

and enhancement of the environment and conservation of scenic, historic, recreational, and other natural resources; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 14972. A bill to permit Canadian trawlers to harvest alewives in Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 14973. A bill to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.J. Res. 1022. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to employment of substitutes in defense facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.J. Res. 1023. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1024. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1968 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1025. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, and Mr. SIKES):

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. LANGEN, and Mr. MACGREGOR):

H.J. Res. 1027. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.J. Res. 1028. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 1029. Joint resolution to assist Vietnam veterans in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H. Res. 1049. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 1050. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 53; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Res. 1052. Resolution creating a non-legislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study with respect to the adoption of an official lapel button for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

304. Mr. BERRY presented a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to give prior consideration to the development and use of the waters of the upper Missouri River Basin in the upper Great Plains States including the State of South Dakota before authorizing the funding of the diversion of such waters to other States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 14974. A bill for the relief of Thelma Fuentes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14975. A bill for the relief of Ponciano Salvador; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 14976. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Geraci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 14977. A bill for the relief of Gene W. Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14978. A bill for the relief of Eric W. Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 14979. A bill for the relief of Dr. Del-fin Ganzon Limcangco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14980. A bill for the relief of Antonio L. DiFilippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 14981. A bill for the relief of certain employees at the Naval Air Test Center, U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14982. A bill for the relief of the estate of Donald T. McQuoid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14983. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Musumeci and Concetta Franca Mellia Musumeci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 14984. A bill for the relief of Ferminia R. Cabral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 14985. A bill for the relief of Linda Alimada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

234. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Katherine Ratojski, Brackenridge, Pa., relative to the guarantee of all inalienable rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. Also, petition of Clarence E. Whaley, San Jose, Calif., relative to the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

236. Also, petition of Giovanni Buonmatina, Palermo, Italy, relative to an entrance visa to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Duke Kahanamoku

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the man who more than any other was a symbol of and whose name was synonymous with the Hawaiian Islands is dead.

It was a pleasure and a privilege to have been a personal friend of Duke Kahanamoku, great athlete and public citizen. The following editorials from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser pay eloquent tribute to this man among men.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Jan. 23, 1968]

DUKE KAHANAMOKU

Duke Kahanamoku was far more than simply Hawaii's best-known citizen for over half a century.

In a very real way, he was, as he remains,

a symbol of the friendly good will and vigorous achievement in sea, surf and on shore that has marked the Hawaiian people for the world.

It has become an image all Hawaii, all races, have come to share—in fact, an obligation we want to maintain.

Some would call it the Aloha Spirit and say the Duke was its best example.

When he turned 75 two years ago, we and others said the only question for history is how big Duke's legend will become.

Some of the things bearing his name include a scholarship foundation, a beach, a swimming pool at the university, an annual regatta, a restaurant and nightspot, a line of sportswear, a music and recording company, ukuleles, surfboards, a surfing club, and an international surfing championship.

All these will help perpetuate Duke's name, as they already have for generations of youngsters who were born after his famous swimming and surfing achievements.

But far more important is perpetuating Duke's spirit—the friendly, modest young Hawaiian boy whose real accomplishments won the respect of the world, the older man who carried his legend with modest dignity. These are goals all might seek.

He was the "Bronze Duke of Waikiki," and his name was as magic as that of Diamond Head in evoking the image of a pleasant Polynesia.

Many things changed at Waikiki over the many years of Duke Kahanamoku's long life from Monarchy to Jet Age. And in his final few years he aged rapidly into a man reflecting his memories.

But if there was a certain sadness in this there were those days when surfers and sailors off Waikiki would see Duke out on his boat, obviously happy in his element, his silver hair shining in the sun, his eyes gazing in across the surf he rode so well.

That Duke Kahanamoku must always be a part of Hawaii. It is a great sadness to lose him in body now. We must never lose him in spirit later.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Jan. 23, 1968]

REQUIEM FOR THE DUKE

Death came swiftly yesterday to Duke Paoa Kahanamoku, hard by the sea he loved. After 77 eventful years, the champion's heart stopped and people all over the world mourned.

Honors came early and late to this simple, happy child of the sea. In between were years when he struggled all but forgotten by the Hawaii whose fame he established along with his own.

Duke Kahanamoku electrified the swimming world with a 55.2-second 100 meters in 1911, then went on to the 1912 Olympic Games in Stockholm where he proved he was the fastest swimmer in the world. He reigned for more than a decade, taking part in the 1920 and 1924 Olympics, then made way for a young upstart named Johnny Weissmuller who was later to become the movie Tarzan, and remain Duke's fast friend for life.

An amateur athlete finds gold medals poor sustenance, and in his young adult years, earning a living became a problem. He played occasional movie roles in Hollywood, worked as a beach boy and a service station operator until 1934 when he was elected sheriff of Honolulu, and thereafter never lost an election. When the office was abolished in 1959, he became Hawaii's official greeter for life.

Commercial enterprises using his name brought him financial security. His athletic exploits won recognition in 1965 when he was chosen for the Swimming Hall of Fame, in 1966 when he entered the Surfing Hall of Fame, and last year when, in Los Angeles, he attended a banquet honoring the greatest athletes of this era.

But this recital reveals nothing of the true nature of the man so universally loved and respected. Nor does a recital of traits—kindliness, humility, integrity, sincerity, courage, good cheer, warmth, compassion—encompass the lovable character of this remarkable man. He never spoke unkindly of anyone, and gave no one cause to speak unkindly of him.

No all of old Hawaii comported himself with greater dignity or nobility of spirit. As an athlete, he was a hero; as a man, he was good and kind in the finest meaning of those words.

Saturday, the child of the sea will return to the sea, leaving memories enshrined in the hearts of all who knew and loved him.

### The President's State of the Union Message

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, President Johnson's state of the Union message has received much analysis in the American press. Many people were disappointed with it—both for what it contained and for what it omitted. Another criticism, and a justifiable one, was the failure of the President to differentiate among the numerous goals which he attempted to set. No priorities were given, no order of importance noted.

As for what it did contain, the state of the Union address should be faulted on at least two counts. First, while the President was applauded for his stand against crime and violence, there was little in his statement which would actually help solve the problem. Second, the President again endorsed civil rights legislation, which in all probability would merely create more dissension and further centralization of power in this Nation.

The greatest omission of the state of the Union message was its failure to

economize and to call for a balanced budget without a great increase in taxes. The economic problems besetting this Nation can best be solved by a reduction in Federal spending. This the administration has not done.

The Greenville News published excellent editorials on the President's address in their issues of January 22 and January 26. These penetrating analyses are of more than routine interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

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

#### STATE OF UNION: A QUESTIONNAIRE

President Johnson's State of the Union message was both a report to and a questionnaire for the Congress and the people.

The President acknowledged the obvious: Americans are restless and concerned about the Vietnam war, foreign affairs in general and mounting domestic problems, including crime and rioting, hard core unemployment, big city and racial unrest, the soundness of the dollar.

His proposals to cure the nation's uneasy feelings appeared to be more federal spending and control—the root cause of much of today's trouble, fiscally and otherwise. Instead of cutting federal expenditures, he promised more spending in the next fiscal year and again demanded an income tax surcharge (or tax on tax) to minimize another inflationary deficit.

Some of the President's proposals were new in a sense. An attack on hard core unemployment in big cities through government and private industry cooperation probably would be worth the expenditures involved—if the funds could be diverted from less effective and wasteful federal projects.

His health program for the very young could be of benefit, if it can be safeguarded against extension of socialized medicine. The nation must reserve judgment on this until the administration spells out details.

A step-up in new housing for low and middle income groups would be beneficial, in fact it is necessary. If the emphasis is to be upon promoting home ownership and helping private enterprise do the job, this would be a fine program. If it is an extension of federal control, it will cause more harm than good. Here again the people must wait for the details.

Otherwise, there was little new in the message. The President called again for more civil rights legislation, his own version of crime control measures, his model cities program.

Mr. Johnson seemed unsure of himself on domestic affairs as he enumerated the country's problems. He appeared intent upon appraising the "applause meter" as he discussed each point. He was asking for reaction on how people felt about their domestic affairs.

He got some answers. His denunciation of crime and violence received the most enthusiastic response from Congress. His consumer protection, unemployment, housing and big city remarks gained moderate response. Civil rights drew a blank.

Undoubtedly the White House now is studying nationwide reaction, as well as congressional response. In this election year, LBJ's public stance probably will be based largely upon the results of that study.

In other words, Mr. Johnson asked questions about public attitudes and is in the process of getting answers.

The President was uncertain, too, in his approach to the defense of the dollar overseas, despite announced restrictions on travel and business expansion, as well as

cutbacks in the number of federal employees overseas.

He failed to recommend the one step which could cure fiscal uncertainty, both at home and abroad—a balanced federal budget, achieved by abandoning a policy of attempting to buy both guns and butter in a time of major military conflict.

He failed also to drive home the point that unions and management alike must control production (mostly labor) costs in order to keep down prices at home and to meet foreign competition.

It remains to be seen whether the President's expressed firmness on Vietnam will stand the test of a difficult political year. In recent weeks Mr. Johnson has acted well in the situation. He needs support to continue a firm policy in the best interests of this nation and the free world.

The State of the Union message was, therefore, a rather strange report in that it posed more questions than it answered. Perhaps that is an accurate appraisal of the State of the Union in 1968.

#### TIME FOR APPLAUSE: TIME FOR SILENCE

At least as much as in the President's State of the Union Message, we were interested in the reaction to it expressed by Roy Wilkins, chief executive officer of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

And, considering some other factors and developments in the field of racial activities on the part of organizations other than Mr. Wilkins' NAACP, we were moved to a certain amount of sympathy for him—for reasons quite different from those he expressed.

When asked by the TV boys for his feelings about the speech, Mr. Wilkins expressed concern that members of Congress who formed the "live audience" loudly applauded Mr. Johnson at the end of those passages dealing with law enforcement, the elimination of crime in the streets and making the cities safe for law-abiding citizens.

He was somewhat dismayed when references to the latest proposals for more civil rights law drew no applause at all. This, Mr. Wilkins concluded, indicates that the "national mood" is one to produce suppression and oppression of Negroes.

Mr. Wilkins reads the "national mood" correctly, but only in part. The attitude of Congress towards more civil rights legislation indicates that the members have gotten the message that the public is fed up with relentless agitation and pressure for legislation which erodes the ordinary rights of the majority to bestow special rights on the minority.

The public is fed up with senseless marches and demonstrations which serve no purpose other than to evoke and promote violence. It is fed up with violence stemming from resistance to sworn agents of public protection, with riots which turn into lawless looting, shooting and vandalism sprees.

It is fed up with public officials—and private citizens—actually encouraging the breaking of basic laws designed to preserve simple peace and good order on the streets and highways, knowing full well that ignorant or naturally mean members of the minority will take the law into their own hands when told it is all right to break laws they consider to be unjust.

It is fed up with the endless clamor for privilege without responsibility, for food and beer money without working and for "equal employment" without equal ability.

Most of all, it is fed up with the antics of lawless, self-seeking, self-appointed minority leaders who never let up on the primitive drumbeat of hatred and threats of violence against the majority, against duly constituted government and civil authority and against the very foundations of society.

There have been, are and will be excep-

tions, of course, exceptions which will affect deprived Whites no less than Negroes. But the national mood, the feelings of the majority, are not in favor of suppression and oppression by law enforcement or anyone else.

We believe the majority is still willing to help those who show a willingness to help themselves and to make good on the many opportunities already open. But their patience with alternate "po' mouth" whining and frenzied threats is wearing thin.

If Mr. Wilkins and others would understand what we mean, let them consider just one example of what is being planned and plotted, with the aid and abetment of liberal financiers and officers and agencies of the federal government.

It is pretty well known that Martin Luther King is planning a "poor peoples march" on the nation's capital this summer, and that he has vowed to disrupt the whole city with a massive "non-violent" demonstration of thousands of Negroes and White malcontents and heaven only knows what else.

A recent definitive UPI interpretive news story told how King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, one division of which will manage the Washington mess, has been reorganized, refinanced and beefed up with experienced agitators and civil disobedience leaders—with the forthright purpose of becoming more "militant."

King and his henchmen hope to have the support of CORE, SNCC and other groups which have outdone him in militancy in the past. No one is saying so out loud, but SCLC will also have the support of just about every subversive and criminal element in the country and, no doubt, some imported from abroad.

It is also known among some people who hesitate to say it and probably could not prove it that King and others like him have received financial help from mysterious sources. This money clears through secret accounts in Swiss banks and reaches the United States through Canada, and probably Cuba.

