

more than any other two groups could do more toward solidifying and unifying the American people into the effective opposing force that must be massed if we are to destroy the enemy before he destroys us.

That is why there is much merit in House Joint Resolution 447, U.S. House of Representatives, as proposed by Representative PILLION.

Needed: Greater Mobilization of U.S. "Idea Reserve" To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in our Nation's battle against the Communist effort to take over the world, we are, in my judgment, failing to adequately utilize to the maximum degree one of our greatest resources—the brainpower of the free people.

How can this be accomplished?

Recently, I was privileged to make some suggestions in a radio broadcast over station WGN, Chicago. The idea of the broadcast was tied into a recommended Fourth of July effort to stimulate new thinking among our people on the challenges confronting the country.

We recognize, however, that such endeavors cannot be limited to a specific day. Rather, this is a year-round challenge.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

On July 4, 1961, the American people will celebrate, once again, the anniversary of our independence.

The occasion offers a great opportunity for us to renew the Spirit of '76; become rededicated to the ideals of our Republic; inspire the patriotism and greatness required for survival of freedom in these challenging times.

On July 4, 1776, the Liberty Bell was rung to announce the official adoption of the Declaration of Independence. This was actually the birthday of the Nation, and marks the most important single event in its history.

The Constitution—after adoption by the requisite number of States and put into effect in 1789—provided a foundation for the new Nation "• • • to form a more perfect union; establish justice; insure domestic tranquillity; provide for common defense; promote the general welfare; and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

For these ideals, early Americans fought, and won, a battle for independence.

Later, in the 1860's, the Nation faced a great trial of its life. In the midst of the Civil War, the great challenge, to paraphrase Lincoln, was: "to determine whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal could long endure." After a long and bloody struggle—with the highest war-casualty rate in our history—the Nation was preserved.

Now in the 1960's, we, again, face a great test: to determine whether a nation of free

men, faced with great, and growing, threat to survival, can endure, survive, and perpetuate the ideas and ideals of freedom.

In my judgment, Khrushchev's threat to "bury us" was not just an idle wisecrack. By word and deed, the Communist bloc, now controlling one-fourth of the land and one-third of the world's people, continues to mobilize its efforts toward world conquest.

In the face of such a challenge, what can we, the American people, in observing July 4, 1961, do to strengthen, in muscle and spirit, the ability of our country to meet the great challenges of the times?

Traditionally, we have observed July 4 by patriotic lipservice observances; shooting off fireworks; recreation; enjoyment of a lazy holiday; indulging in other kinds of celebrations.

But 1961 is no time for "playing." Rather, it is a time for serious reflecting upon the great threat to our way of life.

Should we, then—

Wave the flag? Yes.

Tighten our belts as necessary? Yes.

Better educate our people in the history, objectives, workings, and accomplishments of a free system? Yes.

Encourage greater individual effort, as well as civic, cultural, fraternal, veteran, religious, and other organizations to better serve our national cause? Yes.

In addition, we should encourage more citizens to enlist voluntarily, either in a military or nonmilitary role, to fight communism and to support national policies that effectively oppose the Red foe.

In my judgment, however, there is still a great untapped reservoir of good ideas of the American people on how to win the battle for freedom.

For this reason, I have suggested that we—and this means you and me—

Devote on July Fourth time to evaluating the challenges confronting the Nation, and

Create, if we can, new ideas on how to better combat the threat to our security and improve our way of life.

If in your judgment these would serve the national interest, then forward them to the President, or to myself, or to other Senators or Congressmen.

This is the time for action. Let's get going. Let's demonstrate to the world—

That as a free people we are not fat and lazy and so swimming in self-indulgence that we cannot compete with or defend our system against communism;

That freedom is not, as Khrushchev says, and outmoded concept that is literally dying on the political vine of history; and

That freedom, not totalitarian communism, is the dynamic revolution of the times that can best serve the people of the world now and in the future.

In this battle we need you, and you, and you. Only by so mobilizing every American can we hope to insure the triumph of freedom.

Gen. Thomas Dresser White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1961

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago the then U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, William C. Bullitt was involved in an airplane crash near Lenin-grad in the Soviet Union. The aircraft, piloted by a tall, dark-haired, good-looking young man, had become iced up, causing the crash. Mr. Bullitt immedi-

ately wired the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, saying:

We landed upside down, but came out right side up.

