

mind. Nothing can loosen the close unity of the government and the people. It is impossible to detach the underground movement from the Polish Government in London, the only lawful and constitutional government. All attempts to impose upon Poland a government or a regime from outside, to meddle in her internal affairs—political or social—to violate her territorial integrity, or to control her foreign policy, will always and everywhere meet with unanimous resistance from the government and people of Poland, at home and abroad.

Poland's gallant and unswerving fight against German aggression, Poland's immaculate moral and ideological record, give her the undeniable right to full justice, and to compensation for the incredible sacrifices made by the Polish people in their fight for world freedom.

The Poles were the first to fight the Germans. Poland has produced no Quisling. The sacrifices of the Polish Nation are greater than those of any of her allies. More than one-tenth of the entire Polish Nation have laid down their lives in the fight for freedom.

Our immediate aim is victory over the Germans, a victory that will free Europe and the whole world from any new aggression. Poland will demand material guarantees against any new German attack. Poland will demand strict adherence to articles 6 and 8 of the Atlantic Charter, which provide for a system of collective security and for permanent disarmament, as well as for rendering harmless states that are a potential threat to peace.

In reborn Poland, the complete unanimity existing between the Government and the people will find immediate expression in far-reaching political and social reforms, which, however, like the great reform of the 3d of May will not be imposed by force, but enacted by a free parliament elected by democratic universal suffrage. These reforms will seek first of all to raise the standard of living and productive strength of Poland to the level of the western democracies, and to improve the lot of the working classes which—as the 3d of May constitution said—are the best part of any nation. The declaration of policy of the Polish Government in London—a government of national unity—issued on February 24, 1942, rejecting all dictatorship, emphasizing devotion to democratic principles, guaranteeing equal rights to all minorities, promising full employment at fair wages, also provided for the completion of agrarian reform to increase in Poland the number of medium-size homesteads. Poland believes in the victory of right over might, justice over violence, and the reign of freedom in this world. Poland in a spirit of democracy looks to the world for the realization of her hopes, for Poland is really a test case. Without justice to Poland, there can be no better world.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, as we mark the anniversary of the adoption of a constitution in Poland in 1791, I should like to express the hope of every one of us, I am sure, that Poland and Polish people may once more enjoy the

liberty and freedom for which they have dared so much and endured so much. As we enter upon the days of our own greatest trials and final victory, it should not be forgotten that we are also charged with a great mission to restore the imprisoned and oppressed peoples of Europe who have already paid so dearly for their share in the triumph and in the better world to follow.

Freedom Through Free Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1944

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith, including as a part of the RECORD, an interesting and informative address delivered in this city late in April by Clarence K. Streit, author of *Union Now* and proponent of a proposed pattern of international cooperation called *Federal Union*.

Whether you agree with Mr. Streit's proposals as many do or whether, like me, you remain open-minded as to the optimum method to be used by the United States in making its influence felt for good in the post-war world, I believe you will find considerable food for thought in the accompanying address by Mr. Streit. His reasoning is the more challenging because it has the virtue of leading to specific suggestions and I am sure that it is the fervent hope of many Americans today that more and more we can replace the glittering phrases descriptive of general goals by definite proposals as to possible policies to be pursued in approaching the objectives which are so universally desired.

It is only as we get down to procedures and policies that we can really discover the size and scope of the area of agreement existing in the world today as to what can be done and what should be done to provide for a permanent peace and an orderly and prospering world in which a fair chance for the free people may become the right of the many instead of the privilege of a select few.

I do not know how to express my appreciation of the honor you have heaped upon me; it touches me too deeply. I feel the need of support, and when I really need support I always turn to my wife here. We have been a team now, and loved it, longer than either of us have lived alone.

My wife is French, you know, and I can express best in French how much I owe to her. The French have a word for it that we lack, or rather don't use any longer. I mean the second person singular. The French say *vous* to all the world as we say *you*, but in the family they use the more intimate *tu* and *toi*, our *thou* and *thee*, without the religious significance that has almost monopolized that form of address in English.

The first book I ever got published I dedicated to my wife. The dedication was in French, and one critic said it was the best

thing in the book. It was simply this: *Pas sans toi Jeanne Defrance.* (Not without thee, Jeanne Defrance.) And that's the way I feel about her tonight.

I would try, next, to thank those of you who, like my friend Governor Landon, do not agree with me in favoring union now—what am I saying?—who do not yet agree with me in favoring union. I honor highly the friendship of these men who carry the principle of free discussion to such a height, who not only agree with—was it Pitt?—that if the opposition did not exist it would have to be created, but join in honoring the opposition with a dinner.

