your local merchants and business friends promote Patriotism in their advertising. Facts Forum will gladly send suggestions on request.

☆ Use the material in Facts Forum News to stimulate interesting debates and discussions in your club meetings. Tell presidents or the finance chairmen of all organizations that they can add to their treasury by using the Facts Forum Fund Raising Plan. Full details will be sent upon request.

☆ Pass your copy of Facts Forum News along to friends so they may become acquainted with it and subscribe.

☆ Make Facts Forum your organization . . . help enlarge its activities . . . with your contributions. Donations from $1 to $1000 (or more) will help immeasurably to further this important work. By a U. S. Treasury ruling, all donations to Facts Forum can be deducted from your income tax.

FACTS FORUM, INC.
Dallas, Texas

☐ I enclose $3 for a 1-year subscription to Facts Forum News.

☐ Enclosed is my voluntary contribution in the amount of $ _______ for the support of Facts Forum.

Name (please print) ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ____________________________ Zone
State ____________________________

The Status of Forces Treaty

THE CON (Continued from page 52)

the treaty-making power of the President, since the treaty is an accomplished fact. It was intended as an expression of the wish of the American people through their duly elected representatives. I know of no other way in which they can voice their dissatisfaction with a treaty. This has been done before. I furnished the Foreign Affairs Committee with precedents in our history where the President had been directed both by resolutions and in legislation to terminate arrangements with other powers. The adoption of my resolution would strengthen the President's hand in such negotiations.

I do not quake at the suggestion that a request for revision will jeopardize our foreign relations. This is part of the scare technique which pictures such a request as playing into the hands of the Soviets. I am convinced that if our diplomats would approach our allies properly with a request for modification of these agreements, that such a request would be granted. A high-ranking naval officer who had personal experience with the working of the agreement abroad said privately that he believed the countries he had dealt with would have been glad to give us exclusive criminal jurisdiction if they were asked for it. If our diplomats were concerned with the emotions of the American people and the welfare of our men, and if they followed a national rather than an international form of diplomacy, it would not be necessary to direct such action.

Trials of United States personnel in foreign countries and to report any irregularities or denials of justice to our government. I believe the overseas commitment of our troops is vital to our defense. I am afraid that it is going to be difficult for us to retain all of those we now have. It would be a tragic mistake for us to raise the issue and stir up controversy in all the nations where

THE PRO (Continued from page 53)

our forces are serving by reopening the matter under present conditions.

Until evidence is disclosed, devoid of propaganda, that the Status of Forces Treaty is injurious to the United States, to our American servicemen, and to our national pride, I am of the opinion that these agreements should be preserved. The question is: "Do the Status of Forces agreements we have work fairly and impartially, taking into consideration all of the factors of sovereignty, international law, national pride, and above all—national security?"

FACTS FORUM NEWS, November, 1950
FACTS FORUM PRESENTS

REPORTERS' ROUNDDUP

America's NEW and most distinguished
roundtable television program

Famous personalities in the Washington spotlight
give their straightforward opinions on the
headline topic of the week. Witness, too,
the mental agility of the veteran news
reporters who ask the questions
on this weekly program.

TOPIC OF THE WEEK

A radio presentation of the NEW
Reporters' Roundup-TV program

True to the nonpartisan tradition of Facts
Forum, final decisions will not be rendered
on these programs. You participate in the
shaping of public policy by forming
your individual opinion on
controversial issues.

Facts Forum takes pleasure in announcing that Robert F. Hurleigh,
well-known news analyst and commentator, and director of Mutual Broad-
casting System's Washington operations, will be the moderator on the
Reporters' Roundup programs.

Intensive research and planning have preceded the presentation of the
NEW "Reporters' Roundup-TV" program, and the radio version, "Topic
of the Week." You will welcome the news and views of Members of Congress,
and the Cabinet, Diplomats, and Military Officers who will bring you
behind-the-scene news direct from our nation's capital.

Presenting the differing philosophies of
two congressional leaders on govern-
mental issues of grave importance
to the welfare of our country.

Radio

Where by-lines make headlines.

Famous names in the news will continue
weekly on this Reporters' Roundup radio
program to answer the questions
the public want answered.
What they’re saying...

about FACTS FORUM

As an experienced journalist in social sciences I find your magazine excellent because it represents both sides of major issues today, and represents an important viewpoint. Its name, FACTS FORUM, truly denotes its real significance. Problems in democracy and civics are greatly aided in making independent decisions on vital issues through your two-sided approach which is after all the real objective of the “Fourth Estate.”

ROBERT A. SMITH III
MOAMA Historian
Mobile, Alabama

This is the first time I have read your magazine and I think it is wonderful, giving both sides of all issues and in language that anyone could understand. If more people would take the time to read your publication, and be a little more informed on the issues confronting the U.S. today, we would all be better off.

MRS. ROBERT CONKLIN
5559 East Broadway
Temple City, California

I am President of The Sylmar Republican Women’s Study Club, Federated, and the group has gotten so much from Fac ts Forum [News] in our studies of current and world problems. We just wouldn’t have a meeting without it [it].