To top it off, however, a few days after the story of SCLC's new stance of militancy appeared in print, the Ford Foundation announced a grant of \$230,000, ostensibly to finance seminars for Negro ministers in 15 out of 25 cities having Negro populations of more than 100,000.

In making the announcement, McGeorge Bundy, a former Kennedy aide who is now President of the Foundation, said it is earmarked for "educational work among Negro ministers," in recognition of the broader role the Negro clergy must play in the "crisis of the cities" and because King's group is qualified to give "unusual leadership" in such a program.

However, the plan calls for only about 150 ministers to participate, which works out to about \$1,500 each. The seminars will cover about 40 topics, all of them outside the realm of religious inspiration and leadership. Most have to do with organizing and running civil rights activities, and those attending are expected to lead other seminars, for which additional financing may be forthcoming.

At the same time, McBundy announced a \$552,000 grant to the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice to be used to influence "equal employment policies among commercial firms that do business with churches." How this will operate also is pretty clear.

It is obvious that, directly or indirectly, the Ford Foundation, which has a decided preference for far-left causes, is going to be supporting activities which can only cause trouble and produce harm. If it comes off, King's Washington invasion will violate a whole book full of laws intended to protect all persons, regardless of race, color or creed.

If they could but see it, Negroes have more to gain than anyone from evenhanded but firm enforcement of the law, and the most to lose when law and order break down.

Roy Wilkins should have applauded along

with members of Congress when Lyndon Johnson at least paid lip service to supporting the war on crime and violence.

### Busy Apprenticeship Behind: His Eye to the Future

#### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members an article which appeared in the Providence, R.I., Evening Bulletin of December 21, 1967, in which the achievements of my esteemed colleague, ROBERT TIERNAN, are discussed.

His dedication to serving the people of Rhode Island and his ability in meeting the demands of his office have placed him well ahead in the race for "freshman Congressman of the year."

The article follows:

#### BUSY APPRENTICESHIP BEHIND: HIS EYE TO THE FUTURE

(By William H. Young)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Robert O. Tiernan came to Congress in April billed as a man with a tendency to plunge into the water without testing its depth or temperature.

During his first congressional session, Mr. Tiernan has for the most part belied the advance billing of brashness. He has, in fact, devoted much of his energies to a careful charting of the congressional waters, apparently in preparation for a long swim.

There have been a few exceptions—most notably a strident letter to all House members supporting the Dickey-Lincoln school public power project—but overall Representative Tiernan has played the role expected of a freshman member of the House.

—He has supported the Democratic administration's positions both on the war in Vietnam and on domestic programs with almost 100 per cent consistency.

—He has spent considerable time on the floor of the House listening but rarely speaking, has conscientiously tended to his committee assignment, and willingly performed routine legislative chores for the leadership.

—He has courted the friendship of his fellow congressmen and the favor of the Democratic leadership of the House, trying to establish good, and useful, relationships.

—Knowing that good congressional relationships are useless if he is not reelected, he has made frequent trips to his district and given more than usual attention to correspondence with constituents.

Summing up his own appraisal of his first eight months as a member of Congress, Representative Tiernan says, "I worked hard to come here. I've worked hard here, and I think I've done a reasonably good job."

He noted that, taking office three months after Congress had convened, he faced some immediate and pressing problems in establishing a staff, getting oriented, and catching up with the work already under way in the House. Taking these into consideration, he says, "I'm extremely pleased with the progress we've made, I think I've made some impressions here that aren't easy to make as a freshman. I have a real fine staff and I'm very pleased with them."

While Representative Tiernan has accepted the role of a freshman congressman, he has pursued it somewhat more aggressively than others.

An example: New members may be asked to handle the routine "special orders" and

adjournment of the House at the end of a legislative day and it would be poor policy to refuse even if inconvenient. Mr. Tiernan accepted when asked and, on occasion, volunteered when not asked.

It is through gestures such as this, rather than brilliant speeches, that freshmen members show the approved attitude of a willing apprentice and gain the notice of senior members.

In return, senior members bestow tokens of recognition to the freshman member, as House Speaker John W. McCormack did by asking Mr. Tiernan to take the chair during a routine quorum call.

More important than the token recognition is the indication that the leadership looks with favor on the new congressman, and the approval of the leadership is all-important when such matters as committee assignments are being decided.

#### DEFENDS ASSIGNMENT

Assignment to a committee was one of the handicaps that Representative Tiernan carried when he took office in April. The Congress was organized, and the committee assignments had been made.

In these circumstances, Mr. Tiernan says he felt fortunate in being assigned to a seat on the science and astronautics committee. On the other hand most congressmen have a second committee assignment and none was available for Mr. Tiernan.

The congressman loyally defends the importance of his committee assignment. He has done extensive reading on the space program and made efforts to let his committee chairman know he is interested in the work.

Only when pressed on the question will Mr. Tiernan concede that he is not necessarily "married" to the space committee for the rest of his congressional career. He is eligible for assignment to an additional committee when there are openings, and the possibility exists that he would relinquish the space committee seat for another committee if the opportunity arises.

Representative Tiernan's efforts to establish good relationships were directed at the White House as well as fellow members of Congress. One of his first actions after taking office was to write a letter to President Johnson thanking him for his support in the election campaign. (The White House is reported to have arranged a substantial injection of contributions into the Tiernan campaign.) The result was a brief private meeting with the President at the White House. Whether from conviction, party loyalty, or gratitude, Mr. Tiernan through the session has been a firm administration supporter in the House.

#### ROLE LIMITED

Legislatively, the role of a freshman congressman is limited.

The only original bill sponsored by Mr. Tiernan in the session was a measure to provide for the use of portions of national memorial battlefields as national cemeteries.

Otherwise his legislative record consisted largely of cosponsoring bills introduced by other members. Partly because his predecessor, the late Rep. John E. Fogarty, was a leader in health legislation, Mr. Tiernan cosponsored several bills that would extend or expand federal health programs.

In addition, he co-sponsored bills aimed at establishing marine sanctuaries, at protecting the textile industry from excessive imports, and a resolution to increase the amount of silver available for Rhode Island industry.

The congressman was especially vigorous in support of measures to create an independent Merchant Marine administration. He co-sponsored a Merchant Marine bill and testified in support of it before a committee—the only time in the first session that he testified before a committee.

In many cases, Mr. Tiernan said, he supported or opposed bills in letters to committee chairman, without making the letters public. In the next session, he said, he expects to testify more frequently before committees. The congressman said he is now considering whether he should try to initiate original legislation on matters outside of his committee assignment, or concentrate on legislation in science and astronautics where his bills would be given greater consideration.

While carefully cultivating congressional relationships, the congressman has also taken care not to neglect his new constituency.

There have been about 30 weekends since Mr. Tiernan became a congressman, and all but three of those he has spent in Rhode Island.

He has emphasized to his staff the need for prompt attention to constituent mail and phone calls. This is an area in which Mr. Tiernan feels his staff has done well, in part because of the experience of several staff members retained from Mr. Fogarty's office.

The congressman himself has given unusual personal attention to some constituent mail, dictating long personal and sometimes argumentative letters in reply to voters who have written criticizing his position on the war in Vietnam or his stand on other issues.

In doing so, he has eschewed the stock noncommittal reply used by many congressmen—"Thank you for your letter and you may be sure I will keep your views in mind." While still avoiding the stock reply, Mr. Tiernan says he has found it necessary recently to reduce the number of personal, discursive replies to voters.

It is in some of his prepared statements, as well as in the letters, that a natural inclination to combat appears.

When the controversial Dickey-Lincoln school public power project was before the House, Mr. Tiernan dropped the garb of apprentice congressman and squared off against Rep. Robert M. Glaimo, D-Conn, a ranking member of the powerful House appropriations committee. Mr. Tiernan's letter on the subject to other House members failed to save the appropriation for the project, but it did raise a few eyebrows.

#### CRITICIZED CHAFEE

The congressman also has jumped into other controversies in which he could easily have escaped involvement. There was, for example, his criticism of Governor Chafee on plans for bond financing of a parking garage at Hillsgrove Airport. On another occasion he attacked the Republican governor for remarks the governor had made about a college scholarship proposal by Sen. Cialborne Pell.

The congressman describes these forays as a continued interest in subjects he was involved in as a member of the General Assembly.

There is some indication that, having taken his soundings in the House, Representative Tiernan will become more vocal in the second session of the 90th Congress.

He has announced already his intention to offer an amendment in the next session to restore funds for a summer intern program for college students in congressional offices, a program that was killed in the final week of this session.

And after eight months of service, Mr. Tiernan no longer bears the burden of being the lowest-ranking member of the House. Rep. Paul McCloskey, who won a special California district election, took his seat last week to become the most junior member of the House, elevating Representative Tiernan to number 433 in seniority. (There are 435 House seats, but the Harlem seat has been vacant since the House refused to seat Rep. Adam Clayton Powell).

Also, in the final week of the session, Mr. Tiernan was invited to the White House for the signing of the new meat inspection act and collected one of the prestige symbols with which congressmen decorate their office

walls—one of the pens used by the President.

Granted no intercession by the voters, the long climb to seniority status and power in the House of Representatives has begun.

### Obedience to Law

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the English statesman, William Pitt, once remarked:

Where law ends, tyranny begins.

If there was ever a time when America needed reminding of these words, that time is now. Far too many people of prominence, people who are in a position to influence our youth, have seriously neglected the implications of their words and their deeds. Liberty is a precious thing—history is littered with the remains of once-free societies that lapsed into dictatorship under the pressure of the lawless mob. Obedience to law is essential if we are going to prevent our Nation from experiencing this same lapse into lawlessness, anarchy and, as a result, dictatorship.

The State newspaper of Columbia, S.C., published an editorial on this subject on January 22, 1968. Entitled "Obedience to Law," the editorial is important both for its excellence and for its timeliness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

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

#### OBEEDIENCE TO LAW

As a part of any public works program which may be started by the Johnson administration, we suggest that attention be given to the construction of a flock of new jails. They may be needed before the year is out and President Johnson leaves office.

All over America, draft dodgers and their adult counselors, civil rights demonstrators and their agitators, and Communists and the fellow travelers are begging—by deed and often by word—to be put in jail. They should be accommodated.

The United States affords its citizens not only the right of protest but the legal means of making protests effective—provided enough people subscribe to the particular cause. But protests notwithstanding, this still is a government by majority.

The Constitution and the courts of the United States have been more than generous in safeguarding the rights of minorities, both as to free speech and freedom of assembly. But nowhere is there legal or moral justification for allowing the frenzy of the minority to override the considered judgment of the majority.

There always will be differences of opinion on such matters as waging war or preserving the American form of government. The ferment which grows from such disagreement often is beneficial in that it keeps the citizenry as well as officialdom alert to the need for change or adjustment of our pattern of government.

But it is the essence of collective idocy to allow the stability of a government to be upset, even temporarily, by the intemperate clamor of groups which—by any measure—

represent only a minute proportion of the total population.

The majority of Americans have been patient and overly tolerant in their indulgence of the variegated rabble which finds fault with our government and its policies. If we are any judge of the temper of the general public today, we are convinced that the broad mass of decent Americans—this usually inarticulate majority which in the long run governs America—is fed up with law breaking, whether it be in the guise of civil disobedience, "dissent," or outright criminality.

The people, we also believe, are equally outraged at the continuing reluctance or refusal of civil authorities to insist on the minorities' compliance with the form of government chosen by the majority.

If a minority, by dint of persuasion or the accumulation of political power, can influence the majority, or perhaps even become the majority, well and good. But the procedures and policies which have been set by duly elected representatives of the people must be obeyed, not only by the majority which supports our system of government but by the minority which opposes it.

Any other course is a negation of majority rule and an invitation to anarchy.

### Russia Revisited

## HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Arthur J. May, for 30 years a member of the faculty of the University of Rochester and currently university historian, made an extensive trip recently to the Soviet Union and wrote about it in a series of articles in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle. Professor May brings a broad perspective to his writings because of his years as a scholar of European history and his extensive travel and research abroad. For his book "The Hapsburg Monarchy," he was awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize by the American Historical Association. During 10 trips abroad he has conferred with leaders in most of the countries of Europe and has carried out research on both a Guggenheim fellowship and two Fulbright grants.

This was Professor May's third trip to the Soviet Union. So that my colleagues may share his observations of conditions he found, I include a number of his articles to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 15, 1967]

#### RUSSIA REVISITED: IVAN NO LONGER DISDAINS TIPS

Hotels in European Russian cities are generally of very good quality. The food, if somewhat monotonous, is abundant. Tip-ping, once regarded as a mark of bourgeois decadence, is now widely practiced. Shopping is done at ordinary Soviet stores or in special shops where only hard foreign currency is accepted. Prices are in American dollars.