The pilot of that airplane on that cold bleak day in the Soviet Union was Gen. Thomas Dresser White, then a first lieutenant. And I can say it was indeed fortunate for us that this outstanding man came out of that crash unscathed. Certainly he has come out right side up ever since. General White was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in July of 1920 and has given his country over 41 years of outstanding, dedicated service. These 41 years have covered a unique period in history, particularly the last few years which have been termed the technological crossroads. I believe it fortunate that we had a man of the caliber of General White as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force during this period. We know that his successor, Gen. Curtis LeMay, will carry on the fine tradition that General White is leaving. I know all of you join me in wishing General White the best of everything. We shall reflect often on his unstinting and dedicated service to his Nation.

The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5, 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the Berlin crisis, written in May 1960, by Dr. Leo Szilard, of the University of Chicago.

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

[From the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, May 1960]

THE BERLIN CRISIS

DEAR SIR: Whether in the so-called atomic stalemate America and Russia may succeed in avoiding the war which neither of them want, will depend on a number of factors which are involved. It seems certain, however, that the stability of the stalemate would be enhanced if the great powers were to reach an understanding on the necessity of freezing the map for an extended period of time. It might be somewhat difficult to freeze the map as it stands at present, because it includes a number of arbitrary arrangements which were meant to be temporary, and perhaps it would be easier to freeze the map after certain readjustments have been made.

Those readjustments which may at present be negotiable are of necessity rather modest ones, but they might represent a first step in the right direction. Let us take the Berlin issue, for instance. Russia once proposed that there be established a loose federation between the West German state and the East German state. I suppose this would mean the setting up of a Federal Council with an equal number of delegates from West Germany and East Germany. Presumably, the delegates from East Germany would represent the Government of

the East German state, whereas the delegates from the West German state might either represent the Government of the West German state, or else they might be elected, by the Bundestag perhaps, or directly by the citizens of West Germany. Presumably, the ground rules of the Council would provide that it could take action only with the concurrence of 75 percent of the delegates. This rule would insure that action taken by the Council had the support of the majority of the delegates of both the West German state and the East German state.

There are enough issues on which the interests of West Germany and East Germany coincide to keep such a Federal Council busy and effective for many years to come—in spite of the severe restrictions imposed by the ground rules.

We may assume that, if such a loose federation between the two German States were established, there would be no bar to the migration of Germans within the federation. In order to keep migration to West Germany within tolerable limits, the government of East Germany would have to eliminate those restrictions which have in the past caused their people to flee to West Germany. Even so, there would probably be some migration to West Germany, at least initially, because the standard of living there is higher. In the case of a major economic recession in West Germany, however, migration would probably be reversed.

If we accept the thesis—as I believe we should—that, at some future time, such a federal council may be set up as a first step toward unifying Germany, then it would appear reasonable to propose that we resolve the current Berlin crisis along the following lines.

Let East Germany shift its capital from East Berlin to Dresden, and West Germany shift its capital from Bonn to Munich. Let us then set up East Berlin and West Berlin, each as a free city with a government of its own and, in addition, establish a council of Berlin, in which half of the delegates would represent East Berlin and the other half, West Berlin.

If such an arrangement were adopted, we would have made a constructive use of the current Berlin crisis, because the arrangement would enable us to find out how this type of federation would actually work, and Berlin might set the pattern for a subsequent federation of the East German State and the West German State.

About 2 years ago, I spent several months in West Berlin. There was no telephone communication between East Berlin and West Berlin at that time. People could freely cross over from one half of the city to the other, but taxicabs could not cross the dividing line. There was good theater both in East Berlin and West Berlin, and people crossed the line in order to go to the theater. It was very difficult, however, to find out in West Berlin what was playing in the theaters of East Berlin, because the West Berlin papers did not carry this information and there were no posters on display. I imagine the situation in East Berlin was quite similar.

Once the two Berlins cease to be pawns in the cold war, Berlin could again become a great cultural center; its theaters and concert halls might once more attract visitors from all over the world, as they did for a short time between the two world wars. The council of the two free cities, even though they could take action only with the concurrence of 75 percent of the delegates, should be able to adopt a number of nonpolitical measures which would enhance the welfare of the people of Berlin and would make both East Berlin and West Berlin a far more attractive place to live than they are today.

If the current Berlin crisis were resolved along these lines, then when Germany is ultimately united, it might end up having Munich as its capital rather than Berlin. This

might be just as well, however, for the thought of Berlin as capital of Germany is something of a nightmare to those who find it difficult to forget the past.

LEO SZILARD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill.