MRS. LOUISE F. MARTINO
12937 Drobne Avenue
Sylmar, California

Your magazine is fine. Keep up the grand work and we may yet come to your tallpin.

L. L. CLOVER
1790 Orange Avenue
Eustis, Florida

Although I read Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report, etc., I now find Facts Forum [News] indispensable to my teaching Social Science.

ROBERT M. PEPPER
Haley, Idaho

I get many magazines to occupy my leisure moments since retirement. Facts Forum News is giving me current events which represent the vital issues of the day.

W. J. KLOPP, Ph.D.
4279 San Rafael Avenue
Los Angeles, California

*Facts Forum **Topic of the Week
†Reporters’ Roundup TV
**What they're saying...**

I always read Facts Forum [News] for me that is the only magazine that really gives you the true facts about the great game of politics in the U.S. so, I would appreciate it very much if you send me a copy of the May, 1956, issue, as I missed this one.

**Lloyd E. Holmes**
3523 Greenmount Avenue
Baltimore 8, Maryland

**Facts Forum News** is a well written, thought-provoking publication. Your magazine fills a great need—that of informing the public of the true facts behind the items in our newspapers. The nation should be grateful for it.

**Dale Gove**
407 Fifth Street
New Cumberland, Pennsylvania

I've been reading Facts Forum [News] for quite awhile. I found it an outstanding magazine to read... an enlightenment of how our government should function.

**Donman E. Cook**

McComb, Mississippi

What a wonderful idea to handle [in FPN] books such as THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.*

**Mrs. E. Knight**
2018 North Houston Street
Fort Worth 6, Texas

*Appeared in March to June, inclusive, 1956, issues of FPN.

I have spent a great deal of time today reading your Facts Forum [News] and believe you are doing a good job. I am enclosing a list of names of those who might like to have a copy of your valuable publication.

The condensation of "School of Darkness," Dr. Bella V. Dodd's [book] in the September Facts Forum [News], is very good. It deserves to be read by a great many people.

**Paul V. Beck**
House of Representatives
State of Oklahoma
1308 E. 27th Place
Tulsa 14, Oklahoma

You have both an interesting and informative publication. Keep up the good work.

**A/IC Dennis A. Duschill**
Det. 9, 6982 RSM
Montauk AFS, L.I., N.Y.

---

**KENTUCKY** (Continued)

Madisonville WFMW** 730 Sun 5:50 p.m.
Mayfield WFMW* 730 Wed 6:45 p.m.
Monticello WFLW** 1050 Tues 8:30 a.m.
Murray WNRB** 1190 Thurs 8:30 a.m.
Owensboro WKMD* 1240 Tues 7:30 p.m.
Paducah WPAF** 1450 Mon 9:00 a.m.
Prestonsburg WPIT** 1780 Sun 10:30 a.m.
Princeton WPKY** 1350
Vanclave WMTC* 730

**LOUISIANA**

Alexandria KALA-TVI 5
Lafayette WLFV** 1570 Mon 1:00 p.m.
Lake Charles KTAC-TVI 25 Sat 9:30 p.m.
Minden SUN** 1320 Mon 10:30 a.m.
Monroe KMBL* 1440 Sat 6:00 p.m.
Natchitoches KNOE** 9 6 Mon 8:00 a.m.
New Orleans WJNO-TV** 120 Sun 8:00 a.m.
WIBM* 990 Sun 12:15 p.m.
Opelousas KCO** 1230 Sun 9:00 a.m.
Pascagoula WLOL** 1190 Sat 10:00 a.m.
Ruston KRLS** 1490 Sun 6:15 p.m.
Shreveport KTSW** 720 Wed 3:00 p.m.

**MAINE**

Bangor W-TWO-TV† 2 Mon 10:30 p.m.

**MARYLAND**

Annapolis WAL* 810 Sun 7:00 a.m.
WASL** 810 Sun 2:00 p.m.

**MASSACHUSETTS**

New Bedford WBSM* 1230 Sat 1:15 p.m.

**MICHIGAN**

Ann Arbor WPGF-TVI 20 Mon 8:30 p.m.
Cass City WTVI** 113 Sun 6:00 p.m.
Coldwater WTVB* 1500 Sun 2:00 p.m.
Detroit WJBK** 1000 Mon 9:00 a.m.
WJBK-TV† 2 Sun 8:00 p.m.

**MINNESOTA**

Austin KMNT-TVI 6 Sun 3:30 p.m.
Breckenridge KGBN-TVI 1450 Sun 6:00 a.m.
Duluth KDAL-TVI 1440 Sun 2:30 p.m.
Minneapolis KSTP* 1500 Sun 9:45 a.m.
Rochester WJAC** 1150 Wed 1:00 a.m.

**MISSISSIPPI**

Biloxi WVBY** 570 Sun 5:30 p.m.
Canton WYMM* 570 Sun 12:00 a.m.
Cleveland WGBR** 1490 Sun 3:00 a.m.
Columbia WCBR 1490 Sat 6:00 a.m.
Corinth WCMA* 1650 Mon 10:00 a.m.
Greenwood WGRM** 1240 Sun 9:00 a.m.
Jackson WJTV-TVI 1240 Mon 10:15 a.m.
McComb WAPF* 1010 Sun 2:00 p.m.
Philadelphia WJHS** 1460 Mon 6:00 a.m.
Starkville WSSO** 1320 Tues 6:15 p.m.
West Point WORB* 1450 Tues 7:15 p.m.