Photographing military installations or facilities regarded as essential in national defense, such as railways, is forbidden. Taking of pictures of slum areas or of other potentially embarrassing subjects may result in an unpleasant incident.

Yet camera addicts are allowed much more freedom than in 1939 or 1955. My wife, who

had charge of the photographic division for us, brought back hundreds of pictures.

Leningrad (originally St. Petersburg and briefly Petrograd) was scrubbed up in anticipation of the 50th anniversary of the Revolution. Poles along the principal streets were festooned with electric lights wrapped in red cloth.

Huge portraits of Vladimir I. Lenin, of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, founding fathers of the Communist creed, and of the top personalities in the present Soviet hierarchy decorated brilliantly lighted buildings. Interspersing the pictures were large 50s. Red flags and bunting were everywhere. Not once in three weeks in the U.S.S.R. did I see a portrait of Josef Stalin or of Nikita Khrushchev—nor even hear their names mentioned.

Moored in the Neva River was the cruiser Aurora from which the shot was fired in November 1917 that gave the signal for the beginning of the upheaval. It, too, was gaily decorated and inspected by a stream of sightseers.

Sidewalks of Leningrad teemed with pedestrians by day and night, for all citizens had at least a four-day holiday during the festivities. Men in military uniforms were abundant. Down Nevsky Prospekt, the broad and straight Fifth Avenue of the city, a contingent of Young Pioneers marched on parade. They wore blue jackets, red scarfs and gray caps, and were accompanied by tanks and other armored vehicles. Traffic was brought to a halt.

Teenagers stepped up and inquired if we were interested in changing money, which is unlawful. Urchins offering Soviet pins of various kinds asked in flawless English for "chewing gum," or even "Chiclets."

Throngs lined Nevsky Prospekt to catch a glimpse of Leonid I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the Communist Party, and of Aleksei N. Kosygin, Soviet prime minister, who paid a state visit. They stood in an open car, preceded by a fleet of motorcycles, driven so fast that there was scarcely time to snap a picture of them. Could it be that they were fearful of an attack? Big black Zim automobiles and smaller cars brought up the rear of the motorcade.

Soviet citizens look upon Leningrad as a sacred place because of the heroic defense and resistance during World War II. Nazi invaders vowed to destroy this most beautiful of Russian cities. A grotesque monument nine miles out marks the high point of German penetration. Two Soviet soldiers, ramrod straight, stand on guard.

For 900 days the defenders of the city displayed legendary courage. Upwards of 600,000 citizens perished and nearly as many more were evacuated. Small wonder that Leningrad was awarded the distinction of "Hero City." The monument raised in Piskarevskaya Center carries the inscription: "Nobody and nothing is forgotten."

Leningraders speak with pride of their comparatively new "Metro" or subway system which links up the city center with the outlying districts. The network is undergoing expansion. One subway escalator that I used required two minutes to move from top to bottom—the longest, I have seen anywhere.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 18, 1967]

RUSSIA REVISITED: LENINGRAD KEEPS RELICS OF CZARS

In Leningrad, handsome architectural ensembles, ornamental bridges over canals, and monuments from the pre-Communist era have been preserved carefully.

Even equestrian statues of Czar Peter the Great and of the "Iron Czar" Nicholas I, valued for their artistic qualities, still stand as they have for generations.

Toward one end of Nevsky Prospekt is

the large, colonnaded Kazan Cathedral, erected to commemorate the victory over Napoleon I. Today it is a Museum of Religion and Atheism.

Walls are loaded with pictures, cartoons, and monographs ridiculing religion and poking fun at churches. The Darwinian theory of the origin of the human species is lavishly illustrated. Priests and bishops, invariably portrayed as big, fat slobs, are shown extracting money or other gifts from credulous men and women.

Letters by churchmen and photographs depict them trafficking with Nazis during the war. Relics, statues, and other religious pieces have been assembled here from abandoned churches all over Russia. Exhibitions of science, such as a Sputnik soaring into the heavens, are plentiful.

A woman guide explains the anti-religious displays to a company of young teenagers, who listen with rapt attention. A basement section that I saw in 1955, describing the horrors and brutalities perpetrated in the name of religion, is now closed to the public.

Just as Paris has its Louvre and Washington its National Gallery, so Leningrad boasts its famous Hermitage Museum. It occupies the vast green Winter Palace, once the residence of the czars. The museum and adjoining structures are said to contain 3 million art objects. Among them are masterpieces by Leonardo da Vinci and Titian, Rubens and Rembrandt.

To see the entire collection requires a walk of 18 miles! Experience has taught me that when visiting an art gallery the wise thing to do is to find out which treasures have been placed on postcards—for they are the best. Pick out five pieces, observe them, and depart. One would need weeks and weeks to do anything approaching justice to the Hermitage resources.

Across the Neva River is the Peter and Paul Fortress originally raised to defend the city against attack and subsequently converted into a prison. Guides dwell at length on the hardships inflicted upon generations of Russian revolutionaries who were incarcerated here in the era of the czars.

No reference is made, of course, to the horrors of the Stalinist labor camps, such as Vorkuta. Inmates were known to indulge in cannibalism and women prisoners begged to be made pregnant so that they could obtain a "motherhood remission" from their sentences. According to one estimate, a million victims perished at Vorkuta, which ranked in barbarity with Auschwitz and other pens of Nazi sadistry.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 19, 1967]

RUSSIA REVISITED: "SOME DOG HOUSE" REAL PALACE

(By Arthur J. May)

The Palace of Young Pioneers I visited has 360 rooms. Decades ago it was the home of the widow of Czar Alexander III and her four dogs. "Some dog house," someone was heard to remark wryly.

Now it is the neighborhood gathering place for youngsters from 6 to 16 years of age. "Are the children from homes with good incomes?" I inquired. And the indignant reply came back: "No, they come alike from families of Academicians (nearly the highest paid element in the land) and from homes of charwomen."

On a stairway are large pictures of Soviet worthies playing games with children. Lenin is portrayed studying a book and writing.

Some 2,000 children come to the Palace daily. A dozen were being taught how to play chess while a picture of young Lenin playing chess gazed down. A club of young cosmonauts was being instructed in radio operation and parachute jumping.

Girls from 8 to 13 put on a demonstration of folk dancing with accordion music. On

invitation, I joined in but I just could not get in step with the happy, energetic youngsters.

A matron assured me that the Glassboro, N.J., meeting of President Johnson and Premier Kosygin in June was reported in detail in the Soviet press and on TV screens. "We are doing our best for (North) Vietnam," she remarked later. "But there is a limit. We can't sacrifice more. We're doing a good deal, too, for India and the African countries."

"The Chinese? That is a very painful subject for us. The so-called 'cultural revolution' out there shows that the opposition to Mao—a pro-Russian element—is being suppressed. The Peking charge that the Soviet Union has abandoned Marx-Leninism is false. All Chinese students who were in Russia have been called home by their government," she said.

An evening at the ice circus was a memorable Leningrad diversion. The hall seats about 3,000 in 30 sharply rising tiers. An orchestra was in a balcony, high up at the rear. The performance was late in starting and patrons expressed their feelings by clapping in unison.

Trumpeters sounded off. An impassioned young orator declaimed as photographs of the revolutionary events of 1917 flashed on a screen. Men and women skaters presented fancy numbers on the ice rink with comic actors and diverting clowns mixed in.

Three big brown bears and a little cub put on a skating act. One washed clothes in a tub.

Between the acts, patrons wandered about in the foyer and smoked. I noticed that clothing and shoes were better than in 1955. Women do not wear much jewelry, few have necklaces. Wrist watches, however, were quite common. Not one person in 50 had spectacles.

Back at the show, women skaters performed in formal evening dresses, their male partners in white ties and tails. Girl gymnasts showed astonishing prowess on a rope high in the hall. Five brown bears played in a hockey game and the audience roared appreciation when a goal was scored.

"Better than Barnum and Bailey," I heard an American comment.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 20, 1967]

RUSSIA REVISITED: SOVIET MUSCLE IN RED SQUARE

(By Arthur J. May)

Nov. 7 in Moscow began cold and foggy. It was the day of the climax and crown of the 50th anniversary celebration of the Bolshevik Revolution. In the morning a monster parade passed through the vast Red Square before the most prominent Soviet personalities.

The parade was not scheduled to start until 10, but my wife and I at 7:20 took up positions at a street curb a couple hundred yards from Red Square and on a direct line from the Lenin Mausoleum. We brought along a stool on which to stand in order to take pictures. I sat on it while waiting.

Within half an hour a solid mass of humanity extended from the curbing back to the line of buildings. A Czech-speaking counterpart of Fatty Arbuckle pushed insistently against me on one side, while the pink-coated arm of a British woman tried to guillotine me on the other. It seemed as though every time anyone breathed the pressure was intensified.

By clapping my hands and wriggling my toes, I managed to counteract the cold. Luckily, the sun soon started to climb over the Kremlin and kept on climbing, making the day the warmest for that day in 90 years, it was reported.

Buildings all about were decorated with flags, banners, large '50s, and slogans in many languages. "Workers of the World Unite," was

one. Portraits of Russian government and party leaders flanked larger pictures of Lenin. Tanks and jeeps lined up in ordered columns in the Square in front of us. Smartly dressed detachments of soldiers marched in a Soviet version of the old Prussian goose-step.

An American loudly lamented that it was too cold and foggy to get good results with his Polaroid. Nevertheless, the pictures he took evoked murmurs of amazement from the Soviet police standing around.

The foremost leaders of world communism, I later learned, assembled in Red Square. But there were conspicuous absentees—China's Mao Tse-tung, Fidel Castro of Cuba, and President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam. Rumor had it that illness prevented the 77-year-old Ho from attending.

China completely boycotted the anniversary celebrations and Castro reportedly was at odds with Russian chiefs over guerilla warfare theories.

Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia appeared, though the Moscow press let it be known that his type of Communism was not as blood-red as it ought to be. The national chairman of the American Communist party, Henry Winston, and Gus Hall, the party secretary, led a delegation from the U.S.

Shortly before 10, figures could be detected moving about on the Lenin Mausoleum. As soon as the great bell on the Kremlin's Spasskaya Tower sounded the hour, the festivities got underway.

Loud speakers carried short talks delivered by men on the mausoleum. Soviet Defense Minister Andrei Grechko declared, "The fiftieth anniversary of the October (old style calendar) Revolution is a festive day for the world's working class . . . Imperialism and its main bulwark—the United States—are striving to check the course of mankind's development."

The colorful pageant ranged all the way from horse-drawn machine gun carts to a colossal missile hauled on an eight-wheeled tractor.

In the vanguard of the parade were men dressed as revolutionary commissars carrying famous banners of the Soviet army and cavalry troops in old Red uniforms. Armored cars bore placards reading "Death to Capital."

Parachutists wearing red berets and marines with blue ones were brigaded with contingents from other branches of the Soviet armed forces. Then came an arresting display of Soviet rocket and artillery weapons. Most of the missiles, it was said, were new or improved in design.

I was cramped by sitting so long on the stool and, in order to resist pressure on me, I stood up. Since I had on a tall Russian cap, I obscured the view of those behind me, and voices in 13 languages shouted what amounted to, "For heaven's sake, sit down." I obeyed.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 21, 1967]

**RUSSIA REVISITED: FIREWORKS FINALE TO CELEBRATION**

(By Arthur J. May)

Hour after hour, civilians paraded by luging banners and transparencies recalling the 50-year-old Soviet record in industry, agriculture, living standards, scientific advances and education. Floats somberly recalled Soviet battles in World War II.

Masses of flowers, imitation branches of leaves, streamers, placards, balloons, enhanced the picturesqueness of the whole affair. Some groups sang or yelled as they moved along, but in general marchers and spectators impressed me as careworn—or perhaps solemn would be more accurate.

Police hauled off an inebriated youth, one of three I noticed all morning.

Sidewalk stands selling coffee, hot dogs,

and chocolate bars did a brisk business. Portable toilets were provided and from one of them urine coursed down the pavement.

Surprisingly, several men engaged in a violent altercation with policemen, though what the issue was I could not puzzle out.

At nightfall, buildings along Red Square, the Kremlin, and ships anchored in the Moscow River were brilliantly illuminated. As though hanging from the sky itself, a massive representation of Lenin looked down upon the multitudes that gathered in Red Square and adjacent areas. They had their reward in the biggest (that's the way things are done in this big country) and most spectacular display of fireworks I have ever witnessed.

