

HOUSE FILE 449 REPRINTED

Walker of Hamilton asked and obtained unanimous consent to have House File 449 reprinted, as passed by the House.

CONCERT BY AUGUSTANA CHOIR

The Augustana Choir, from Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois, conducted by Brynolf Lundholm, gave a concert of several choral selections before the House at 12:30 p.m., today.

On motion by Goode of Davis, the House recessed until 1:45 p.m., today.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The House reconvened, Speaker Lynes in the chair.

Shifflett of Ringgold moved that a committee of three be appointed to notify the Senate that the House was ready to receive it in joint convention.

Motion prevailed and the Speaker appointed as such committee Shifflett of Ringgold, Nielsen of Monona and Stiffler of Warren.

The committee appointed to notify the Senate that the House was ready to receive it in joint convention reported that it had performed its duty. Report was accepted and the committee discharged.

The sergeant-at-arms announced the arrival of the President of the Senate and the honorable body of the Senate.

The President was escorted to the Speaker's station, the Secretary to the Chief Clerk's desk, and the members of the Senate were seated on the west side of the chamber.

JOINT CONVENTION

In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 20, duly adopted, the joint convention was called to order, William H. Nicholas, President of the Senate, presiding.

Senator Byers of Linn moved that a committee of six be appointed to notify the Pioneer Lawmakers that the joint convention was ready to receive them.

Motion prevailed and President Nicholas appointed as such committee Berry of Calhoun, Hanna of Adams and Ramseyer of Wash-

ington on the part of the House, and Senators Byers of Linn, Moli-son of Poweshiek and Mercer of Johnson on the part of the Senate.

The committee previously appointed escorted the Pioneer Lawmakers to the House chamber.

President Nicholas welcomed the Pioneer Lawmakers with the following remarks:

TO THE PIONEER LAWMAKERS OF IOWA AND MEMBERS OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

It is not only a great pleasure, but a distinct honor for me, upon this occasion, to welcome you, members of the Pioneer Lawmakers, to this joint convention. We who are your successors in the making of laws for the State of Iowa have a great privilege in looking into the records of the past to guide us in our deliberations of today. I personally have a very deep feeling of responsibility in the maintaining of the traditions of many years, whereby we meet as we do today in joint session, to give proper recognition and honor to you, the legislators of the past, for the splendid work you have done in the years gone by. So today we are most happy to greet you, to welcome you, and to look forward in great anticipation to the program which is about to be rendered. I therefore take great pleasure in introducing to you the Senator from Muscatine, the Honorable Herman B. Lord, who will extend the official welcome on behalf of the Senate.

On behalf of the Senate, Senator Herman B. Lord of Muscatine welcomed the Pioneer Lawmakers with the following remarks:

MR. PRESIDENT, PIONEER LAWMAKERS, MEMBERS OF THE JOINT SESSION, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The privilege of welcoming the Pioneer Lawmakers of Iowa on this occasion is an honor and an opportunity. With this undertaking I have discovered a philosophy that otherwise would not have been revealed to me. In checking over the Journals of other sessions with reference to meetings of the Pioneer Lawmakers, there has come to me two thoughts which I shall set out in separate parts:

1. Today we stand in the presence of those whose endeavor in the past has become a heritage to us as evidenced by the functions of government and institutions of this great state.

It seems to me that to know more personally and intimately our honored guests we should ask that their names be published in the Journals as a part of these doings. In this way we may better preserve the memories and personalities of this occasion.

2. Throughout their labors there seems to run a thread of admonition to us, starting with the Constitution which contains therein, in the Bill of Rights, Article I, Section 1, the following:

"All men are, by nature, free and equal, and have certain inalienable rights—among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness."

Under the Bill of Rights man is a free agent and only such restraints shall be placed upon him as will require him to respect the same rights for others.

We are warned that as the population becomes more dense, our society will become more complex. As society becomes more complex, there will be more demands for rules and regulations made upon the legislature by special groups. As rules and regulations are increased, that freedom which our Pioneer Lawmakers intended for us is limited and restricted.

We have met in regular session for the 54th time. During that period there have been enacted over 17,000 sections within 795 chapters of the Code. And it is safe to say that Iowa has not less than 50,000 departmental rules and regulations, and many have the force and effect of statutory law.

It would appear that 17,000 Code sections should be sufficient to regulate a complex society. Should Iowa legislatures continue in the next 54 sessions at this rate, the Civil Rights provisions of the Constitution could well be nullified.