**MISSOURI**

Cap Girardeau KFVS-TVI 5
Caratherville KCRV 1570 Sun 4:15 a.m.
Charlotte KCRV 1570 Sat 11:00 a.m.
Clinton KCHB** 1350 Sun 1:00 a.m.
Dexter KDEX* 1590 Sat 1:45 a.m.
Flat River KFMO* 1240 Sun 5:30 a.m.
Jefferson City KLIK* 950 Sat 2:30 p.m.
What they're saying . . .

I am seeking background material for certain sociological studies I have undertaken recently.

I just saw the [booklet] "Case History of a Snoop Campaign," reviewed briefly in a May, 1955, copy of The Freeman. I would like very much to acquire a copy of this.

I would also like to learn more about your program and publication.

Robert Weiss
2827 Royal Street
Augusta, Georgia

Facts Forum News is truly America's most thought-provoking publication, and you are doing a great service to the American people.

Ada A. Snyder
206 E. North Street
Muncie, Indiana

Please accept my thanks for the excellent article on fluoridation,* but it should have been much longer.

Leonard H. Ponder
Box 453
Weaverville, North Carolina

*Should cities put TEETH in their laws through . . . FLUORIDATION?* September, 1956, issue.

I certainly enjoy reading all that's in the Facts Forum News. As a secondary school teacher at West Virginia High School, I am planning to introduce Facts Forum News as a source for panel discussions. Also looking forward to getting your essay contest* for high school students.

Louis J. Greco
462 Holden Street
West Virginia, Pennsylvania

*Complete information on the Young American Essay Contest appears on page 27 of this issue.

I am enclosing a list of names of people who should be taking your fine paper, who we hope will read after reading copies of it. It is such an excellent magazine for those Americans interested in and concerned about the future of their country.

Mrs. Fred Harris
5602 Jones Street
Omaha 6, Nebraska

I read and reread "facts" — and pass it on. It is a wonderful, long-needed magazine.

Mrs. Dorothea M. Adams
264 Jefferson Court
Benton Harbor, Michigan

MACHINES — (Continued)

Joplin
KSFM
1310 Sun
3:30 p
WBBG
1390 Sun
5:00 p

KANSAS CITY

KCVM
1350 Sun
10:00 a
KCTV
1370 Sun
12:00 n

MADISON

KFWB
1620 Sun
7:30 p

Minneapolis

KFAN
1130 Sun
10:30 a

MIDLAND

KBCW
1620 Mon
7:30 p
KFHT
1410 Mon
7:30 p

ROCHESTER

WROX
1430 Sun
6:00 p
WASHINGTON

WHED
1340 Sun
6:00 p

WILMINGTON

WMFD
1360 Fri
10:30 p

Winston-Salem

WTOB
26 Sun
5:30 p

NORTH DAKOTA

Bismarck
KFYR
5 Sat
7:30 p

Dickinson
KDIX
1230 Sun
5:00 p

FARGO

WDAY
6 Sat
3:00 p

Hettinger
KNDX
1490 Sun
6:30 p

NORTH CAROLINA

Forest City
WBBO
780 Mon
5:00 p

Hickory
WHIC
680 Sun
10:00 a

Kinston
WNCN
320 Sun
11:00 a

LEXINGTON

WRU
1340 Sun
7:30 p

Mt. Airy
WYAO
1600 Sun
7:15 p

Raleigh
WNAG-TW
28 Sat
5:00 p

Winston-Salem

WRD
1340 Sun
6:00 p

WFMF
1340 Sun
5:30 p

Winston-Salem

WTOB
26 Sun
5:30 p

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City
WLDI
1490 Sun
4:30 p

Pleasantville
WOND
1400 Sun
5:00 p

South Orange
WSOU
1400 Thurs
3:00 p

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque
KCGM
13 Mon
3:30 p

Carlsbad
KAVE
1240 Mon
1:30 p

Clayton
KFLX
1450 Tues
6:00 p

Cruces
KFUN
1240 Sun
1:30 p

Las Vegas
KLV-TV
8

NEW YORK

Albany- Troy
WCIA
41 Fri
9:00 p

Amsterdam
WC&S
1460 Mon
10:30 p

Brockport
WBF
907 Mon
7:45 p

Dunkirk
WFCB
1410 Mon
7:15 p

Hornell
WWBC
1350 Mon
10:15 p

Hudson
WCHB
1410 Mon
7:15 p

Jamesvllle
WJSN
1420 Mon
6:30 p

Middletown
WKIS
1450 Mon
7:30 p

New York
WOR
250 Mon
7:00 p

Niagara Falls
WJFT
1440 Sun
7:00 p

Port Jervis
WDLC
1470 Mon
7:00 p

PORT AUTHORITY

WPEN
1540 Sun
7:15 p

WPEN
1540 Sun
7:00 p

WEGO
1140 Sun
9:00 p

NORTH CAROLINA — (Continued)

What are they saying . . .