Then Muscovites, young, old, middle-aged trudged to their apartment dwellings.

Nov. 7, 1967, in Moscow was a day never to be forgotten.

What are called skyscrapers in "Stalinist baroque" architecture testify to the fondness of the late marshal for bigness and "grandomania." Seven of these lofty structures—two of them tourist hotels—loom up in any panoramic view of Moscow.

The most glittering Stalinist showpiece is the immense new university, raised on the Lenin (or Sparrow) Hills, above a bend in the Moscow River and well removed from the center of the city.

The university complex is crowned by a central edifice of 32 stories and admirably advertises the Soviet commitment to education. Laboratories, classrooms, and living quarters for faculty and students compare favorably with the best in Europe. The corridors, we were told, if laid end to end would cover 26 miles.

The taste for bigness in construction did not end with the passing of Marshal Stalin. A new Lenin Stadium for sporting events seats 103,000, and the Hotel Rossiya, now being pushed to completion, will accommodate 6,000 guests. Tall structures in which glass is extensively used are going up. An enormous building will house the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon), which aims to integrate the economies of the Soviet Union and the other Communist states of Europe.

The huge residential blocks and factories, schools, welfare and recreational structures thrown up quickly after World War II have a bleak, barrack-like appearance. Many look shabby and are poorly maintained.

That is true, too, for the unprepossessing United States Embassy. Soviet soldiers are on duty at the portal. When I tried to close the door on the rickety elevator, pieces of the frame fell into my hand. Offices resemble rabbit warrens. The room holding the telephone exchange is scarcely larger than a hen coop.

The American personnel in this extremely important and highly sensitive diplomatic post are grossly inadequate. Housing is one explanation for the deplorable situation. While a few of the officers live in the Embassy itself, most of them have quarters in apartment houses shared with official representatives from other countries.

Moscow authorities are reluctant to allocate more living space to Americans than to Czechoslovaks, say.

The Soviet diplomatic delegation in Washington equals our corps in Moscow in size, but the Russians also take along cooks and maids which the Americans do not.

Another handicap is the shortage of qualified Americans with first-class facility in the Russian language. The officers with whom I talked impressed me as knowledgeable and thoroughly competent.

It was reassuring to learn that the Embassy feel that American press correspondents stationed in Moscow furnish their readers with balanced and comprehensive information on what is happening inside the Soviet Union.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 22, 1967]

**RUSSIA REVISITED: SUPPLIES AMPLE, BUT PRICES HIGH**

(By Arthur J. May)

Consumer goods supplies in Moscow were substantially increased for the Golden Jubilee celebration. Stores were thronged with eager customers. Some of the prices I noted on Gorky Street, the leading shopping thoroughfare, were: Sausage, \$1 a pound; coarse-grained beef, 50 cents a pound; wool socks, \$2 to \$3.50; opera pumps, \$33 to \$44; low, felt-lined boots for women, \$33 to \$70.

Men's suits were priced from \$66.65 to \$162.80. The wages of a skilled Muscovite artisan range from \$100 to \$110 a month.

A typical day's menu for the tours read this way:

Breakfast (thankfully not of the meager Continental variety): Yogurt (for those who relish that beverage), wheat cereal, a boiled egg, rolls or excellent bread, a generous serving of butter, and coffee.

At mid-day: Tomato salad, thick borsch, a very large perch, boiled potatoes, bread and butter and an orange.

Evening: A pleasing portion of black caviar, sausage and whipped potatoes, bread and butter, a sweet roll with slices of apple deftly tucked inside and tea.

Two other Americans and I engaged a taxi to take us to an entertainment center. The light over the cab meter was dim, and the charge kept mounting ominously. We checked our resources to see whether we had enough rubles to pay for the trip. When we reached our destination the meter read 10 rubles, 20 kopecks—or about \$11.25. We were aghast, though our mood changed radically when the driver let us know that the cost was only one ruble and two kopecks, about \$1.20—not bad at all for half an hour's journey.

Tourists, native and foreign, trooped in great numbers to the Moscow Exhibition of Economic Achievement.

On the way, I saw many one or two-story weather-beaten hovels in a Moscow slum district. Yet even here not a scrap of paper littered the sidewalks. Men and women sweepers with long brooms made of brush kept streets and pavements immaculately clean.

Close by the Exhibition Hall is a glistening metal shaft extolling the Soviet achievement in space science.

Inside the park each of the 15 republics in the U.S.S.R. has a pavilion for display of its agricultural and industrial productions.

Spotted about the grounds are motor vehicles, helicopters among them, various types of airplanes, railway rolling stock, and replicas of Sputniks and space rockets which attracted far the largest crowd of onlookers.

An agricultural section contains a carefully tended apple orchard. There is a big statue of an ear of corn. Can this be a silent tribute to that forgotten man, Nikita Khrushchev, the most vocal sponsor of expansion in Soviet corn production?

The charming Intourist guide confessed that as a city girl she knew little about farming, although she was aware that loaves of bread did not grow on trees.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Dec. 25, 1967]

**RUSSIA REVISITED: NIGHT AT BALLET ONE OF PLEASURE**

(By Arthur J. May)

My stay in Moscow would not have been complete had I not had an evening at the world famous Bolshoi Theater ballet. The theater itself, though old, has been renovated into a glittering palace suggestive of the great Opera House in Vienna.

The performance attracted a capacity patronage of 2,500. First came an exquisite classical dance in three parts. Uncanny pre-

cision of movement matched the radiant emotionalism of the entourage.

The supreme presentation was "Don Quixote," featuring the 25-year-old ballerina, Yekaterina Maximova, a pupil of the immortal Galina Ulanova, and regarded as the finest dancer of her generation. Regal grace complemented her physical beauty.

The story revolves around competition for the affections of the wonderful ballerina with the great Vasiliev winning out. At one point a donkey and a horse appear on the stage. Attractive stage settings and colorful Spanish costumes added to the gayety of the ballet.

Thunderous applause broke loose when the curtain fell. Bunches of flowers were tossed on the stage as the dancers responded to curtain call after curtain call. The final offering was an odd, light-hearted little ballet, titled "Geology," in the avant garde category and danced without particular zest or distinction. Communist dancers, you discover, are no different from capitalist dancers.

On another occasion, I watched the superb Maya Plisetskaya in a shortened version of "Swan Lake." Holder of the Lenin Prize Laureate Badge, the highest Soviet award for artistic eminence, this older ballerina (though you would never guess she is 42), will retire soon and probably devote herself to teaching.

One of the secrets (if indeed it is that) of the global renown of Moscow ballet is the choreographic training commenced at the age of 9 or 10 at the Bolshoi Theater School. Applicants are rigorously screened and, if accepted, taught the fundamentals and the dazzling techniques of the highly cultivated ballet art of former stage celebrities.

In the box with me at the Bolshoi Theater was a young soldier from the provinces spending his first night in Moscow. Before entering military service he was a factory worker. How many youths of other countries with his background, I wondered, would have picked the ballet—even the Bolshoi—for an evening's entertainment. When I offered him a bar of chocolate, he declined at first, placing his right hand over his heart, a characteristic Russian gesture of gratitude. A little later he accepted the candy, withdrew from his seat, and returned with a large bottle of lemonade for me!

Not far from Red Square is the huge (how often that word or a similar one must be written about things Russian) Lenin Museum. It is filled with pictures of Lenin, the civilian and military clothes he wore, a replica of his book-lined study, a Rolls-Royce in which he had ridden, and volumes of his writings translated into 110 languages.

A documentary film recalls major events in Lenin's revolutionary career and reproduces excerpts from his speeches. On the platform, he was extraordinarily dynamic, spoke in sharp staccato sentences, and gestured vigorously—all calculated to sway masses of men. A complete tour of the Museum would take two hours of steady walking.

"Why is there nothing here about Leon Trotsky?"—second only to Lenin himself in the Bolshevik saga—I asked, all innocence and guile. "I don't know," the guide responded blandly, but after a bit of reflection added, "Trotsky disagreed with many of Lenin's policies. He did not want peace." And that was that.

Dr. Robert R. Spitzer

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on January 18 Dr. Robert R. Spitzer, of my

hometown of Burlington, Wis., was honored as the Milwaukee sales and marketing executive of the year. The sales and marketing executives of Milwaukee bestowed the honor which was well deserved.

It has been my pleasure to be a good friend of Bob Spitzer for many years, and I am gratified that he has been singled out for an award which further points out his outstanding record as the chief executive officer of the Murphy Products Co., of Burlington.

I include the sales and marketing executives' brief writeup of the accomplishments of Bob Spitzer in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

Dr. Spitzer and the Murphy Products Company have had an outstandingly successful year of increased sales and earnings following a series of successful years plus an outstanding personal contribution on the part of Dr. Spitzer to his company, his industry, his university, his community, state and the nation.

Sales of the Murphy Products Company have increased 12.6% in the fiscal year ending 1967 vs. 1966 with a 52.3% increase in income. The average percent increase in income during the last three years was 26.8%.

The Murphy Products Company is a leading manufacturer in animal and poultry feeds.

Dr. Spitzer is a native of Wisconsin, born in Waukesha County. He is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and received his Master of Science degree and his Ph.D. award in animal nutrition—all from the University of Wisconsin. He came to the Murphy Products Company as Director of Research but has made his main contribution in developing a sales organization of young men that were born and raised on a farm, who understood the problems and the opportunities in animal agriculture and serving the farmer-businessman of today.

Dr. Spitzer conducts his own sales meetings with his sales force, with dealers and consumer groups. He becomes the salesman for his company handling major new accounts.

He recently developed a special account involving a duck operation feeding in excess of 200,000 ducks for market annually. Murphy Products will furnish the feed for the Sentry Food stores recently announced egg factory which will house 180,000 hens, producing almost 10,000 dozen of eggs daily.

The Sales & Marketing Executives—International are very much interested in developing agri-business and will be very pleased with the accomplishments of Dr. Spitzer and the Murphy Products Company. Agri-business also happens to be the No. 1 contributor to Wisconsin economy.

Bob Spitzer is currently the President of the American Feed Manufacturers Association. He is also a past president of the University of Wisconsin International Alumni Association. He has found time to appear before 600 audiences and 1,000,000 people on Americanism. Following his tour of Russia as a representative of the United States Department of Agriculture, his talks became so popular that he produced a film of his message that was distributed to those organizations at which he was unable to make personal speaking appearances. For this film he received the Freedom Foundation Award. He has appeared before major marketing and university audiences on such topics as "Freedom—Mightier Than Missiles" and "Let's Keep Our Stake in Tomorrow."

Dr. Spitzer has also found time to serve his local community as President of the Rotary; Deacon of his church; President of the local hospital; he is active in fund raising and organization work in the political party

of his choice. He is currently serving on the Governor's Economic Development Committee.

### The "Pueblo" Incident

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American people have been patiently waiting for an indication of the kind of action that the United States is going to take to avenge the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by the North Koreans. As an indication of the reaction from the State of South Carolina, I bring to the attention of Senators three editorials published in newspapers in that State.

The first is from the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., which carries in its January 25, 1968, edition a short editorial entitled "Rescue the *Pueblo*." The second editorial appears in the Spartanburg Herald of January 26, and is entitled "The World Knows the United States Must Act on Seizure." The third editorial appears in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., of January 25, and is entitled "The Winning of Wars." In all of these editorials it is very evident that the public—at least the South Carolina public—is angry and humiliated and demands prompt, firm action.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Jan. 25, 1968]

#### RESCUE THE "PUEBLO"

North Korea appeared to be testing the resolve as well as the patience of the United States when it hijacked the U.S. Navy intelligence ship, the *Pueblo*, off the Communist country's coast.

If it is definitely confirmed that the ship was in international and not territorial waters when it was attacked and seized, the United States should go as far as invasion if necessary to recapture the vessel and rescue its crew.

Quick negotiations should be attempted, but if the Communists are adamant or defiant, stern action must be taken to avoid a rash of other incidents which challenge American sovereignty and the will to protect our forces on the high seas.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Jan. 26, 1968]

#### THE WORLD KNOWS THE UNITED STATES MUST ACT ON SEIZURE

The American people will stand solidly behind firm and prompt action to meet the new crisis in Korea.

Every diplomat and every government leader in the world knows that the United States simply cannot condone the seizure of its ship and men.

Nations are very much like people. They are composed of human beings and their affairs are conducted by human beings.

They react to the same kind of pressures, emotions and stimuli as ordinary people—though on a much more crucial level.