I think they embody one of the highest American traditions, I confess I hope that they will end by following the example of one of the greatest of our neglected heroes. I mean Melancton Smith, the chief orator of the majority opposing Federal Union when the Constitution was up for ratification in New York State in 1788. When he finally became convinced—partly by the urbane logic of Hamilton and partly by the harsh logic of events—that he was on the wrong side, this remarkable Mr. Smith went over to the other side and brought with him enough others to give the Constitution a majority of three votes, enough to ratify it * * * for luckily the Constitution did not have to pass the Senate to go into force.

If my opposition friends who have done me so much honor tonight do not follow Melancton Smith's road, they are still in the great line that Peter Porcupine embellished. Peter Porcupine—his real name was William Cobbett—was, as his pseudonym implies, the sharpest-quilled of the British pamphleteers opposed to Tom Paine. But when Paine died in America, neglected by the people whose independence he had been the first to champion, Peter Porcupine so resented this indifference that he had the remains of Tom Paine dug up and brought back to an honorable tomb in England, to rest among the Englishmen whose Empire he had cut in two, but whose rights as men he had so immeasurably advanced. It seems to me this should encourage us all to look on our opposition with a more mellow eye. After all, without opposition none of us could discuss anything at all, and freedom of speech would be an empty right.

But though I am a great believer in thinking things out and discussing them freely, I must say that my primary aim has never been simply to stimulate thought and discussion. I am for them as the best means to sound action, but I would never divorce them from action, timely action. And so I hope you will pardon me if I express even warmer appreciation, if possible, to all those friends of mine who have agreed with me enough to work for *Union Now*. I wish I could thank each in person, or at least those whose devotion has touched me most, but there are too many of you. It is your unrecognized work that has brought me here and given the union idea what strength and life it has.

No matter what power a book may seem to have, no matter how much thought it may stimulate, its power is dissipated and lost unless some of its readers band themselves together to achieve its ends, and thus provide the only democratic means of achieving them, as these friends of mine have done in Federal Union organization (some of them, such as Howard Ford and Brice Toole there, continuously now for 4 or 5 years), and in the Student Federalists.

I know that many of these friends of mine agree with me only on balance. And I honor them the more for working for a program that is perhaps only 60 percent, or even only 51 percent, to their liking, and working as devotedly as though they approved it 100 percent. They are playing anew the part of

Alexander Hamilton, who, though many of his ideas were rejected by the Convention, championed the Constitution as ardently as if it were his own creation.

It is true that 51-percent swings the balance against 49 as decisively as does 100 percent against 0, but it takes a high type of citizenship to champion the reality of 51 percent right as firmly as the fanatical followers of dictators and demagogues champion the illusion of 100-percent perfection.

I confess I feel deeply on this problem of translating thought into action. It is the great problem of democracy in general and of our Republic in particular. For the wise checks and balances which our Constitution contains give a greater guarantee of free discussion than do other systems, but this greater freedom to find fault, and this greater difficulty to act, combine to expose us to the grave danger of too much thought and too little action.

"And thus the native hue of resolution

Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,

And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action."

By its very nature our Republic is always in much more immediate danger from its Hamlets than its Caesars; the dictator can rise only after prolonged indecision has delivered us to anarchy.

We Americans, it seems to me, have gone much farther than we realize on the road to anarchy. We say we are fighting in this war for freedom, period. Well, to advocate freedom without government is to advocate ungoverned freedom, or anarchy. We always stood before for freedom through free government, or for free government as the way to freedom, for the combination of these two that Webster phrased so well when he said: "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

In our first great war we Americans fought behind the great declaration that proclaimed that all men equally have certain inalienable rights and that "to secure these rights governments are instituted among men," and that "when any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government." How far we have wandered from that inspiring realism.

We were even more clear-headed in the Constitution when we announced that "We the people * * * in order to form a more perfect Union * * * and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution."

The issue in our next great war was to advance freedom by preserving the Union or, as Lincoln phrased it at Gettysburg, in the great language that is the hallmark of the true American tradition, "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Then Woodrow Wilson led us into our third great war * * * "for the things"—, as he put it—"which we have always carried nearest our hearts, for democracy * * * for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." Confusion had already put the accent on the rights of nations instead of the rights of men, on "dominions" and "concerts of free peoples" instead of on government, and union. Even so, President Wilson never treated freedom as a thing that could be divorced from human organization, never made the mistake of letting the people perish from lack of vision of the inseparable relation of freedom and government.

That mistake was never made in all our great wars until the present one. This time we have gone to war for freedom, indeed, for "four freedoms," but the leader who put the greatest accent on freedom has passed mutely over the primary American principle, that freedom can be had only by instituting free government. There is no hint of this principle in the Atlantic Charter or in the Declaration of the United Nations or in the Teheran communique.

The wishful tongue may find some taste of it in the statements of Secretary Hull, or in the Connally and Fulbright resolutions, but how their formulas suffer from the confusion of national sovereignty with human sovereignty which frustrated Woodrow Wilson. How much weaker are these formulas than his league, which failed because it was too feeble, because it did not form a government but what Alexander Hamilton called a political monster—a collectivity of governments.