I am seeking background material for certain sociological studies I have undertaken recently.

I just saw the [booklet] "Case History of a Snoop Campaign," reviewed briefly in a May, 1955, copy of The Freeman. I would like very much to acquire a copy of this.

I would also like to learn more about your program and publication.

Robert Weiss
2827 Royal Street
Augusta, Georgia

Facts Forum News is truly America's most thought-provoking publication, and you are doing a great service to the American people.

Ada A. Snyder
206 E. North Street
Muncie, Indiana

Please accept my thanks for the excellent article on fluoridation,* but it should have been much longer.

Leonard H. Ponder
Box 43
Weaverville, North Carolina

*Should cities put TEETH in their laws through . . . FLUORIDATION?* September, 1956, issue.

I certainly enjoy reading all that's in the Facts Forum News. As a secondary school teacher at West Virginia High School, I am planning to introduce Facts Forum News as a source for panel discussions. Also looking forward to getting your essay contest* for high school students.

Louis J. Greco
462 Holden Street
West Virginia, Pennsylvania

*Complete information on the Young American Essay Contest appears on page 27 of this issue.

I am enclosing a list of names of people who should be taking your fine paper, who we hope will read after reading copies of it. It is such an excellent magazine for those Americans interested in and concerned about the future of their country.

Mrs. Fred Harris
5602 Jones Street
Omaha 6, Nebraska

I read and reread "facts" — and pass it on. It is a wonderful, long-needed magazine.

Mrs. Dorothea M. Adams
264 Jefferson Court
Benton Harbor, Michigan

*Facts Forum * **Topic of the Week * Reporters' Roundup TV

Reporters' Roundup radio program is broadcast weekly by the Mutual Broadcast­ing System. Consult your local news­paper for station and time.

Portales
KEMM
1450 Fri
6:00 p

Roswell
KWSW
1450 Mon
6:15 p

Truth or Consequences
KCHS
1400 Sun
12:15 p

Tucumcari
KTNM
1400 Sun
8:00 p

NEW YORK

Albany-Troy
WCIA
41 Fri
9:00 p

Amsterdam
WC&S
1460 Mon
10:30 p

Brockport
WBF
907 Mon
7:45 p

Dunkirk
WFCB
1410 Mon
7:15 p

Hornell
WWBC
1350 Mon
10:15 p

Hudson
WCHB
1410 Mon
7:15 p

Jamesvllle
WJSN
1420 Mon
6:30 p

Middletown
WKIS
1450 Mon
7:30 p

New York
WOR
250 Mon
7:00 p

Niagara Falls
WJFT
1440 Sun
7:00 p

Port Jervis
WDLC
1470 Mon
7:00 p

PORT AUTHORITY

WPEN
1540 Sun
7:15 p

WPEN
1540 Sun
7:00 p

WEGO
1140 Sun
9:00 p
**SOUTH CAROLINA**

Anderson  WAIM-TY  40 Sun  3:30 p
Beaufort  WEBZ  960 Sun  2:00 p
Bishopville  WAGS*  1330 Sat  9:00 a
Charleston  WCKZ  5 Sun  4:00 p
Columbia  WRRD  1460 Sat  12:30 p
Edisto  WUCC  1490 Sat  6:30 p
Florence  WCKW  1230 Mon  9:00 p
Georgetown  WQKH  1230 Wed  9:00 p
Greenville  WFTC  1460 Sat  1:00 p
Mullins  WJAY  1280 Sat  11:15 a
Orangeburg  WYND  920 Sat  1:00 p
Portsmouth  WYND  920 Sat  1:00 p
Sumter  WSNW  1150 Sun  5:15 p

**SOUTH DAKOTA**

Rapid City  KRSI*  1540 Sun  5:45 p
Sioux Falls  KELO-TV  11

**TENNESSEE**

Clarksville  WDXX*  540 Sun  6:15 p
Dyersburg  WTSC  1450 Thurs  5:45 p
Elkhorn  WCFH  1220 Sun  2:15 p
Harriman  WHIT  1250
Jackson  WTNJ  1530 Sat  5:45 p
Johnson City  WJHL  11 Sun  2:00 p
Knoxville  WATE-TV  6
Lawrenceburg  WDRX  1370 Sun  5:30 p
Lebanon  WOCO  900 Sun  2:00 p
Loudon  WNOG  1470 Sun  5:30 p
Maryville  WCAH  1400 Sun  9:00 p
Memphis  WHBO  560 Sat  6:30 p
MCN  1460
Marionboro  WQNS  1430 Sun  1:00 p
Memphis  WBBB  1450
Newport  WLKK  1220
Paris  WSEW  940 Sun  4:15 p
Sevierville  WPTC  1450 Sun  1:00 p
South Pittsburgh  WPTO  910 To be announced
Springfield  WDTX  1430 Sun  12:00 a