North Korea, in this instance, is acting the part of a little bully trying to intimidate a

big guy who would much prefer to avoid conflict. Obviously, the big guy can't let him get away with the bullying, because that would only incur more serious bullying.

Thus, to avoid a major brawl, the big guy must let the bully know, in no uncertain terms, that his intimidation will not be allowed.

This is the attitude the United States must take toward North Korea.

We are obligated, of course, to follow the path that achieves the purpose with the least hazard of military war. But that path must include the determination to use military force if necessary.

President Johnson's call-up of Air Force and Navy reserves is a loud and clear message to that point. Its meaning should be unmistakable in North Korea, the Kremlin, and Peking.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,  
Jan. 25, 1968]

#### THE WINNING OF WARS

The caldron that is Korea has come to a boil again, this time to such intensity that it well might rekindle armed action by the United States against the "People's Republic" of North Korea.

With a Communist temerity fostered by United States' and United Nations' timidity, the North Koreans have seized an American naval vessel, taken it into the port of Wonsan, and captured its crew of 83 officers and men, some of whom are reported to have been killed or wounded. All accounts thus far indicate that the USS Pueblo was confronted by armed North Korean patrol boats in international waters of the Sea of Japan.

This latest and gravest incident in the continuing struggle to contain the spread of Communist aggression from North Korea came within hours after a large band of North Korean guerrillas had been thwarted in a determined effort to assassinate President Park of South Korea and disrupt his government at Seoul.

The motives behind these obviously calculated provocations are somewhat obscure at this point. But they make it all the plainer that the armed truce that has prevailed in tenuous fashion since 1953 did not end North Korea's determination to conquer and communize all of Korea.

But if we are puzzled over the Communist motives of the moment, we should be absolutely convinced of the futility of "negotiating" with the Communists on any other basis than that which is accompanied by a show of armed force and strong will.

We showed both force and will during the early 1950's when the United States, in company with a handful of other members of the United Nations, rallied to the defense of South Korea against the naked aggression from the north. But our will played out once the invaders had been driven out of South Korea and we bogged down at Panmunjom in interminable and inconclusive negotiations which now have been going on for almost 15 years.

We never really won the Korean war and we are now paying the price of compromise and appeasement.

We are seeing latter-day vindication of the words imbedded in American military history by that soldier-statesman, the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. After being relieved (by President Harry Truman) of command of the United Nations' force in Korea because of his efforts to win the war, MacArthur gave to Congress the essence of his military philosophy in this imperishable declaration:

"I know war as few other men now living know it, and nothing to me is more revolting . . .

"But once war is forced upon us, there is no other alternative than to apply every

available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision.

"In war there is no substitute for victory."

Had we achieved a true victory in Korea in the 1950's, we would not today be teetering on the brink of further conflict in that strife-torn land. Nor, in our judgment, would we be bleeding in manpower and resources in the "prolonged indecision" of Vietnam.

The course of history and the cause of peace hinge—not on war—but on victory.

### The Late Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., Founder of Bob Jones University

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 16, 1968, my State and the Nation lost the services and leadership of a great citizen; Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., passed away in Greenville, S.C., at the age of 84. Dr. Jones, the founder of Bob Jones University, was a renowned educator, author, editor, and friend to thousands.

An internationally known evangelist whose ministry extended over more than 70 years, Dr. Jones began to preach and conduct revival meetings in the country when he was just 13 years of age and was licensed to preach at the age of 15. He held evangelistic meetings in practically every State in the Union and a number of foreign lands and consistently drew some of the largest crowds of any minister of the Gospel in the 20th century.

Dr. Jones was editor and publisher of the Fellowship News, a national religious weekly. He wrote a syndicated column entitled "Comments on Here and Hereafter," published in a large number of American newspapers, and was the author of a number of books.

He founded Bob Jones University because of a need that existed for a truly Christian university, one which not only taught but also exemplified the traditional Christian beliefs. It was during my tenure as Governor of South Carolina that Bob Jones University moved to Greenville. In subsequent years, as a member of the board of trustees, I came to know the genuine nature of Dr. Bob Jones. The university he founded has experienced amazing growth, and today is the largest fundamental Christian school in the world with an annual enrollment of nearly 4,000. Bob Jones University instills in its students high ideals and Christian principles and endeavors to graduate patriotic citizens, who not only "know how to make a living but know how to live." This school stands as a living memorial of Dr. Jones' dedication to the cause of fundamental Christianity and fundamental Americanism.

In an editorial in the Greenville News, January 18, 1968, the editor said of Dr. Jones:

He didn't stop preaching until a short time ago and as a preacher he was, indeed, a warrior. "Dr. Bob" was a man of unshakable

fundamentalist belief, a born conservative, and a fighter by nature. In the defense and extension of his beliefs and in his efforts to achieve his firm purposes he was indomitable and uncompromising.

The Greenville Piedmont editorial of January 19, 1968, said:

Extensive national reporting of his death indicates a prestige which may not have been fully recognized in Greenville because of close association.

He was, however, a notable personality who drew attention to Bob Jones University and Greenville as he traveled the world to continue preaching to the last his conservative brand of evangelism.

In a tribute to his father, Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., said:

Some say that it is only human to be inconsistent; but my father, who was of all men most human in his sympathies and understanding of man's weakness, was the most consistent man I ever knew. In private as in public, he never turned for a moment aside from the principles by which his actions were shaped or departed in his own living from the convictions which fired his public statements and molded the lives of other thousands who sat under his ministry.

Mr. President, my association with Dr. Jones and the school he founded has been inspiring and rewarding. I now pay well-deserved tribute to him; he was a man of character and a man of God. I ask unanimous consent that the tribute by Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., and a number of editorials and articles about Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 17, 1968]

#### DR. BOB JONES, SR., DEAD AT AGE 84

Dr. Bob Jones Sr., founder of Bob Jones University and internationally known fundamentalist evangelist, died yesterday in the university hospital where the infirmities of old age had held him for the past two years. His condition had worsened two weeks ago.

The 84-year-old patriarch, in his last interview, on his 81st birthday, declared his greatest achievement had been the founding of the school, now in its 41st year, to provide an opportunity for a college education without "shaking the faith of the students."

The school has had an amazing growth and today is the largest fundamental Christian school in the world with an annual enrollment of nearly 4,000. And it is known around the world as a leading center of fundamentalism—remaining true to the founding principles in every respect.

Almost equally famous are his contributions in evangelism. It was said on his 50th anniversary in the ministry that he had preached to more people face to face than any other living person. He finally preached for more than 70 years, having begun to hold revival meetings at the age of 13. He was formally licensed to preach in the Methodist Church before he was 15.

Last rites for the university's founder will be at 3 p.m. today in Rodeheaver Auditorium with burial to be in front of the auditorium.

The body will lie in state from 9 a.m. to noon today in the War Memorial Chapel with university ministerial students to serve as honor guards.

Classes for the university and for Bob Jones Academy will be suspended after 11 a.m. for the remainder of the day.

The services will include an obituary and challenge written by his son, Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., BJU's president, and read by Dr. Edward Panosian, chairman of the division of church history. There will also be an excerpt from a transcribed message by the university's founder.

The services will open with the university choir singing "Jesus, Saviour, Pilot Me," followed by a scriptural reading by Dr. Gilbert Stenholm, director of extension and ministerial training. "Amazing Grace" will be sung by the congregation and Dr. Marvin Lewis, director of religious activities will offer the prayer.

The university choir will be heard in the "Hallelujah Chorus" and also "The Sands of Time." James Ryerson, manager of WMU and WMUU-FM will sing "Christ Is All." Karl Stahl will be the organist; James Conley, band director; and Dwight Gustafson, the choir director.

The graveside services will open with a medley of hymns by the university band with Dr. Marshall Neal, dean of the school of religion to perform the committal. Jeffrey Darnell, president of the Student Ministerial Association, will give the benediction.

Pallbearers will be members of the executive committee of the university's board of trustees, including Dr. Charles Bishop, Bainbridge, Ga.; Dr. Horace F. Dean, Havertown, Pa.; Dr. Otis Holmes, Portsmouth, Ohio; Dr. Parker, Chattanooga, Tenn.; and Dr. R. K. Johnson, Greenville.

Also serving as pallbearers will be Sen. Strom Thurmond, representing South Carolina; George Grant, former congressman, representing Dr. Jones' home state of Alabama; Dr. James D. Edwards, dean of administration, representing the alumni; and George Thornton, president of the university student body, representing the students.

Honorary pallbearers will include all of the male faculty and staff members who have been employed by the university for 20 years or more; Ralph D. Clough, C. W. Gibson, G. G. Jackson, W. C. Kintigh, John Ludwig, H. E. McQueen, Marshall Neal, Robert Pratt, Harold Root, James Ryerson, Samuel Scroggs and Roy E. Waite.

The Mackey Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

Surviving in addition to Dr. Bob Jones Jr., are his wife, Mrs. Mary Gaston Stollenwerck Jones; three grandchildren, Dr. Bob Jones III, BJU vice president, Jon Jones, captain in the U.S. Army stationed at Ft. Benning, Ga., and Mrs. Gerald Jordan (Joy) of Columbus, Ind., and two great-grandchildren, Bob Jones IV and Roxanne.

Born Oct. 30, 1883, in Dale County, Ala., he was christened Robert Reynold Jones, and his boyhood home was a small farm near Dothan in the southeastern corner of the state. A neighbor once recalled that young Bob used to practice his sermons while plowing his father's fields as he began a career that was to carry him around the world in evangelistic campaigns.

After spotty schooling in his early years, he later attended a Christian high school and Southern University in Greensboro, Ala., serving as pastor of several small churches and conducting evangelistic services to pay his way through school.

After campaigning for Christ for many years, he felt the need for a Christian college that held "to old-time religion." Thus, Sept. 12, 1927, the Bob Jones College opened at College Point (now Panama City), Fla., with 135 students.

In the depression era, it moved to Cleveland, Tenn., and when it outgrew its site there moved to Greenville in 1947, where it was dedicated on Thanksgiving Day.

Dr. Bob Jones Sr. resigned as president in 1947 but held the board chairmanship until 1964 when he turned that, too, over to his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr.

Dr. Jones was the founder of the Gospel Fellowship Association and of the Young People's Fellowship Club movement. He was editor of the weekly devotional paper, "Fellowship News," author of a number of books, a national syndicated newspaper columnist and carried the Gospel message still wider by film and radio.

His death takes the last of the old-time evangelists from the world—he was a contemporary of Billy Sunday. But Dr. Bob Jones' "boys" have gone out from the university to preach in nearly every state and in 90 countries around the world.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Jan. 16, 1968]

#### DR. BOB JONES, SR., DIES AT AGE 84

Fundamentally Christianity has lost one of its most militant leaders. Dr. Bob Jones Sr.—internationally known evangelist and founder of Bob Jones University here—died this morning at the University hospital after several years of declining health. The 84-year-old minister was the last of the "old-time" evangelists.

Dr. Jones considered his greatest contribution to the cause of Christianity the founding of the school which bears his name. Now in its 41st year, it is the largest fundamental Christian school in the world, with an annual enrollment of almost 4,000.

He has been vocal in the fundamental-liberal issue in the Christian ranks and opposed what he considered compromise in present-day evangelism, in which evangelists work under the sponsorship of liberal ministers.

Born Oct. 30, 1883, in Dale County, Ala., Dr. Jones' home was a small farm at Brannan Stand, near Dothan. He was the 11th of 12 children born to William Alexander and Georgia Creel Jones.

The educator-evangelist has preached for more than 70 years, having begun to hold revival meetings at the age of 13, preach in the Methodist Church before he was 15.

Dr. Jones' evangelistic crusades drew unusually large crowds, and it was said on his 50th anniversary in the ministry that he had preached to more people face to face than any other living person. In 1957 the Montgomery, Ala., "Advertiser" published its 125th anniversary edition and characterized the Bob Jones campaign in his adopted home town as "the outstanding religious event in 125 years."

Bob Jones University came into being as a direct result of Dr. Jones' experiences as an evangelist. He had met many young people whose faith had been shaken in colleges that claimed to be Christian. He felt that God wanted him to start a Christian college that would adhere to the "old-time religion." The school has had a phenomenal growth and is known around the world as the leading center of fundamentalism.

Dr. Jones served as chairman of the university's Board of Trustees until his retirement in 1964. He was succeeded as chairman by his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., the university president.

Many schools have departed from the purposes and positions of their founders; however, according to university officials, the school has remained true to the purposes and intent of its founder. Dr. Jones tried to make every possible preparation in the school's by-laws to keep BJU true to the principles on which it was founded and true to the word of God.