In gratitude to you, the Pioneer Lawmakers of Iowa, we the lawmakers assembled here today give thanks for your philosophy—that philosophy “that the least governed is the best governed”.

We promise you here, we promise you now, that your posterity shall remain free.

President Nicholas introduced the Honorable Arch W. McFarlane of Black Hawk with the following remarks:

It now gives me great pleasure to introduce to you one of your fellow members, and still a member of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, and recognized as the dean of Iowa legislators, the Honorable Arch W. McFarlane of Black Hawk County, who will extend to you a welcome on behalf of the House of Representatives.

On behalf of the House, the Honorable Arch W. McFarlane of Black Hawk welcomed the Pioneer Lawmakers with the following remarks:

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE JOINT CONVENTION AND PIONEER LAWMAKERS:

It certainly gives me one of the greatest thrills of my lifetime to appear before this distinguished group of Iowa citizens today because I am one of the pioneers and a member of your association.

I was raised on a reading diet which included all of J. Fenimore Cooper's Leatherstocking tales, and I got my idea of what a pioneer looked like and acted like out of such books as the “Deerslayer.”

In later years, especially since the movies came along, my subconscious idea of a pioneer became even more glamorous; all pioneers were rugged heroes, all pioneer women were beautiful, and the few villains who moved in on them were speedily disposed of.

I realize now that all of the men and women I knew in my boyhood were pioneers, and pioneers of the sturdiest type. Many of you here today were reared under pioneer conditions and knew at first hand some of the tough side of pioneer life here in Iowa or elsewhere.

I doubt very much if any of you here today thought about yourself as a pioneer in the Iowa lawmaking business. Yet, even today, lawmaking is still a good deal of a pioneering process. We are constantly entering new fields of public activity, enacting measures never even thought of in our earlier days of statehood, and made necessary by the inevitable march of time.

As I look back upon the legislative history of Iowa, I begin to realize with the passing of years what a good job earlier pioneer lawmakers did when they wrote the Constitution of the State of Iowa to begin with, and when, through the sessions of each General Assembly, they built up what is now the Code of Iowa.

I am also somewhat amazed when I realize that on really fundamental issues, such as roads, schools, and public welfare, we seldom find that our legislation needs repealing. I can't remember a single really important development along these lines in which the General Assembly has found it necessary to go into reverse.

As we meet here today it is appropriate that we should pay tribute to the great men who have been our pioneer lawmakers throughout the years.

Their greatness was not always recognized at once, sometimes, indeed until long after they were dead.

One of the greatest of them all, Samuel Kirkwood, came to the state Senate with, as they say, "seeds in his hair."

In my own time I have seen young men come into the Iowa House with little or no heraldry, and develop into governors and United States senators before my eyes. I consider our lawmaking body sometimes in the light of a university for the training of public leaders, and it is, in my own opinion, a very great and successful school.

On behalf of the members of the House of Representatives, I deem it a great deal of pleasure to welcome you here today and sincerely hope that your meeting will be beneficial and that you will all enjoy yourselves by renewing acquaintances with the older members and friends and becoming acquainted with the new members who are trying to follow out the program which you outlined in years gone by.

President Nicholas introduced the Honorable Carl W. Reed, vice president of Pioneer Lawmakers, with the following remarks:

Due to the fact that your President, the Honorable C. F. Clark of Cedar Rapids, is unable to be present on account of illness, it is now my pleasure to present to you, and introduce to the members of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly, the vice president of the Pioneer Lawmakers of Iowa, the Honorable Carl W. Reed, who is presently serving the State of Iowa so ably as one of our commerce commissioners.

The Honorable Carl W. Reed addressed the joint convention as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THIS JOINT ASSEMBLY OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, FELLOW PIONEERS, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It is my pleasure at this time to refer to four distinguished members of our association that are now serving in the legislature—Senator Byers,

Mr. McFarlane from Black Hawk, Mr. George Miller from Shelby County, and Mr. Langland from Winneshiek County. Those are men who have been in the state service a long time ago and are still working for the people.