The best that our leaders have yet given us—how blurred or blind it is compared to the vision in the Gettysburg address, the Constitution's preamble, the declaration of 1776—the clear vision of "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

For lack of this vision the people perish, and, first of all, our sons. We stand on the brink of the most difficult and dangerous of military enterprises—the invasion of Europe. We stand with millions of men armed with billions of dollars of material weapons, but not armed with the most powerful force on earth—a great idea capable of arousing fresh hope and faith and enthusiasm among the people. There has not been and there cannot be enthusiasm anywhere for reviving the big-power system of the quadruple alliance, the holy alliance. There has not been and there cannot be any enthusiasm for restoring national sovereignty or for a redictated Versailles treaty or a reconditioned League of Nations. The idea that freedom can be had without government has not aroused and cannot arouse faith or hope; the people know, as do their leaders, that ungoverned freedom is only anarchy in sheep's clothing.

The old American idea, the idea of freedom through free government, of liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable, that idea has never failed to rouse hope and faith and enthusiasm. Look at the support the great principles of the declaration drew us from Europe when the Colonies had no material power, nothing but an idea. Look at the way this idea undermined George III even at home. Consider, too, how the confused Wilsonian dilution of this idea of freedom through union fired our men and weakened the enemy, and brought victory sooner, and saved so many lives in 1918.

Now, for the first time in our history we are sending our sons to battle unarmed with a powerful idea, unarmed with the great idea that made America powerful, unarmed with the moral force that could save so many lives.

Who is responsible for this tragedy?

The President has a heavy responsibility for it. He has shouldered the responsibility for arming us on the material side and discharged that responsibility better, I believe, than any President ever did. But whereas the President can delegate his authority on the material side, he cannot delegate it on the moral side. This moral responsibility came first with Wilson and with Lincoln, and I wish the President had followed their great example. I pray he still may do so.

The candidates for his high office have their responsibility, too, for the country's lack of moral preparation, lack of bold, honest, straightforward leadership in the highest American tradition, for the neglect in this crisis of our primary principle of freedom through free government.

The Members of Congress, too, have their responsibility for this neglect. For 20 years the standing excuse for not trying to extend

this basic principle beyond our shores has been that "you can't get it through Congress." Had the Executive defaulted on the material instead of on the moral side, had the boys been sent to invade Europe, armed only with a great idea, would Congress have merely washed its hands? A Congress that could override the President on the tax bill could have assumed the moral leadership that he neglected, instead of passing milk-and-water resolutions on world organization.

After all, the first great enunciation of the American principle of freedom through free government did not come from any President or from any single leader; it came from Congress itself in the Declaration of 1776. Before there was a White House, there was Congress; it has never lost the right to lead; and from the Senate itself first came the great formula, "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

But before there was the Congress, there was the people. It was the people, acting in informal committees outside the regular machinery of government, who established the governments of the 13 States and the Congress. And it was again the people, acting through special conventions outside the regular governmental machinery, who established the Constitution, not only proclaimed therein the principle of freedom through free government, but set up the first Federal Union, the only form of interstate government that ever solved the problem we face today.

That first generation carefully secured the right of every succeeding American generation to be as great as they were. They expected us not to do less than they, but more. Since we have never lost the rights they had, it is no use our trying now to put on the President and Congress all the blame for our failure to arm our sons with the most powerful of principles. We the people, who made the Congress, and the Presidency, and the Constitution, have the ultimate responsibility for the tragic fact that our sons must now dash their lives against the walls of Europe without a single attempt to save them or to help them by first trumpeting forth a call that could shatter those walls as the walls of Pericho were shattered, the old American call of "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

It is no use our saying, "I'm only one individual in 130,000,000; what's the use—I'll never get the others to do what they should do." To make that excuse is worse than useless, for it is to deny the basic principle of this Republic—that "all men are created equal," equal in their right to freedom, equal in their responsibility for the Union of the free through which freedom comes.

The deep distinctive thing about our Republic is that it did not hitch its hopes—as so many regimes did before and do today—on great material power, but on great moral principles, not on the men in power, not on hereditary kings and lords, not on passing Presidents and plutocrats, not on fuehrers and dictators and members of a self-perpetuating ruling party, but on the least of men, on the humblest citizen—and on the only immaterial, intangible thing in him, on his conscience.

The hopes of our Republic have never been hitched before our time on combining the greatest armed powers, on bringing heads of states together in a clubby threesome or a foursome, and leaving everything to them, but bread and circuses. The hopes of our Republic have always been centered on uniting the common garden variety of citizen, the man with the hoe—on uniting the humble, man to man, equally and freely, first by the millions and then by the tens of millions and later * * * now * * * by hundreds of millions, and eventually by billions.