Dr. Jones also was founder of the Gospel Fellowship Association; founder of the Young People's Fellowship Club movement; editor of the weekly devotional paper, "Fellowship News"; author of a number of books; national syndicated newspaper columnist; and preacher of the Gospel through radio and films.

He was the only living person selected for

the "Christian Hall of Fame" which opened in Canton, Ohio, in 1966.

Dr. Jones is survived by his wife, Mary Gaston Stollenwerck Jones; a son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., BJU president; three grandchildren, Dr. Bob Jones III, BJU vice president, Jon Jones, captain in the U.S. Army stationed at Fort Benning, Ga., and Mrs. Gerald Jordan (Joy) of Columbus, Ind.

Funeral services will be held on the university campus Wednesday at 3 p.m. The family has requested that in lieu of flowers contributions be made to the University Hospital Fund.

Pallbearers will be members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, including Dr. Charles Bishop, Bainbridge, Ga.; Dr. Horace F. Dean, Havertown, Pa.; Dr. Otis Holmes, Portsmouth, Ohio; Dr. Monroe Parker, Chattanooga, Tenn.; and Dr. R. K. Johnson, Greenville.

Also serving as pallbearers will be Sen. Strom Thurmond, representing South Carolina; George Grant, former congressman representing Dr. Jones' home state of Alabama; Dr. James D. Edwards, dean of administration, representing the faculty; Dr. Fred Afman, president of the University Alumni Association, representing the alumni; and George Thornton, president of the university student body, representing the students.

Honorary pallbearers will include all of the men faculty and staff members who have been employed by the university for 20 years or more. These are Ralph D. Clough, C. W. Gibson, G. G. Jackson, W. C. Kintigh, John Ludwig, H. E. McQueen, Marshall Neal, Robert Pratt, Harold Root, James Ryerson, Samuel Scroggs and Roy E. Waite.

The body will lie in state from 2 until 10 p.m. today and from 9 a.m. until noon on Wednesday in the War Memorial Chapel on the campus. University ministerial students will serve as honor guards while the body is in state in the chapel. Interment will be on the campus.

Classes for the university and academy will be held until 11 a.m. on Wednesday. All remaining classes will be suspended for the day.

Mayor David G. Traxler said, "Dr. Bob Jones Sr.'s death was a great loss to the community and to the university which he founded and brought up to its very modern standard."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Jan. 17, 1968]

#### BOB JONES, SR., EVANGELIST, DEAD AT 84

GREENVILLE.—The founder of the university which bears his name, Dr. Bob Jones Sr., died here Tuesday morning after several years of declining health. He was 84.

Dr. Jones combined his educational leadership with an evangelism which covered the United States and extended into other countries.

He preached fundamentalist Christianity and at times engaged in conflict with evangelists he held to be more liberal in some aspects, including the Rev. Bill Graham.

But Dr. Jones regarded the founding and maintenance of Bob Jones University as his prime contribution to Christianity. He saw it grow to an institution of 4,000 students, to many of whom he referred as "my preacher boys."

Jones served as chairman of the board of the university until his retirement in 1964, when he was succeeded by his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., who is also president. The institution is one of the largest of its kind in the world. It was moved to Greenville from Cleveland, Tenn., in 1947. It was established in 1927.

Primarily the evangelist, Jones said the idea of his school grew out of his experiences in evangelistic meetings. As his activity ranged over most of the United States and into other lands, he said he found many

young people whose faith had been shaken in conventional colleges. He said he felt impelled to establish a college where the emphasis would be on the "old-time" religion.

Jones founded the Gospel Fellowship Assn. and the Young People's Fellowship Club movement. He was the editor of a weekly devotional newspaper, *The Fellowship News*; author of a number of books; wrote a nationally-syndicated column and preached on the radio and through films.

Jones' preaching extended over 70 years, he having begun to expound the gospel at the age of 13. As a minister, he was formally licensed in the Methodist Church.

Some regarded him as the leading evangelist of the period between the late Billy Sunday and the contemporary Billy Graham. His motivation, he once said, was to "get the Gospel to as many people as possible in the shortest time possible."

Born Oct. 30, 1883, in Dale County, Ala., Jones' home was a small farm at Brannon Stand, near Dothan, Ala. He was the eleventh of 12 children born to William Alexander and Georgia Creel Jones.

Funeral services will be held on the campus of Bob Jones University Wednesday at 3 p.m. The family has requested that any contributions which might be made go to the university hospital fund.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Mary Gaston Stollenwerck Jones; his son, three grandchildren and two great grandchildren.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Jan. 16, 1968]

#### DR. BOB JONES, SR., DIES IN GREENVILLE

GREENVILLE, S.C.—Dr. Bob Jones Sr., internationally known evangelist and founder of Bob Jones University at Greenville, died this morning after several years of declining health.

The 84-year-old minister was one of the last "old-time" evangelists.

Jones considered his greatest contribution to the cause of Christianity the founding of the school which bears his name.

It is in its 41st year as one of the largest fundamental Christian schools in the world with an enrollment of almost 4,000.

Jones has been vocal in the fundamental-vs.-liberal issue in the Christian ranks, and opposed what he considered compromise in present-day evangelism in which evangelists work under the sponsorship of liberal ministers.

Born Oct. 30, 1883, in Dale County, Ala., Jones' home was a small farm in Brannon Stand, near Dothan, Ala. He was the 11th of 12 children born to William Alexander and Georgia Creel Jones.

The educator-evangelist has preached for more than 70 years, having begun to hold revival meetings at the age of 13. He was formally licensed to preach in the Methodist Church before he was 15.

Dr. Jones' evangelistic crusades drew unusually large crowds and on the occasion of his 50th anniversary in the ministry it was said that he had preached to more people face-to-face than any other living man.

Bob Jones University came into being as a result of Jones' experiences as an evangelist. He said he had met many young people whose faith had been shaken in colleges that claimed to be Christian. He said he felt God wanted him to start a Christian college that would adhere to the "old-time religion."

Jones served as chairman of the university's board of trustees until his retirement in 1964. He was succeeded as chairman by his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., the university president.

Dr. Jones Sr. also was founder of the Gospel Fellowship Association; founder of the Young People's Fellowship Club movement; editor of the weekly devotional paper *The Fellowship News*; author of a number of books; national syndicated newspaper col-

umnist; and preacher of the gospel through radio and films.

He was the only living person selected for "the Christian Hall of Fame," which opened in Canton, Ohio, in 1966.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Gaston Stollenwerck Jones; his son, three grandchildren, Dr. Bob Jones III, BJU vice president; Jon, captain in the U.S. Army stationed at Ft. Benning, Ga., and Mrs. Gerald Jordan (Joy) of Columbus, Ind., and two great grandchildren, Bob Jones IV and Roxanne Jones.

Funeral services will be held on the university campus Wednesday at 3 p.m. The family has requested that any contributions be made to the university hospital fund.

Dr. Jones moved the university from Cleveland, Tenn., to Greenville in 1947.

[From the Times and Democrat, Orangeburg, S.C., Jan. 17, 1968]

#### BOB JONES DIES, WAS KNOWN OVER WORLD AS EVANGELIST

GREENVILLE, S.C.—The founder of Bob Jones University, Bob Jones Sr., internationally known fundamentalist evangelist, died Tuesday at age 84 after several years of poor health.

Although he began preaching at 13 and was formally licensed to preach by the Methodist Church before he was 15, he considered the university he started his greatest contribution.

The native of Dale County, Ala., started the university that bears his name at Cleveland, Tenn., but moved it to Greenville in 1947. He retired as chairman of its board in 1964 to be succeeded by his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., president of the university.

Death came on the campus at the university hospital. Funeral services Wednesday will be on the campus at 3 p.m. The family has asked contributions to the university fund be made in place of sending flowers.

He was the 11th of 12 children born on a small farm at Brannon Stand near Dothan, Ala., Oct. 30, 1883 to William Alexander and Georgia Creel Jones.

His experiences as an evangelist led him to found the university that now is in its 41st year and has 4,000 students. He said many colleges seemed to shake Christian faith and he felt God wanted him to start a Christian college that would adhere to the "old-time religion."

He always stood in the forefront of the battle for fundamentalism against liberalized Christianity and was vocal in his opposition to evangelists who operated under the sponsorship of liberal ministers.

When the "Christian Hall of Fame" was opened in 1966 at Canton, Ohio, he was the only living person selected for inclusion. In addition to the college, he founded the Gospel Fellowship Association; the Young People's Fellowship Movement; edited the *Fellowship News*, weekly devotional paper; authored numerous books; had a nationally syndicated newspaper column; and preached over radio and on films.

Surviving are the widow, Mary Gaston Stollenwerck Jones; his son, three grandchildren, Dr. Bob Jones III, vice president of the university; Jon, a captain in the U.S. Army at Ft. Benning, Ga.; and Mrs. Gerald Jordan Joy of Columbus, Ind.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 18, 1968]

#### DR. BOB JONES, SR.

On the day that Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., simply fell asleep after 84 years and a period of declining health, one who had worked with him and loved him most if not all of his adult life summed it up:

"There must have been great rejoicing in Heaven this morning when that old warrior arrived at the gates."

We are sure that sentence, spontaneous and affectionate, aptly sums up the feelings

of Dr. Jones' countless friends and admirers, the thousands who had heard him preach and the many more who knew him only by his personal reputation and that of the University he founded and gave his name.

The death of Dr. Jones came as a shock to his family and friends, of course, but it was not unexpected. The atmosphere on the campus is not so much one of mourning as of remembering the extraordinary man as a powerful personality and of tribute to his long and fruitful career.

We were struck by the phrase, "old warrior," used by his longtime associate. In many ways it characterizes Dr. Jones' evangelical ministry which spanned almost exactly the biblically allotted three score years and ten.

So many times have we heard him refer to BJU ministerial students as "our preacher boys" that we suspect, somehow, the phrase stemmed from the fact that he was himself a "boy preacher," speaking from the pulpit at 13 and licensed to preach at 15.

He didn't stop preaching until a short time ago and as a preacher he was, indeed, a warrior. "Dr. Bob" was a man of unshakable fundamentalist beliefs, a born conservative and a fighter by nature. In the defense and extension of his beliefs and in his efforts to achieve his firm purposes he was indomitable and uncompromising.

Those two words applied to his relations with friend and foe alike, and such a man always has his foes. Those characteristics were hallmarks of his evangelistic career.

They were apparent in the founding and building of Bob Jones University. We believe he was the first to call it "the world's most unusual university," which without a doubt it is.

They are reflected, too, in the fact that his son and his grandson are following closely in his footsteps even while possessing, each in his own right, the individuality which is a part of the Bob Jones legacy.

It would be presumptuous for anyone to attempt to evaluate the life and career of this strong man. For, as long as Bob Jones University stands, as long as there is a Jones of his lineage engaged in evangelism, so long will that career extend.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1968]

#### EVANGELIST BOB JONES DIES AT 84

GREENVILLE, S.C., January 16.—Mr. Bob Jones Sr., 84, a hell-fire and brimstone evangelist who preached his way to fame during the Billy Sunday era, died today at his "fortress of faith"—the fundamentalist university he founded to shield young Christians from liberal theology.

The cause of death was not disclosed. A spokesman at Bob Jones University said only that death came "after a long illness."

Dr. Jones, an Alabama farm boy who began denouncing Satan at the age of 7 with his father's mules as the only audience, considered the school as his greatest contribution to Christianity.

Known as "the world's most unusual university," he said it was established to "dispel the idea that is going around that if you have old-time religion, you have to have a greasy nose, dirty fingernails, baggy pants and that you must not shine your shoes."

Dr. Jones, who would make no compromise with "modernists" or watered-down Scripture, ran the school with an iron hand.

Drinking was strictly forbidden; sexually integrated groups were not permitted to use the gymnasium, swimming pool or tennis courts; Hollywood movies were forbidden, and boys and girls going to his school had to keep their bodies at least 6 inches apart.

Famed evangelist Billy Graham attended the school in 1936, but quit after a brief stay.

Dr. Jones officially launched his ministry

at the age of 13, and at 40 figured he had preached 12,000 sermons to audiences totaling more than 15 million people.

His religious philosophy was, perhaps, best captured in the creed he wrote for BJU.

"I believe in the inspiration of the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments; the creation of man by the direct act of God; the Incarnation and Virgin Birth of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ . . ."

Dr. Jones, one of 12 children of Mr. and Mrs. William A. Jones, was born near Dothan, Ala. Though his parents were Methodists, he severed ties with organized religions in the 1930s in a dispute over "modernism" and from then on claimed ties with no denomination.