The introducing of myself as vice president brings to mind a story that was going the rounds a good many years ago, back in what were known as the horse and buggy days. A farmhand, who in those days was called the hired man, after his evening chores were finished one day, was very busy polishing his lantern globe. He was going to have a very clean, polished clean, lantern chimney. His boss observed his industry working on that chimney and he said to him, "Well, Al, what are you going to do tonight? Why are you so busy fixing up that lantern chimney?" And the hired man said, "Well, boss, I am going courting tonight and I am fixing my chimney so as to have my lantern in the best shape." And the boss said, "Well, that is strange fixing up your chimney to go courting. Why, when I was a young man and went courting, I never took a lantern with me." The hired man said, "No, you didn't take a lantern but see what you got." Now if any of you came here to see Frank Clark, see what you got.

However, Frank was very faithful and he sent up a story of these men which I am going to read to you. It is entitled, "The Constitutional Convention."

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The most dramatic event of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly was the killing of the constitutional convention bill by the House of Representatives.

Section 3, Article X, of our state Constitution provides that the question of calling a constitutional convention be submitted to the voters every ten years, and if the voters vote in the affirmative the General Assembly shall provide for the holding of the convention.

This measure was submitted and defeated every ten years until the general election in 1920 when it was carried by a very small majority, with only half of the voters of the state voting on the proposition at all. It probably would not have carried even then if it had not been for eleventh hour telegrams sent out from Des Moines, urging votes for the convention, but without giving any reasons. The parties responsible for sending out these telegrams never suggested any reason for calling the convention, or any amendments that could not be made in the usual way without a convention.

Bills were introduced in the House and in the Senate, the chief difference between the bills being that the Senate bill called for non-partisan election of delegates to the convention, while the House bill provided for their selection on party tickets. The House bill passed the House by a vote of three to one, and when this came up for consideration in the Senate the Senate bill was substituted. The House refused to concur in the Senate substitution; the Senate insisted and conference committees were selected.

Speaker Arch McFarlane was opposed to the convention and selected a conference committee, of which I was named chairman, which would endeavor to prevent the calling of the convention. I succeeded in delaying the meeting of the conference committees until the lunch hour of the closing day of the session. The House conferees insisted that the Senate must take the House bill or nothing, hoping this would result in a deadlock which would prevent the measure from passing. The Senate conferees at first were equally insistent on their bill, and I suggested that we report a disagreement. The Senate chairman called for a conference of the Senate conferees and they announced that they would accept the House bill rather than see the measure lost. A struggle then ensued in the committee, the House members urging that we agree to disagree, but the Senate members would not consent to this and the report was made out, the Senate receding from its substitute and adopting the House bill with the single modification of an age qualification of twenty-five years for delegates.

The report was drawn up and signed and, as chairman, I submitted it to the House at about 4:00 p.m., the legislative clock still standing at 11:40 a.m., as the Assembly had voted to adjourn at noon. The report was submitted amid the usual confusion and hubbub of a closing day and I merely suggested that, if the House really desired a constitutional convention along the lines of the House bill, it should adopt the report.

The vote showed up before us on the voting board, with two-thirds of the members voting in the affirmative, and the only thing remaining was to count and announce the vote.

Just then Joe Anderson of Winnebago County (afterwards Speaker) rushed over to my seat and asked me whether that meant a constitutional convention. I replied that it certainly did unless someone made a motion to reconsider within the next thirty seconds. Neither he nor I could make the motion, as neither of us had voted on the prevailing side, but I suggested that he go to Peters of Dallas County, who sat in the front row center, and get him to make the motion to reconsider as soon as the vote was announced, while I went up to the Speaker's desk and advised him what we were trying to do. The motion was made and Anderson started the debate, while I sent to the law library for memoranda relating to the legal right of the legislature to defeat the bill and prevent the convention.

As Anderson took the floor and announced our purpose to defeat the "Con Con" the confusion immediately subsided, and amidst intense excitement and silence unusual in the House, the debate proceeded. Information spread over the State House that a fight had been started on the "Con Con" and the galleries as well as the floor of the House—the doors having been thrown wide open for the closing day—were immediately packed to their full capacity, while ten or fifteen Senators came over to watch the proceedings.

Among those who joined with us in the attack on the bill were Edson of Buena Vista (afterwards Speaker), Powers of Crawford, leader of the Democratic minority (and afterwards Supreme Court justice), Moen of Lyon, Narey of Dickinson, Lake of Woodbury and others.