**TEXAS**

Abilene  KXKW*  1340 Sun  9:15 p
Amarillo  KANC  1310 Sun  5:15 p
Ballinger  KRUN  1400
Brownsville  KEBE  1490 Wed  8:15 p
Big Spring  KBST-TV  1270
Bonham  KBTW  1450 Wed  12:15 p
Breckenridge  KFFX  1450 Sun  12:15 p
Brownsville  KBBF  1490
Brazosport  KBPB  1380 Sat  6:15 p
Carrizo Springs  KBEN  1450 Wed  6:00 p
Clifton  KCLE  1120 Sun  1:15 p
Colorado City  KVCC  1320 Sun  12:30 p
Corpus Christi  KFOR  1340 Sat  7:00 p
Crockett  KVTV*  1222 Fri  6:30 p
Dallas  KRLD-TV  1290 Sun  5:30 p
El Paso  KBTV  1290 Sun  5:30 p
Galveston  KULF  1400 Sun  7:00 p

---

**WASHINGTON**

Chehalis  KITT*  1420 Sun  5:00 p
Colfax  KCXL  1450 Sun  2:00 p
Colville  KCCF  1480 Sun  9:15 a
Crescent  KSEX  1450 Sun  9:30 a
Moses Lake  KSES*  1450 Thurs  9:30 p
Pullman  KOPF  1150 Sun  10:45 p
Seattle  KTFT-TV  1370 Mon  5:00 p
Spokane  KXLY  1450 Sun  11:00 p
Sunrise  KREV  1230 Sun  7:15 p
Tacoma  KATC  850 Sun  9:15 p
Walla Walla  KU*  1490

---

**WEST VIRGINIA**

Barboursville  KDFX**  750
Bel Air  WMGV*  1240 Sun  12:00 p
Morgantown  WCLG*  1500 Sun  4:45 p
Oak Hill  WTOA-TV  1400
Ronco  WROK  1400
Wheeling  WKVR*  1400 Sun  7:45 p

---

**WYOMING**

Cheyenne  KJOM  1240 Sat  10:00 a
Evanston  KLUX*  1240 Sun  1:00 p
Laramie  KOWB  1200 Sat  11:00 a

---

**What they're saying . . .**

**about FACTS FORUM**

The article by W. G. Vollmer entitled "The Primrose Path," September issue, is one of the finest of the many articles advocated by our government today and shows clearly what the outcome is when we violate rules and laws which our smart forefathers led us to follow under our American Constitution and Bill of Rights.

**CHARLES V. SOMMER**
6302 Alameda Blvd.
El Paso, Texas

---

**Article by Bullitt** is the most telling evidence against the deceiving cussedness of communism that I have ever read.

If it did not cost too much I would like to have 1,000 copies of that page for distribution. At 86½ years of age, it might be my last fight against the free world menace.

The people to whom I have sent your magazine praise it very highly. Yours in high regard,

S. M. MANN, M.D., Ret.
10 East Fifth Street
National City, California

---


---

**I am proud that I have been granted the privilege of having a small part in a magazine of the magnitude of Facts Forum News [a winning contestant in FFN Poll Question Contest]. May it continue to improve with each issue. If there was ever a time when a nation needs such a publication, it is now. May its effectiveness guide America toward a greater future.**

**DARYL P. BAILEY**
1112 South Howeth Street
Gainesville, Texas

---

**Facts Forum News continues to be a wonderful magazine and we need it more than when it started.**

**RUTH C. DOUGLAS**
R.F.D. 1
South Shaftsbury, Vermont

---

I am enclosing letter* recently sent to our paper in Seattle. Hope you can find a place for it in your valued publication.

**STANLEY MACDONALD**
2110 East 65th Street
Seattle 15, Washington

---

*Entered in FFN Letters to Editor Contest.

---

**What's Topic of the Week**

**Reporters' Roundup TV**

---

**WVTR** 1300 Sun 7:00 a

---

**Reporters' Roundup radio program is broadcast weekly by the Mutual Broadcasting System. Consult your local newspaper for station and time.**

---

**Facts Forum, November, 1956**

---

---
Contest Rules

To enter the Facts Forum contest it is necessary that contestants (1) vote the Facts Forum Poll and (2) submit with each entry a list of names and complete addresses of five friends who would be interested in receiving FACTS FORUM NEWS (contestants' names will not be used in connection with any solicitation).

Only one list of names is necessary for contestants to enter any one or all of the monthly contests. However, contestants are eligible to submit only one entry form each month. Use the handy entry sheet on page 63.

Letters to the Editors: Write letters of 150 words or less to your favorite newspaper about any subject of national interest. If you need more than 150 words to express your views, divide the material into two or more letters. Letters must have been published in a newspaper or magazine, and a clipping sent for entry.

An award of $10 will be paid for each letter selected by our contest judges.

Slogan: An award of $10 will be paid to the person who, in the opinions of the contest judges, submits a slogan superior to the one currently appearing in the magazine. Until such a slogan is received, the present slogan will be continued each month.

Poll Questions: Do you have questions on subjects of national interest which would be suitable for use in our monthly poll? Facts Forum offers a prize of $5 for each question selected by our judges. Questions for the contest must not contain more than 72 characters, including spaces. Questions will be judged for their current interest, fairness and conciseness. Keep questions "unloaded." Questions must be worded so that they can be answered "yes" or "no."