He began holding revivals in Alabama at 13, was licensed by the Methodist Church at 15, attended Southern University in Greensboro, Ala., in his early 20s and received an honorary doctorate from Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio, at the age of 38.

Throughout his years, Dr. Jones was an ardent foe of liberalism in religious thought, both in his ministry and in syndicated newspaper and radio messages.

"I'm tired of leading boys and girls to Jesus Christ and then seeing them attend institutions which shake their faith," he remarked.

His school was first located near Panama City, Fla., later was moved to Cleveland, Tenn., and finally to Greenville in 1947 when it opened as Bob Jones University, "the world's most unusual university."

Today, the college is a mixture of modern architecture and old-time religion, which houses a multi-million dollar religious art collection and is centered, first and foremost, on religion.

A library sign said the university exists "to exalt the Lord Jesus Christ."

Dr. Jones leaves his wife, a son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., who has succeeded his father as president of the University and three grandchildren.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Jan. 17, 1968]

#### EVANGELIST BOB JONES, SR., DIES IN GREENVILLE AT 84

GREENVILLE, S.C.—Bob Jones Sr., a famed Bible-pounding evangelist of the "old-time religion" who toured the nation and world as a contemporary of Billy Sunday during the evangelistic crusades of the 1920s, died here Tuesday. He was 84.

A militant defender of fundamental Christianity, Jones died at Bob Jones University, an institution he founded 40 years ago to shield students from anti-Christian teachings and liberal theology.

Jones launched his ministry in a brush arbor in Alabama at the age of 13 and, at 40, figured he had preached 12,000 sermons to audiences totaling more than 15 million people.

At ceremonies marking the 50th of his 70 years as a minister, it was said Jones had preached "face to face" to more people than any living man.

At the height of his preaching career, the six-foot, one-inch, broad-shouldered evangelist held audiences spellbound with a forceful, dramatic, yet homespun delivery of the old-time gospel.

His religious philosophy was, perhaps, best captured in the creed he wrote for the university he founded:

"I believe in the inspiration of the Bible, both the old and new testaments; and creation of man by the direct act of God; the incarnation and virgin birth of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ . . ."

Jones was born a Methodist, one of 12 children of Mr. and Mrs. William A. Jones, near Dothan, Ala., in 1883, but severed ties with organized religions in the 1930s in a dispute over "modernism". From then on he claimed ties with no denomination.

He began holding revivals in Alabama at 13, was licensed by the Methodist Church at 15, attended Southern University in Greensboro, Ala., in his early 20s and received an honorary doctorate from Muskingum College at the age of 38.

Throughout his years, Jones was an ardent foe of liberalism in religious thought, both in his ministry and in syndicated newspaper and radio messages.

It was his devotion to the "old-time" religion that led Jones 40 years ago to set about founding a college that would seek to protect the religious heritage of the students.

"I'm tired of leading boys and girls to Jesus Christ and then seeing them attend institutions which shake their faith," Jones remarked.

He told his wife, "I'm going to build a school that will dispel the idea that is going around that if you have old-time religion, you have to have a greasy nose, dirty fingernails, baggy pants and that you must not shine your shoes."

The college was first located near Panama City, Fla., later was moved to Cleveland, Tenn., and finally to Greenville in 1947 when it opened as Bob Jones University—"The World's Most Unusual University."

Today, the college is a mixture of modern architecture and old-time religion, which houses a multi-million dollar religious art collection and is centered, first and foremost, on religion.

A library sign said the university exists "to exalt the Lord Jesus Christ." The teaching of mathematics, science, literature, music, speech, art and all other subjects are incidental to this.

Jones was never a man to avoid a battle over the gospels and has been a critic of Bob Jones University's most famous student, evangelist Billy Graham, because of Graham's stray from fundamentalism.

A spokesman for Graham said associate evangelist T. W. Wilson will represent the Graham Association at Jones' funeral Wednesday at 3 p.m. at the university.

Jones leaves his widow, a son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., who has succeeded as president of the university, and three grandchildren.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 18, 1968]

#### DR. BOB JONES BURIED ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUS (By Lucille B. Green)

Dr. Bob Jones Sr., who rose from a humble farm boyhood to international recognition as an evangelist and educator, was laid to rest yesterday on the campus of the great fundamentalist university he founded 41 years ago.

Greenvilleans and alumni and friends from across the nation joined faculty and students in paying respect to the last of the oldtime evangelists, who won fame anew when he founded and nurtured the fundamentalist college now known as Bob Jones University.

More than 5,000 were present for the last rites for the fine old Christian patriarch who died Tuesday of the infirmities of age. And they followed the body from Rodeheaver auditorium, where the funeral was held to the area in front of the auditorium where the body was placed in its final resting place on a little island in a fountained pool.

The university band, standing on the Bridge of Nations, with the flags flying from the 25 countries represented by students now enrolled in the student body, played a medley of hymns. Dr. Marshall Neal, dean of the school of religion, gave the brief committal rites and Jeffrey Darnell, president of the Student Ministerial Association, offered the benediction.

#### EULOGY IS MOVING

The funeral service itself, in the auditorium, was relayed to other student gatherings by closed circuit television, since only 3,000 could be seated in the auditorium, and it

captured the spirit of the militant fundamentalist—even carrying an excerpt from one of his transcribed messages, calling for "old-time Christian conviction."

Most memorable, most dramatic and most moving, however, was the eulogy written by his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., president of the university.

It began: "This should not be a day for weeping. This should be a time for rejoicing. This should not be moment of sorrow. This is an hour for gladness. A fight has been fought, a race has been won, a crown is laid up."

Drawing from shared moments "in the quiet of the home" as well as "the vigor of his great evangelistic campaigns," the son vividly pictured his father . . . of all men, most human in his sympathies and understanding of man's weakness . . . most consistent . . . in his convictions . . . in his principles.

"Stubborn he was on matters of principle, but never on lesser things like method and means."

Dr. Jones Jr. stressed his father's compassion, his understanding. "He was not a patient man—either with himself or others—but he was a long-suffering man.

"His greatest weakness was his trustfulness of those who sometimes betrayed and failed him . . . At every other point he had amazing gifts of perception."

#### SON PAYS TRIBUTE

The sorrowing son paid tribute to his father's remarkable talents as an evangelist—his dynamic personality—"he was deeply spiritual . . . but intensely practical . . . a keen businessman. Character and integrity were the qualities he most admired."

And then the eulogy by Dr. Jones Jr. called for rededication to the university and its principles—"to stand unchanged and unchanging"—and asked all who might hear or read his words to so rededicate themselves to Jesus Christ as their saviour.

Typical of the triumphant joy that opened the eulogy, read by Dr. Edward Panosian, chairman of the department of church history, was closing of the formal service with the singing of the great "Hallelujah Chorus" of the university choir.

The venerable evangelist and educator died Tuesday at 84 after two years of failing health which had confined him to the campus hospital. But before that he had preached the Gospel message for 70 years in nearly every state in the union and had traveled from England and Europe to India, the Orient and Africa carrying his message of "the saving grace."

But it was the university and its thousands of graduates—so many of whom have gone forth to spread the message wider and wider—that he regarded as his greatest achievement. And it is in the heart of that campus that his mortal remains have been placed.

In addition to the many who came for the services yesterday, there have been literally hundreds of calls and telegrams from around the world—from alumni, friends, heads of institutions of higher learning and from political figures.

South Carolina's Sen. Strom Thurmond was among the pallbearers and declared, "South Carolina and our nation have lost one of its greatest citizens and educators in the death of your fine father," in a telegram to Dr. Jones Jr.

Other telegrams came from Gov. Robert McNair, former Alabama Gov. George Wallace, Georgia Gov. Lester Maddox, U.S. Sen. Frank Carlson of Kansas, and Representatives William Jennings Bryan Dorn and L. Mendel Rivers, both of South Carolina.

[From The Greenville (S.C.) News, Jan. 18, 1968]

#### SOUTH CAROLINA ASSEMBLY PAYS TRIBUTE TO DR. JONES

COLUMBIA.—A resolution of sympathy to the family of Dr. Bob Jones Sr., founder of

Bob Jones University who died Tuesday, was adopted by the General Assembly.

The resolution pays tribute to Dr. Jones who was a world famous evangelist and founded the university now located in Greenville.

The university, the resolution said, "has added immensely to the educational, cultural and religious growth of this state and nation.

"The citizens of the State of South Carolina are deeply indebted to Dr. Jones for his godly example and for many personal contributions to the development and welfare of the state."

The concurrent resolution acted on in both the House and Senate was introduced by Reps. Fred A. Fuller Jr., Rex L. Carter, Charles Garrett and Beattie Huff of the Greenville Legislative Delegation.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) Piedmont, Jan. 19, 1968]

#### DR. JONES' CONSISTENCY

There was one preeminent attribute of Dr. Bob Jones of the many good ones he had that never failed to impress those who came to know him. He was utterly and completely consistent. He was consistent in his beliefs, his principles, his thoughts, his way of life and his relations with the world.

His consistency was based on the Bible, and whenever he was challenged in any area, he fell back on the Bible to support his convictions.

Extensive national reporting of his death indicates a prestige which may not have been fully recognized in Greenville because of close association.

He was, however, a notable personality who drew attention to Bob Jones University and Greenville as he traveled the world to continue preaching to the last his conservative brand of evangelism.

There is no doubt he was controversial and intended to be. The world's most unusual university would not exist if he had not been so. What to others seemed controversy, though, was a way of life for Doctor Bob. To our knowledge he never retreated from a position and was willing to defend his opinions against all critics.

His adamant outlook on life was anathema to many liberals, particularly those adrift in a rapidly changing world often disillusioned with historical ethics.

What he leaves is a post, pleasing or displeasing, to which a philosophy can be tied firmly. His is a tough philosophy to follow.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Jan. 18, 1968]

#### RUGGED FUNDAMENTALIST

He was in the tradition of Billy Sunday and other great evangelists who moved the masses with powerful, fervent preaching of "the old-time religion."

He was the peer of them all in his time and it is said that during his 70 years in the pulpit he preached to more people face-to-face than any other man of his day.

But, Dr. Bob Jones Sr. was not content to expound his heart-felt fundamentalist beliefs only from the pulpit. He wrote books and newspaper columns, and, to insure that his doctrine of conservative Christianity would survive in college education, he founded Bob Jones University 41 years ago. Twenty years later he moved his campus from Cleveland, Tennessee, to an attractive site on Greenville's eastern edge.

Today it is the largest private institution of higher learning in the state, with over 4,000 students. Not everyone in Greenville or South Carolina was or is pleased by the presence of the hard-line fundamentalist school, but it cannot be denied that Bob Jones U. has contributed to the cultural as well as the religious assets of the state.

There is much in modern education and modern theology that he refused to accept.

He was a battler for his beliefs. His school, now under his son, Dr. Bob Jones Jr., refused to sign compliance forms with the Civil Rights Act but insisted it had a right to keep federal student loan funds under an unexpired 10-year contract. The university won at least a moral victory in its long face-down with the U.S. government over these funds.

Dr. Bob Jones had his foes as well as his friends, his detractors as well as his devotees, but none among them can deny that when, at the age of 84, he met his Maker face-to-face on Tuesday he stood four-square as a man of conviction—not compromise.

### African Emerging Nations

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, outside influences at work in the several African nations continue to turn the clock back on civilization and humanity.

In the Congo, British, Australian and South African citizens in jail just disappear and are assumed murdered to appease racial firebrands.

In Nigeria, an estimated 50,000 citizens have been killed over the past 6 months leaving some 200,000 homeless refugees—mostly Ibo tribesmen—in a terror flight from the hatred of other tribesmen.

The one-man, one-vote philosophy has certainly not delivered democracy or security of person to these two countries. Should the leaders of our foreign policy in Africa not reconsider our internal commitments—if we are sincerely interested in helping the Africans achieve stable governments.

I include the report from the Evening Star for January 16 and the Star Johannesburg for January 12 to follow my comments, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1968]

RED CROSS FOILED IN EFFORT TO AID NIGERIA WAR VICTIMS

(By Andrew Borowiec)

GENEVA.—African passions are preventing the International Committee of the Red Cross from helping the victims of the Nigerian civil war.

The Geneva-based organization, which has braved war theaters the world over to bring help, yesterday pathetically admitted its inadequacy in coping with the African mind.

The committee has been forced to cancel the flight of a chartered plane with seven tons of medical supplies and a 10-man team that was to fly to secessionist Biafra via the Spanish island of Fernando Po.