Among the arguments used was the fact that only about half of the voters voted on this proposition at all, and so while the proposition carried by a very small majority, less than thirty per cent of those who voted for president voted in favor of the convention. It was also claimed, and not denied, that a large percentage of those who voted for the convention did not know what they were voting for. Members reported that they had heard from home, and those who had been home reported that there was now a strong opposition to it all over the state, the people feeling that it was unnecessary and might involve the expenditure of half a million dollars, and that it was not advisable in unsettled times, when there are so many strange isms and theories abroad, to rewrite the fundamental laws of the state.

Those supporting the bill, led by Weaver of Polk, Mayne of Palo Alto, Westervelt of Greene, Forsling of Woodbury, argued that the General Assembly was under obligations to listen to the mandate of the people as expressed at the last general election, and that it was a duty imposed on the General Assembly by the Constitution to provide for this convention, and that it would be a most unusual proceeding to override this mandate.

In reply we insisted that this mandate was expressed in the same terms as the constitutional requirement that the state should be redistricted senatorially after each census, although this had been ignored by the legislature after every census for sixty years. Also, that there was nothing in the Constitution that required any member of the legislature to vote against his best judgment and conscientious convictions on any proposition. I also called attention to the fact that the action we were proposing to take was not without precedent as similar actions had been taken theretofore by the legislature in half a dozen states, including two different occasions by the legislature of New Hampshire, and the courts had sustained the right of the legislature to block the convention in this manner.

When the debate started, none of us knew what the result would be. The question had been brought before the House as suddenly as a bolt of lightning from a blue sky, but at the close of the debate the House by a vote of 71 to 17 voted to reconsider and then by a similar vote rejected the report of the committee.

To prevent any interference with the expressed desire of the House, I then made a motion that the House request the return of the bill from the Senate, and that the chief clerk be directed to retain it in his possession until final adjournment, and that the chief clerk and enrolling clerk be directed not to enroll the bill, and Speaker not to sign it as Speaker of the House. This motion was carried by an overwhelming viva voce vote, and as the Des Moines papers reported, "amidst wildest applause and confusion."

When this request from the House was presented before the Senate, an attempt was made to substitute by receding from the Senate amendments and accepting the House bill. This was defeated by a vote of 34 to 15, and the "Con Con" bill, back again in the hands of the House, was buried forever.

The only three constitutional amendments suggested during this debate were: an amendment giving women the right to be members of the General Assembly; another making different provisions for the districting of the state in senatorial districts; and a third providing for collective bargaining by producers. The first amendment suggested, giving women the right to be members of the General Assembly, was adopted by vote of the people in 1926. No change has been made relative to procedure in redistricting the state senatorially, but in 1928 an amendment was adopted which provides "but no county shall be entitled to more than one Senator." Since 1916 no amendments to the State Constitution have been submitted or adopted, aside from the two above referred to and the amendment of 1936 which repealed the provision for the taking of a state census, and the amendment of 1942 which provided that all motor vehicle registration fees and all licenses and excise taxes on motor vehicle fuel, except cost of administration, shall be used exclusively for the construction, maintenance and supervision of public highways exclusively within the state, or for the payment of bonds issued or to be issued for the construction of such roads.

The present Constitution of Iowa was adopted in 1857 and there are but few states now operating under a constitution adopted at an earlier date. The amendments adopted prior to 1920 were few in number and of little general importance. Two of them provided for striking out the word "white" from various articles of the Constitution. Two others made certain provisions relative to the establishment of judicial districts and abolishing the office of district attorney and substituting that of county attorney; the amendment of 1904 providing for biennial elections and making slight changes in the election of members of the General Assembly, and the amendment of 1908 providing for establishment of drainage districts. It would therefore appear that the Constitution as now amended contains all the fundamental provisions of a Constitution and has proved satisfactory to the people of Iowa for nearly a century.

Mr. Reed introduced the Honorable L. B. Forsling with the following remarks:

The principal speaker this afternoon is the Honorable L. B. Forsling, judge of the District Court of Woodbury County. Judge Forsling was a member of the House in the Thirty-ninth, Fortieth, Fortieth Extra, Forty-first, Forty-second, Forty-third and Forty-fourth General Assemblies and the Senate of the Forty-eighth, went to the district bench out there and for a while was in the Army and is now back on the bench; and it is my pleasure to present to you Judge Forsling.

Judge Forsling addressed the joint convention as follows:

I served six terms on this side and a term on the other side. I spoke often, maybe too often, to the House members, and spoke often, maybe too often, to the Senate members. This is the first time that the members of the Senate and House together have been compelled to listen to me.