Questions for TV Program: Mail questions for use on Reporters' Roundup-TV to: P. O. Box 26, Washington, D. C. The three persons submitting questions used will receive Longines wrist watches.

Questions for Radio Programs: Questions suggested for Reporters' Roundup-Radio should be mailed to Mutual Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C. The three persons submitting questions used will receive Witmayer wrist watches.

1956 — "An Excellent Year"

(Continued from page 26)

preached that some of the credit policies condoned or acquiesced in by business were encouraging people to buy when they shouldn't, giving them terms that were too easy. However, I haven't seen anything that constitutes a real danger signal.

Q: Mr. Secretary, do you think our income tax system should be overhauled, or do you feel that it is in keeping with the times?

A: I think it should be overhauled. There should be a basic study and survey, because today in my judgment, we depend much too largely on income tax, both income from individuals and income from business establishments, corporate and otherwise. It is on a hair-trigger setup, so to speak, for if business should get very bad, the income which individuals must have to pay their bills would suffer accordingly.

Q: Does the Administration have a firm and fixed policy with respect to the state right-to-work laws — those state laws which, in effect, forbid a closed union shop?

A: I believe the record will show, if I am correct, although I wouldn't want to be held to this 100 per cent. that the President, at least inferentially, gave an indication that he believed that it was within the province of the states to regulate such matters as they see fit. The President appointed a committee to investigate federal-state relationships. Particularly in the labor field there has been a tendency for judicial decisions to bring about a federal pre-emption of the field which personally I don't think is justified or right. However, I would say basically that the President is very much interested in the federal-state relationship, and I think he believes in leaving as many of these things as possible to the states. I certainly, myself, favor any statute that comes under the general heading of the right-to-work statute.

Q: Mr. Secretary, you once stated that American industry can go on expanding. Do you feel that way at present about the auto industry with its lag in 1956 sales?

A: I certainly do feel that way. The population is growing and new products are continually coming into the market. I think industry is going to continue expanding. This drop-off or softening in the automobile field is to be regretted, but I don't think there is any permanency to it, particularly when this highway program gets under way.

Q: Your department in conjunction with the Labor Department has just issued an employment and unemployment report which shows the figure on employment in the United States is up to 66,500,000. Can you think of anything that compares with that anywhere at any time?

A: It is actually a million more than the previous all-time peak of August, 1955. It is two and a half million more than the figure last June. It is the best ever, and in my judgment it is based on the confidence the people have in the President and what is going on in this country and the direction in which our economy is headed.
DON'T MISS THE CROSS

To the Nashville Banner:

One of the most repelling things I know is cross burning. Repeatedly we read of a cross being burned before somebody's home or on somebody's property.

The cross is a symbol of sacrifice, not hating; of love, not hate; of blessing, not cursing; of salvation, not destruction.

Christ died on the cross for all men, not for any particular race of people. The cross is supposed to help us settle our differences, not aggravate them.

The cross is not a burnt offering. He who tries to make it such desecrates the cross and degrades himself.

George E. Miller
108 Cherokee Road
Nashville 5, Tennessee

REGISTER, VOTE . . .

To the Birmingham Post Herald:

Citizens must always be on the alert to protect their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

The first great essential is to be and remain an active citizen wherever one may live, by registering, paying poll taxes (if required), and voting in all elections.

We have grave responsibilities in doing our part of the big job. It will be so much easier if you and I and our friends will do our part as citizens, regardless of where we may live.

We must not fail our country. We must not fail ourselves.

Watts H. Cameron
Route 1, Box 39
Blount Springs, Alabama

REVENUE SERVICE CLAMPS DOWN

To the Milwaukee Journal:

Some of us were glad to read that our government's Internal Revenue Service clamped down on the Communists. It was a good thing, and it was high time.

Why should we pay taxes and have them go free? It is a crime that they ever were allowed to establish themselves in our country. If most of us knew the history of communism and its workings, we could and would more readily recognize the evil right under our very noses.

If our American people only knew how our money is so often used to help Red plans and propaganda, they would be far more active in fighting this wicked movement.

Gerda Koch
2616 W. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

THREE-WAY SCHOOLS

To the Dallas Morning News:

In all the pros and cons of the race question, I have seen one idea that seems to merit study: a three-way school system. We have had two systems all along. To force all races to go to a common school smacks of dictatorial power.

In the three-way system certain schools could be designated for each race, and other schools for those who wish to attend a common school. This would mean we had the right to choose. The way we are going now, we will be paying school taxes and have no choice.

Roy F. Carpenter
Route 8, Box 144
Dallas, Texas

LOWER INCOME TAXES NEEDED BY AMERICA

To the San Diego Union:

Shall we repeal the Sixteenth Amendment? Or shall we claim justification for our confiscatory income tax rates and our gigantic give-away? Which course is absurd? Both, I think.

How insane to extend our unintelligent give-away to communistic, allegedly-neutral nations! Should it go much beyond Formosa and South Korea? It certainly should be cut greatly, for friendship cannot be bought.