An Analysis of the Proposed Incorporation of Fairfax County as a City Through Consolidation With the Town of Clifton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following analysis of the proposed incorporation of Fairfax County as a city through consolidation with the town of Clifton.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED INCORPORATION OF FAIRFAX COUNTY AS A CITY THROUGH CONSOLIDATION WITH THE TOWN OF CLIFTON

(By Special Committee of the Fairfax County Taxpayers Alliance, Inc., To Study Proposed County-Town Consolidation, Harley M. Williams, chairman)

LEGAL BACKGROUND

Virginia is unique among the States in that all its cities are located outside the boundaries of counties. Towns are, however, located within counties.

To be incorporated as a town an area must have more than 300 and less than 5,000 people. Towns that have grown to more than 5,000 people may elect to become cities of the second class. Towns or cities of the second class that have grown to more than 10,000 people may elect to become cities of the first class.

Residents of cities pay no county taxes and get no county services and vice versa, except that by mutual agreement certain services may be shared and the costs borne by separate appropriations or by service fees. Since the residents of towns are also residents of counties in which the towns are located, they share in most county services and must pay county as well as town taxes.

ANNEXATION

Section 126 of the Virginia constitution requires the general assembly to provide by general law for the extension and contraction, from time to time, of the corporate limits of cities and towns. The general assembly has provided that the corporate limits of cities and towns may be expanded by annexing territory of adjoining counties, and that cities may also annex towns. However, cities may not annex the territory of other cities.

Chapter 8, title 15, of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, provides that after the adoption of annexation ordinances by city or town councils that three-judge circuit courts shall—

“ascertain and determine the necessity for and expediency of annexation, considering the best interests of the county, the city and the best interests, services to be rendered and needs of the area proposed to be annexed and the best interests of the remaining portion of the county, and whether the terms and conditions set forth in the ordinance are reasonable and fair, and whether fair and just provisions are made for the future management and improvement of

such territory and the rendering of needed services.”

In 1951 the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals upheld a decision of a 3-judge circuit court that denied the attempt of Falls Church to annex from Fairfax County 6,880 acres of land containing an estimated population of 14,000. On the same day (December 3, 1951) the supreme court of appeals also upheld a decision of a 3-judge circuit court that permitted Alexandria to annex from Fairfax County approximately 7.65 square miles of territory containing an estimated 11,000 inhabitants. In 1957 and 1959 the towns of Vienna and Fairfax won court decisions extending their boundaries within the county, Vienna acquiring 1,310 acres and Fairfax acquiring 2,225 acres.

Historically, annexation is the method by which cities and towns have expanded their corporate limits all over the country. According to the Municipal Year Book, in 1960 there were 712 separate annexations by cities over 5,000 in population that involved 1,083 square miles of territory. Jewell Cass Phillips, professor of political science, University of Pennsylvania, states in his 1960 text, “Municipal Government and Administration in America,” that: “The Virginia plan for annexation has received a good deal of favorable publicity, since it places responsibility for the ultimate decision concerning the wisdom and all-round fairness of annexation proposals in the hands of an impartial tribunal whose decisions have generally been for the best interests of the communities as a whole.”

CONSOLIDATION

Under Virginia law counties may consolidate with counties, cities with cities, and towns with towns. Article 4, chapter 9, title 15 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, also provides that counties and/or cities and/or towns may consolidate with each other.

Several consolidations have occurred in Virginia. For example, in 1910 the cities of Richmond and Manchester combined as the city of Richmond; in 1952, the city of Hampton, the town of Phoebus, and the county of Elizabeth City consolidated as the city of Hampton; and 1958 the city of Warwick merged with the city of Newport News. Warwick had previously converted from a county to a city in 1952 in order to escape annexation attempts by Newport News.

URBAN COUNTIES

Virginia's annexation laws are based on the idea that what is urban should be a city or town and what is rural should be a county. Yet in 1928 the Virginia constitution was amended to provide for new forms of county government, primarily for urban areas.

In 1930 Arlington County led the way with the first county manager plan of government in the United States. In 1932 the general assembly enacted the Optional Forms Act, under which Albemarle, Henrico, Fairfax, and at one time, Warwick, adopted county manager or county executive forms of government, which permits counties to provide many of the services offered by cities.

The general assembly can give to counties any or all of the powers possessed by cities. The general assembly has given Arlington County all the powers of cities except the powers to annex and to issue utility franchises. Because of their ability to supply urban services under powers granted by the general assembly, the suburban counties in Virginia have been trying to get the general assembly to curb the annexation authority to cities and towns.

ATTEMPTS BY FAIRFAX COUNTY TO SECURE SPECIAL LEGISLATION

Chapter 5, title 15 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, provides for the incorporation of towns within counties and chapter 6, title 15 for the transition of towns