I don't know any work that can be done that I know of that is better than that of legislating, and again there is no work more fascinating than that of legislating. Certainly there is no work that is more important

than that of legislating, and I am sure that there is no work that is so little appreciated as legislating.

It is good to be here and I appreciate very much this honor. It is nice to meet with the men that we struggled with and had our legislative contacts with, with whom we agreed and with whom we disagreed. We thought that we were solving all of the problems of the state when we were serving here, but of course we did not, and maybe it is just as well we did not. It would not be much of a world, it would not be a good world, if we had. We thought we did a good job. Maybe we did. I think we did. But it is good to know that the work that we left unfinished, the work that is left to be finished, and is going to be done now, is in the hands of capable successors.

I propose to talk of that which is uppermost in the minds of Americans and now concerns Americans the most. I do not come as a partisan. America's tangled foreign relationship have brought troubles as big as the nation, solution of which calls for the courage and best thought of all patriots of both and all political parties. America is at its Calvary. In our present situation there is no clear line of cleavage, with adherents of either party having divergent views. Both major parties are guilty of fault responsible for our existing trouble; one party in the driver's seat, the other hopeful to drive, yet seemingly content to ride along.

You may ask why an obscure person in the hinterlands of Iowa should presume to discuss the subject. Answer will be given later on.

We are at war in Korea—already our fourth largest war as measured by casualties—the war threatening tremendous enlargement, with causes, reasons and objectives stated in platitudes or sophistries.

This is a crisis of confidence. What is doubted by millions of Americans is the ability of our leaders to rightly decide problems or their ability to point the way. Lack of confidence in our present statesmanship in that these same persons have piled blunder on blunder, have brought us to our present danger. We have a feeling of bewilderment resulting from diplomatic ineptitude; a history of turns and reversals, a period of off again, on again. American people are afraid this rigmarole will continue on and on until our destruction.

We engaged in two world wars under the slogans "save the world for democracy" and "self determination of small nations." We were victorious in both wars, yet democracy is more restricted now than before our participation; yet small nations have been overcome by the larger.

The manpower, military and industry of America achieved total victory in World War II, but in their turn our diplomats lost the peace as thoroughly as we had won the war.

We destroyed German ability to again make war and boasted at the extent of that destruction. We are now feverishly endeavoring to rebuild, at our cost, that same destruction.

Our amateur diplomats debating tweedledee and tweedledum, lost babes not knowing what they want, are opposed to the professionals of other people, who definitely do know what they want.

We boasted of the complete destruction of the military of Japan. We gave the Japanese a constitution. At the insistence of those profound

thinkers of ours we inserted in that constitution, and perforce accepted by the Japanese, a provision whereby the Japanese forever forswore war or the power to make war.

Now these same profound thinkers are re-arming Japan, America, of course, paying the bill.

Also the star-gazers are now urging the Japanese to eliminate the provision so ardently and fervently insisted upon by us.

We ousted the Japanese from Korea, then granted Russia a joint protectorate of that unfortunate country, victim of its neighbor. We now regret the invitation. We took Korea under a protecting wing—we led it by the hand to better and higher things under a benign and beneficent administration. When all Koreans did not agree on the benefits conferred, we engaged in shooting them and in the destruction of their countryside and cities. Such is the way of some guardianships.

We declare ourselves against dictators, but actually pick and choose, changing with the seasons and without apparent reason. Yesterday it was "good old Joe," today something else. Tito an enemy yesterday, a friend today. Franco unworthy of consideration yesterday, recipient of favors today. We love Vargas and dislike Peron. Our departments vociferous in the denunciation of communism abroad, and equally solicitous of the protection and welfare of the communist (and his fellow traveler) who lives and works and sabotages in our midst. We reject the communists abroad, embrace them here at home, we even extend glad tidings to them.

This recital of failure and contradiction could continue indefinitely. It is given to show a few of the reasons for lack of confidence. Water over the dam. Not water but blood and much of it; blood not over the dam but still flowing, and those same crystal gazers still in charge.

No set course, a record of gymnastics, the pattern of the crazy quilt with a thread of red interwoven. (The conclusion is inescapable.) John L. Lewis was eminently correct in his estimate of the abilities of our state department. Could others have done better? Could others have done worse?