The promised five per cent income tax maximum has soared above ninety per cent. The lowest brackets are equally unreasonable; a limited federal sales tax as a substitute would be better — simpler to collect — simpler for payer.

Yet we need some income tax, merely to maintain the necessary federal government functions.

The answer? Triple the personal exemption; limit the top bracket to forty-five per cent; scale downward throughout; establish a sales tax with a suitably low maximum rate; make the limitations stick by constitutional amendment; and strive mightily for sincere thrift in government.

Ralph E. Jones
4150 Bedford Drive
San Diego 16, California

NEW PARTIES

To the New York Herald Tribune:

With the existence of such extremes within both our parties and the subsequent bi-partisan alliances of conservative and liberal elements on both sides of the aisle, it becomes next to impossible to vote a "straight ticket" nowadays.


It would be much closer to reality to establish conservative and liberal parties.

Marlyn D. Major
174 Murray Street
Binghamton, New York

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign states, a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my Country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies. 

— William Tyler Page
Boys and Girls of all ages...

You can be Santa Claus!

Earn your gifts for Christmas giving (and prizes for yourself, too)

Mail this coupon TODAY to get your FREE PRIZE CATALOG

Facts Forum, Inc.
Dallas, Texas

Please RUSH my big Christmas catalog with complete instructions about how I can earn GIFTS and PRIZES without cost.

Send to

Address

City State

Taking Things For Granted

By JOHN P. DEAR

There was a time in this country when even a single day of life was not taken for granted — much less water, shelter, or a safe night’s sleep.

Now, by reason of a uniquely bountiful heritage, we take for granted — too much. We assume, expect, insist; nowhere else in the world is this possible.

Unthinking, we accept not only the great urgencies of food, shelter, and clothes; but the spate of little things that go to make up a way of life — a pattern of security.

We take for granted the protection of our locked front door, a roof over our heads, heat, and light.

We expect our children, bursting with vitality and vitamins, to knock our hats askew with the vigor of their welcome. As breathing, we take for granted a hot bath, soup, penicillin, and sodas at the corner drug store.

We assume that young husbands will make a successful future for themselves, that elder husbands will retire on whatever over the long years they put away. We expect our daughter to have an evening dress.

We cheerfully assume that decent men will get into public office. We know veterans can get a GI loan, and we assume that with it, some of them will start another U. S. Steel; that another will marry, and produce an Edison, a Jefferson, a Carver.

We take for granted that we shall not be shot, or imprisoned, or have our “everything” confiscated; that our children will live to grow up.

What we forget every day, every moment, is our history. That it was not entirely to give us luxuries (now become necessities) that those men stayed at Valley Forge for twenty-two days; that Lincoln did the fine, unpopular thing, unwaveringly; that countless men died in prison camps between 1861 and 1864; that later half a million lay in their own blood on foreign battlefields. It was not to guarantee us ice cream, cake, and radios, that women bore children during Japanese attacks, were partners in the great pioneering of the West.

It is well to remember what our simple right to vote cost other human beings. Perhaps they had no thoughts of us; perhaps their thoughts were of creating their own America.

To take that heritage for granted is the first step toward losing it.
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HANDY ENTRY FORM FOR

FACTS FORUM CONTESTS

Vote the Facts Forum Poll. If no contest entries are included, simply dip poll questions below and mail.

EXPLANATION: If you wish to vote the Facts Forum Poll only, answer the questions, clip and mail to FACTS FORUM NEWS, 1710 Jackson Street, Dallas, Texas.

If, however, you wish to enter any of the Facts Forum contests, you must...
a. Vote the Facts Forum Poll.
b. Send it in with your contest entry.
c. Submit with each entry form the names and addresses of five persons who would be interested in receiving FACTS FORUM NEWS (your name will NOT be used in connection with any solicitation).

Each contestant is eligible to submit only ONE entry form each month. Read complete rules on page 60.

Your Name

Your Address

Names and addresses of friends who might wish to receive FACTS FORUM NEWS:

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

FACTS FORUM CONTESTS

Complete rules for all Facts Forum contests are given on page 60 of this magazine. The handy entry forms on this page are merely for the contestant’s convenience.

To enter any or all of the contests you must vote the Facts Forum Poll and list above the names and addresses of five friends who might wish to receive FACTS FORUM NEWS.

Poll Questions

I wish to submit the following poll questions (questions must be worded so that they can be answered “yes” or “no,” and must not exceed 72 characters, including spaces).

1. 

2. 

3. 

Slogan

I wish to submit the following slogan.

Letters to the Editors

Please enter the attached clipping of my “letter to the editor” in your contest. It does not exceed 150 words, and it has been published in a newspaper (or magazine).

Name of publication from which my letter was clipped

Name

My name
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SEPTMBER POLL RESULTS

% Yes
88 Has our national economy taken a beating in the name of foreign aid?
86 Should mass-picketing by labor unions be outlawed?
23 Should labor unions be abolished?
34 Should our three military services be merged into one?
41 Should there be a maximum age limit for the President?
62 Do advantages of higher tariffs outweigh the disadvantages?
20 Is the nation's internal security system doing more harm than good?
9 Is India's neutrality genuine?
82 Should the Supreme Court be curbed?
73 Should candidates for public office take a test as to their fitness?
80 Do you consider One-Worlders subversive?
93 Have we become too lax about displaying the American flag?
22 Should our school buildings be idle during the summer months?
77 Should executive departments be put on a pay-as-you-spend basis?

Governments Pay 1 in 6
(Reprinted from T & P Topics, published by Texas and Pacific Railway.)

At least one out of every six Americans receives a government check regularly.

Roughly 27,500,000 persons are on the receiving end of federal, state, or local government payments of one kind or another.

The vast majority get checks weekly or monthly. Others, such as farmers who subscribe to the federal soil conservation program, are paid less frequently.

Checks drawn directly against the U. S. Treasury now go to about 17,000,000 persons.

These include approximately 2,500,000 civilian employees of the federal government; 3,500,000 members of the armed forces; 2,800,000 farmers under the soil conservation program; 2,400,000 retired and disabled veterans; 1,000,000 veterans' survivors; 4,500,000 old persons and widows and dependent children under the federal Old Age and Survivors' Insurance program; and 200,000 retired federal employees or their survivors.

An additional 10,500,000 persons draw checks from state and local governments — in large measure out of funds to which the federal government contributes.

Highway workers, for example, live in whole or in part off checks drawn on funds put up by the federal government under the highway construction and aid-to-highway programs.

Many others are paid under old age assistance or aid-to-the-blind programs in their states, to which the federal government is a heavy contributor.

Direct state and local government checks, or state and local checks drawn partly on federal funds, are being paid to approximately 4,200,000 employees of state and local governments; 2,700,000 persons are getting old age assistance; 2,100,000 persons under dependent children programs; 100,000 blind persons; 100,000 persons who are permanently and totally disabled; 1,100,000 persons receiving state unemployment insurance; and 300,000 persons getting state and local general assistance.

In 1933, only about one person in 25 received a regular check drawn directly on the U. S. Treasury, or from a state or local government, as compared with at least one in six today.

Poll Question Winners
For November, 1956

An award of $5.00 has been made to the following persons who submitted questions used in this month's poll:

1st question: MRS. LEXIE D. ALLEN
Star Route
McConnelsville, Ohio

2nd question: R. W. CARR
1016 Seventeenth Street
Parkersburg, West Virginia

3rd question: HAWORTH A. CLOVER
2509 ½ North California Street
Stockton, California

4th question: MRS. D. COOK
138 Disroeli Road
Putney, S.W. 15, England

5th question: MRS. OLLIE DANIEL
Route 1
Frost, Texas

6th question: SAMUEL FREEMAN
2447 Third Street
Ocean Park, California

7th question: MRS. ED KNIGHT
Lometa, Texas

8th question: EDWARD MAYBURY
54 Osgood Street
Springfield, Massachusetts

9th question: MISS ANNA NEBEL
Station 1
Helena, Montana

10th question: JOSEPH PUSATERI
1717 Sixty-sixth Street
Brooklyn 4, New York

11th question: MRS. CLARA H. SEARLE
4131 Dry Creek Road
Napa, California

12th question: MRS. ANN SOBOL
718 West Complain Road
Manville, New Jersey

13th question: MRS. GEORGE WESSELL
58 Neuman Parkway
Tonawanda 23, New York

14th question: MRS. RUTH D. WILKE
1816 A South 12th Street
Milwaukee 4, Wisconsin

SLOGAN FOR NOVEMBER, 1956

A True Patriot Is an Active Worker

Submitted by MARGARET M. BROWNE
7119 East End Ave., Chicago 49, Illinois
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The scenic beauty of the state of Colorado made it a difficult assignment to select the most beautiful site for presentation this month... fourth in Facts Forum News pictorial series.

The history of Colorado is written in the scarred mines of its rugged mountains and the pioneer trails of its deep canyons. Colorado has no one building that is representative of this development, since the history was not placed in buildings, as it was back in our eastern states.

The growth of Colorado was so rapid and dynamic that buildings were not constructed in many cases until years after the need was first felt. The state legislature met in hotels, in bars, and even in a laundry. There was one period of time when the state’s legislative records were kept in a wagon and were carted from place to place throughout the state. For this reason the state of Colorado claims that it cannot boast of old state houses or old “white houses” of any type.

Colorado was on the move in early days just as it is now, and towns that appeared one night would disappear the next. Much of Colorado’s history had nothing to do with the descendants of the Mayflower. Most of the people came from the South, having first appeared as Spanish Conquistadores. Both the Spanish and the American Indians were responsible for naming many of the rivers, streams, mountains, and towns that exist in Colorado to this very day. They left no formal historical footprints in the past, but left only strange sounds from their various languages.

Photos courtesy of State of Colorado Advertising and Publicity Department

This quaint Hotel De Paris in Georgetown, Colorado, is now a museum.
AN ANGLER'S DREAM COMES TRUE...

Other Colorado attractions described on back of this cover.