Who then are responsible for these tragic sequences? For the most part amiable and well-meaning gentlemen but men obsessed with conflicting purposes, loyal to a world organization and super-government; secondarily loyal to American interests. The result is we carry, or try to carry, the world in a basket, the basket necessarily paid for by us. An optimism of welfare for the entire world, rather than welfare of nation.

A divided loyalty, requiring a departure from organic law, a departure from established principles, a departure from honesty of statement, depending for justification on twisted reasoning. Twisted reasoning not confined entirely to the disciples of either political party.

A conflict of ideas between those who have an abiding and decent respect for our natural obligations to people of other lands without undue sacrifice of our own interests and those who think it America's duty to run the world willy nilly under and according to theories of the unrealistic and impractical. A perfect demonstration that two masters may not be served.

To carry into effect this business of running the world we have abandoned basic things, and are required to adopt strange, startling changes and innovations in the tenets of government.

We have abandoned the golden rule of individuals and nations, that we cannot arrogate to ourselves that which we do not grant to others, nor demand of others what we do not require of ourselves.

A departure from the concept as found in our declaration that when the bonds which have united one people with another become burdensome, then is the privilege to dissolve those bonds.

A departure from the accepted principle that we or any people may conduct internal affairs as we or they dispose without interference, they with us, we with them.

A setting aside of our Constitution which grants to Congress sole power to declare war or appropriate for war.

Concealment of the truth in that the physical integrity of America is not now nor has been for a century menaced by outside forces; choosing to ignore that our real danger comes from maladjustments within; that if America and its priceless heritage is destroyed this destruction will arrive from internal stresses—a blowing apart at the seams.

A failure to recognize the upheaval which is taking place inspired by that same pronouncement which uplifted the colonists to freedom; the yellow and brown races breaking the chains of the outlander; resisting and throwing off exploitation, peonage, poverty and misery which attends empires or colonial systems. A movement which always heretofore has had our sympathetic understanding. A business strictly of those peoples in which the humanities tell us not to meddle. A movement necessary and offering eventual hope for a successful and useful congress of nations.

A departure from organic law in that under it we and they have the right to define, enlarge or limit our government organization; to have king become dictator or representative government as we or they decide and will permit no questioning of that right even though outsiders greatly differ.

Under which golden rule we grant to others the same non-interference regardless of our opinions, likes or dislikes. Incidentally, history discloses that people unite in resisting the meddler and that foreign intervention seldom achieves its objective.

That thinking responsible for the abrogation of the provision which grants Congress the decision of war; abrogation of the provision granting Congress sole authority to appropriate for war; a thinking which would and at this immediate time does give other departments the privilege of embezzlement, the using of public monies set aside for building a military to the expenditure and dissipation thereof in various expeditions. A line of reasoning which brings rhapsodies such as this—I quote from a recent editorial in Iowa's largest newspaper:

"Think what a genuine federal world government with power to raise its own taxes and armed forces could do." Here consider all the implications as of the present—the United States the only have nation in a world envious, covetous, resentful.

The apologists for those dreamers justify the Korean venture, descending in so doing to plausible falsities.

They state we are on a policing expedition—not involved in war, even though the American casualties already exceed those of the wars in 1812, Mexico or Spain.

The apologists say the dignity of the United Nations was involved; that war was required to sustain that dignity. The truth is the 38th Parallel, the Korean Mason-Dixon Line, was not established by the United Nations but by the joint action of Russia and the United States, a proposition with which neither the Koreans nor the United Nations had anything to do, the crossing of which reflected internal dissension by opposing factions of Koreans.

Again the apologists claim the Korean war to be the action of the United Nations. In this claim they are not candid. In making the decision Asiatic nations, India, Pakistan, Burma, Malaya and others did not vote affirmatively. Those nations most directly concerned. Nor did the nations which voted with us at our importuning, cajoling, in consideration of favors granted or to be granted, bind themselves as full partners. The vote was little more than a sanction for us to undertake the venture. No delegate from another country would, nor could, have obligated his people to a full participation of troops, equipment or money. The proof of this may be found in the casualty lists. Despite reports issued to delude us, that disparity no doubt still continues and will continue. Beyond token forces no other government dares to go; casualty lists in proportion to ours would in parliamentary countries bring fall of government overnight. Misinformation blinds us to the real situation; other people realistic and not so misled know the Korean war can bring neither good nor permanent end. What is said may be considered a simplification of the issues; actually the issues can be further simplified. In 1947 Russia agreed to withdraw from Korea conditioned on similar withdrawal by us; this we refused to do, alleging the Russians had rigged the election proposed for Korea. Now then we are engaged in killing Koreans, and they killing Americans, because Russia, a foreign power present through our acquiescence, did or might have influenced an election.

Koreans have no designs on us; a land of relatively primitive, poor and inoffensive people, yet the land of a major war with a rate of losses for us far exceeding that of the war with Japan.

What are the justifications from those responsible?

You know of the young marine and his father who made inquiry. The news account of the reply by Secretary Acheson said his reply of 1000 words was two weeks in being formulated. In brief I shall give you that piece of tripe by Acheson which was two weeks in the cooking. I quote from the newspaper account:

"I thought then and I think now the real problem lies deeper than the question of particular decision, even the important ones which distress your son. It lies (the second time he uses this word) in the fact, for which we thank God, that these boys have been brought up in the fundamental decency of American life. I appeal for a strong faith on the part of American young people in the validity of the ideals on which the country was founded and in which it now endeavors to guide its action. The young men of the nation are denied the natural development

of their lives and are undergoing an agony of spirit. This is due to the fact that some distant and shadowy figures in the Kremlin, controlling millions of people far from them, are setting out to make impossible the kind of life which Americans had every hope and right to live."

What an illuminating answer, and a fair sample of the bologna which is the portion of the American people.

It is self-evident that the secretary does not know the purpose of being in Korea, any more than we ourselves do.

The sad story is the Korean war will be entered in the histories as a war, not fathered by the American Congress, nor actually sired by the United Nations—the product instead of artificial propagation, that kind of war for which descriptive and appropriate names can easily be supplied.

And now consider China and keep in mind the golden rule of non-interference. The explainers say the Chinese communists attacked our forces in Korea. This is in accord with the fact. The explainers, however, fail to go on and say that the United States long ago took up the cudgel for the opposing Nationalists represented by Chiang. That we actively participated in Chiang's behalf in the Chinese factional war. We continued that support despite the fact that the Communist faction demanded and agreed to a cessation of internal hostilities and a joinder of the Chinese to oppose Japan—then the common enemy of China and of us, and further continued the support of Chiang after his refusal of that offer.

We continue the support of Chiang though he no longer purports to follow the Dr. Sun democratic tradition; even though he has failed to offer relief to his people from the exactions of the war lord, hordes of political grafters or from their intolerable poverty; no relief offered by him from the system which maintains the potentate at the cost of the toil, misery and degradation of the thousands. We continue that support though the Chinese have chosen to desert the horrible past for change in future hope; though Chiang and his cohorts were put on the scales by the Chinese and found wanting; even though he was ignominiously chased off the Asiatic mainland by the Chinese after and while receiving aid, comfort and money from us. We persist in that support though his reinstatement in China has no more chance than the well known snowball. A support in what is none of our business, a continuance of which will mean tremendous slaughter, untold expenditure and inconclusive ending. Yet we still hold the torch and bag for Chiang. Witness Japan's experience—15 years of war without loss of a campaign, yet never holding more of China than the spot where the Japanese soldier at the moment was standing.

We are at war with the Chinese, traditional friends, they of us, we of them. Two nations with no designs against each other. Their farmers, laborers, business and professional men without enmity.

In the absence of valid reason, the explainers and warmongers concoct the scarehead—China offers a huge reservoir of soldiers for Russia. China also offers a huge reservoir of soldiers for us. The explainers suppress the real factors. Until the present episode we always aided China against encroachment. The Chinaman is said to never forget.

The control in China is communistic, but the apologists fail to tell that the word 'communistic' is relative and elastic. The present government

of China is absolute. So was that of Chiang. The communist movement in China constitutes a property reform movement which every informed American, rich or poor, knows is long overdue. Unlike some of its counterparts, however, the Chinese communist is not against religion or creed, nor is there evidence that it seeks enlargement at the expense of its neighbors, nor evidence towards empire. Probably the least predatory of nations. The party in power does, however, ask to be let alone so the Chinese may work out their destiny, a people innately peaceful, honest and industrious. This right they should have free from interference.

China heretofore has not suffered at our hands. The main thief of Chinese territory has been Russia. The Chinese, having pride of nation, when the time is propitious surely will demand and force a return of their people and land previously stolen from them. Russians are equally foreign to China with us. Perforce the Chinese Reds accept aid from Russia, no longer wanted or needed when we get out. Then that time will come when China demands a return of what has been stolen. Russia has that to fear; we do not, something you may be sure that the Russians are fully aware. Important it is to note that Great Britain has written *finis* to the Chiang incident and now recognizes his opposition as the government of China.

I shall read what appears to be a carefully considered editorial from the conservative financial paper, the U. S. Weekly. Quote:

"For the sake of China and the rest of the world which has dealings with it, the reforming elements of China, including the Communists, should come to terms and bring order out of the existing chaos, and for us to come to terms with those best able to bring order to that distracted country. It does not mean the present party will not come to agreement with us on reasonable terms. Be assured the Chinese Communists are not a mere appendage of Moscow, but are a genuine national movement fully capable of taking the line they think best for the Chinese people. That is the history of China." End of quote.

Remove Chiang from the picture, as Britain has done, then there is no quarrel with China or any faction thereof.

Admittedly Russia is antagonistic to democratic or capitalistic government and therefore antagonistic to us.

Russia today is following the pan-Slavist ideas of the Czars. It may decide on further and immediate war. A better guess is not. The bear has again stretched out its paws to add additional territory, all aided and abetted by us. It now, as in the past, seeks to digest. As a part of its strategy and to gain time for that process it foments and stirs up trouble in other parts to annoy, to distract and to weaken by attrition its opposition, including ourselves. It is the old shell game with the United States entirely taken in. The Russian strategy has worked perfectly. Instead of preparing and conserving for possible trouble with the bear we are out in the wilderness pursuing John Chinaman. Certainly these shadowy figures mentioned by Mr. Acheson are happy in the complete success of their strategy and in our predicament.

If need there was to make demonstration in behalf of the United Nations, that demonstration has already been made and paid for in blood.

As to future demonstrations we should be mindful that the organization is yet an infant, was born out of hatreds; to grow needs the nurture afforded by peace. All sincere people hope the present organization survives to outlive and live down this existing fiasco. As to future demonstration it is not unreasonable to expect, unlike the present, the assumption by others of a full share of the burden.

So then our advanced thinkers have woven a tangled web. Through them we have deserted actualities for rainbows, cast aside fundamentals for the expedient, from which has come danger.

In following these thinkers we have become the purveyors of good—as they see it—to all others whether they like it or not. They forget or do not want to know that we are up against a foreign-domestic conspiracy, sinister and diabolical, to destroy the American Constitution. They would now let us bleed to death in Korea, China and other sectors; to keep on in this nightmare to save their faces; so they and we are participants in the Oriental game of saving face. They will continue this insanity, even precipitate us into a bigger gamble, hoping that somehow, somewhere, their already monumental folly will be forgotten though the forgetting may not come ahead of ultimate catastrophe.

Under these leaders of ours we have become the swashbuckler of nations. Jousting at windmills. Ours is the paradox of making war under the world flag and preparing for another war against a member partner without regard to that same world flag.

Now then, we should conserve our manpower and resources by getting out of Asia. We should divorce our state department; require future war commitments be made by Congress; return to the Constitution; concentrate for possible armed conflict with Russia.

Comes the question, "Why should an obscure person out in Iowa presume to speak?" Why a better place than Iowa, far from the influence of brass and braid, where the warmonger and the jingo are fewer, where chest beating and flag waving are at a minimum? Also in answer—in obscurity there is immunity from the hatchetman, name caller, malicious apologist; the destroyer and distorter of truth.

America's danger is not imminent, it is here. It is for those who would keep our light burning lest the entire world be made dark, to make known to the public men in Congress and others that the five per cent who make ninety-five per cent of the noise do not represent or reflect the opinion of the vast majority. Let them know that America will no longer tolerate delirium leadership.

In conclusion and to borrow an expression, out in the cattle and cow country we are fed up with all this foolishness. Americans are tired of being hoodwinked, of being prize dupes all the time. What America wants and needs is opportunity to set its own house in order, an end to the bloodletting, a return to the Constitution as written and as intended, and a whole lot of resignations.

Kuester of Cass asked and obtained unanimous consent to have the remarks by President Nicholas, Senator Lord of Muscatine, McFarlane of Black Hawk, the Honorable Carl W. Reed, and the address of Judge L. B. Forsling printed in the Journal.