The rebels balked at the demand of the federal Nigerian government to inspect the cargo and subsequently the federal regime withdrew its agreement for the flight.

OTHER AIRLINES CAUTIOUS

The Balair Charter Co. working for the Red Cross is unwilling to defy the federal ban because its major stockholder provides commercial services to Nigeria. Other charter companies are unwilling to risk federal wrath—and possibly pursuit by its air force.

"We can only say that all this is regrettable," a Red Cross spokesman said. "But as long as the federal government objects, there will be no flight."

It was the second time in recent months

that the Red Cross failed in its African operations.

Last fall, it was unable to evacuate some 120 white mercenaries who fled their Congolese stronghold of Bukavu to nearby Rwanda. The men are still camping in Rwanda because the neighboring countries refuse to grant permission for a Red Cross evacuation plane to fly over their territory.

"It seems that the Africans are still unaware of the mandate and aims of the Red Cross" an organization official said.

FOUR-MAN TEAM ISOLATED

The ban on the Nigerian flight has isolated a four-man Red Cross medical team at the Achi Hospital southwest of the devastated Biafran capital of Enugu. There is no way to replace the men or send them fresh supplies without federal agreement.

And the supplies are desperately needed in the swampland and jungle battlefield where the number of victims is growing in staggering proportions.

"Jeune Afrique," a French-language weekly for African consumption, estimates that some 50,000 people have died in the Nigerian war in the past six months.

"This is more than in Vietnam," the magazine said. "Rarely in history have men massacred as fiercely as in the conflict splitting Nigeria."

REBELS CONTINUE FIGHT

The seizure of the rebel capital of Enugu by federal forces has not broken the back of rebel resistance. Periodic federal announcements that secession is collapsing have not materialized so far.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of homeless, sick people are wandering through the African bush and tall elephant grass, pursued by bullets and racial hatred.

The Red Cross estimates that at any given time there are some 200,000 refugees in the secessionist area, mostly Ibo tribesmen who fled from the north.

On occasion, the Red Cross says, the number of homeless has reached 2 million as entire towns and villages fled before troops zig-zagging through the area.

[From the Star Johannesburg, Jan. 12, 1968]

SOLDIER'S DEATH: CONGO BLAMED

LONDON.—Britain declared last night it held the Congolese Government responsible for the presumed death of a 22-year-old Briton who fought as a mercenary soldier in the Congo.

The man, Ian Graham Pahl, sentenced in Kinshasa 18 months ago to 12 years for armed robbery, was last seen by a British Consul in the middle of last year.

British sources said last night it was assumed he had been murdered, and so had Nicholas van Staden, a South African serving sentences for stealing a Congolese army plane.

The accusation about the death of the Briton was made officially after the Congolese Ambassador in London, Mr. Mario Cardoso, was called to the British Foreign Office.

REFUSED ENTRY

He had a 25-minute meeting with a junior Minister, Mr. William Rogers, Parliamentary Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and was told a statement presuming the death would be issued.

Though it was not mentioned in the statement, it is understood there is also concern about the Australian and the South African, for whom Britain had taken consular responsibility.

The Australian was Graham Larkin, 25, and the South African was Nicholas van Staden, 23. They were sentenced in 1965 to four-and-a-half years for stealing an aircraft.

The statement said the British Government had been gravely concerned for some months about Mr. Pahl's fate.

Last July, the British Consul in Kinshasa was refused entry to the prison where Pahl

was held. Since then, representations for access had been renewed numerous times without result, it said.

#### WHAT NEXT?

In addition, Britain had received no satisfactory reply to inquiries about Mr. Pahl made in the Congolese capital, Kinshasa, and in London.

The statement added: "Her Majesty's Government have no alternative but to conclude that Mr. Pahl must be presumed dead. They hold the Congolese Government responsible for the fate of Mr. Pahl, and reserve all their rights in the matter."—Sapa-Reuter.

### Seek Peace, but Beware of Traps

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, peace is the honorable goal of virtually all Americans. Yet if peace is to be of value to a war-weary world, it must consist of more than the mere cessation of armed hostilities. A so-called peace which encourages the aggressive tendencies of the Soviets, the Red Chinese or their revolutionist allies can only bring more war, more misery, and more deaths. Such a peace would simply postpone to another time and place the ravages of military conflict. In all probability, another time and place closer to the United States would be more accurate.

Another consideration in arranging peace must surely be the effect it will have on the people of South Vietnam. If we abandon these allies to the horrors of Ho Chi Minh, we will find in the future that allies to oppose Communist expansionism will be few and far between.

The Greenville News recently published an editorial entitled "Seek Peace, but Beware of Traps." This editorial urges a cautious approach to any negotiations. It urges consideration for the long-range interests of peace, not just immediate goals of little value in the long run.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be placed in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News]

#### SEEK PEACE, BUT BEWARE OF TRAPS

Peace in Vietnam—a just and secure peace—is, as it has been for many long months, the number one concern of the United States government.

—Only with the ending of war can the United States truly begin to evaluate the possibilities of a reasonably safe settlement of the issues between this country and the Soviet Union; and only then can anything like an approach be made to the more difficult problem of dealing with Red China.

—Only with the ending of war can this country deal effectively with its major domestic problems, which have been discussed many times.

Even beyond these two compelling reasons for arriving at a peace arrangement is one which stems from both—coming to grips with the worldwide problems of underdeveloped nations, exploding populations, ra-

cial and regional antagonisms and conflicting ideologies.

All of these are matters which require a peaceful atmosphere—or at least an absence of major warfare—if there is to be any hope for worldwide progress.

There are signs that this nation's major antagonists in the larger worldwide struggle may be blocking a Vietnam settlement in order to weaken this country and destroy its will to persevere. Meanwhile they obviously are extending their own strength elsewhere in the world, as the Soviet Union is doing now in the Mediterranean and Middle East, and Red China with its nuclear program and its threat to all of Asia.

If the latter is true, a Vietnam peace may be impossible.

In fact there is evidence that the Communist nations are escalating the Southeast Asian struggle by intensifying fighting in neighboring states.

Alarming reports of North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao progress against the neutral government in Laos; of stepped up terrorism in Thailand; of increased use of Cambodia as a sanctuary for Red forces fighting in South Vietnam, all of these argue against prospects for any sort of early settlement short of outright surrender or evacuation on the part of the Free World.

Then, too, there is the constant threat of subversion in Latin America, exported from Red Cuba. Recent terrorism in Guatemala is the latest in a long list of examples.

Despite all of these adverse factors, there is every reason for the United States and its allies in South Vietnam to explore cautiously the latest indications that North Vietnam and the Viet Cong may be ready to negotiate, although such hopes are certain to be slim.

The Red side has hinted vaguely and indirectly it will talk—if the United States ceases bombing North Vietnam. This has set off another round of clamor, in this country and abroad, for a bombing halt.

For some reason those shouting for a unilateral de-escalation by this country fail to even mention the possibility that North Vietnam should de-escalate by pulling troops out of action in both Vietnam and Laos and by ceasing to supply terrorist forces throughout Southeast Asia.

It is strange but true that the advocates of American concessions, but none from the other side, also constantly question the word and honor of the United States, as given in the formal statements of government officials. By the same token, they seem to accept at face value everything said—or even hinted at—by the other side, even in the face of "hard" evidence that good faith is lacking.

It is this sort of one-way reasoning, much of it by groups from which President Johnson once drew considerable support, which makes the President's task much more difficult. He literally is caught between the necessity to maintain American security and integrity abroad and increasingly violent and dangerous dissent at home, as well as around the world.

So far President Johnson has handled most admirably the latest tenuous hints of a possible slight bend in the Red position on Vietnam.

He has said, repeatedly, openly, clearly and unequivocally, that the United States will halt the bombardment, both air and naval of North Vietnam if the Reds only will show good faith by some sort of military de-escalation on their part and will participate in productive talks aimed at an early ceasefire throughout Vietnam.

This is a generous response and is the absolute maximum the President can offer without compromising American principles and prestige among nations depending upon this country for their security.

Even this offer disturbs South Vietnamese government officials, as was made clear in recent statements from Saigon. Well it might. A "settlement" in South Vietnam leading to

an eventual Communist takeover would result in the exile of all who could flee the land and the torture and death of untold thousands unable to flee.

People in this country have to look no further than 90 miles to see what happened when the Red-controlled Castro took over Cuba. Who can forget the horrible bloodbath, pictured day after day in newspapers and on television immediately after Castro gained control? Who can forget the refugees who fled to this country and still live in exile from their homeland?

Cuba is no exception. The same brutal pattern has been followed in every nation overwhelmed by Red aggression. South Vietnam knows it will happen there, too, if a Communist takeover is permitted.

In the light of all the facts available President Johnson is well advised to proceed slowly and with great care in exploring the latest Red ploy. It may be only a trick designed to further inflame opinion all over the world, or to gain a bombing cessation which will permit another major build up of Red aggressive forces in South Vietnam.

Even if the administration gets some positive response from the Reds, it still must proceed with great caution. There are two great dangers involved in talks with the Communists.

—A repetition of the Korean "peace talk" debacle in which for two years the United States and its allies scaled down military operations while the Communists pressed ahead full steam. Thousands of Americans and others died while the Korean "talks" were under way. And still there is nothing but a ceasefire, often violated by the Reds, in Korea.

—Concessions which will put Communists and their agents in position to take over South Vietnam in a year or so. This country must insist upon absolute guarantees, backed by adequate control measures, to assure the freedom of South Vietnam. A neutral Vietnam would be acceptable, but not one modeled on the Laos "settlement" which has turned that nation into a red slaughterhouse.

At every step America must guard against a repetition of the Cuban mistake. That "settlement" in which the Soviet Union agreed to pull out offensive nuclear weapons at first appeared to be an American "victory" over the Reds. In the long run it turned out to be one of Nikita Khrushchev's proudest accomplishments—a Red Cuba, protected by an American agreement against any invasion and free to export terrorism and subversion to other Latin American countries.

The administration may be sorely tempted to reach a Vietnam settlement which, before the elections next November will look good to Americans, but which almost certainly would turn out to be another Cuba.

At this delicate stage—and for months to come—the President of the United States needs the active support of patriotic Americans in the most difficult task of persevering, with a combination of strength and patience, to guarantee a just and honorable cessation of the Southeast Asian hostilities.

### Returning Service Veterans Have Talents We Should Be Using

## HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, are we missing the boat in failing to make full use of the talents of our returning service veterans?

I believe we are.

Our fighting men and women receive

wonderful training in a variety of skills while they are serving our country. But when they leave the service, do we help them put those skills to good use in civilian life? Unfortunately, we do not.

In his recent state of the Union message, President Johnson said he will propose "legislation to encourage our returning veterans to devote themselves to careers in community service."

I do not know what the President will propose, but I look forward to his recommendations with keen interest.

An editorial on January 22, in the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News very much expresses my sentiments on this matter of the returning veteran. The editorial follows:

#### VETERANS CAN HELP

One of the few fresh insights in President Johnson's State of the Union message was his brief recommendation for a new program "to encourage our returning veterans to devote themselves to careers in community service."

Goodness knows, American communities—very much including Buffalo—require more trained and disciplined men in community service fields. We need more teachers, more policemen, more social workers. Most particularly American cities need Negro male talent and leadership in these fields. The veteran who already has or can get the training should be an ideal candidate to fill that need.

The right kind of program could greatly benefit the veteran himself, too, who may feel upon separation from the military an uncertainty about what he wants or should do with his life. Skilled counseling, backed up with a listing of specific and available job openings in the man's home area or elsewhere, would immediately demonstrate for him both the nation's appreciation and opportunities.

The time to re-orient direction and offer these opportunities couldn't be more appropriate, either, than when these thousands of veterans stream into a few well-structured separation centers from diverse points around the globe, and congregate there for a short period before scattering again into cities and towns across the country.

So let us hope President Johnson will spell out some imaginative details on this promising proposal to Congress very soon. Skillfully implemented, such a program should assist both the communities that need the talented service and the young men who can provide it.

To what the Evening News editorial has said I can but add: "Amen."

In talking to leaders of veterans' organizations at the White House last November 15, President Johnson suggested that every effort be made to use veterans as teachers in our schools, particularly in our grade schools.

The President speaks with feeling on the need for teachers. A former teacher himself, the President told veterans' representatives that "when I leave here, that is directly where I am going—to the classroom."

As for using service veterans to teach in our grade schools, the President said:

Here is the job that I want you to do for me. Here is the new battle ground where I think our Veterans belong. I want them not only to protect our freedom abroad—I want them to protect our freedom and our liberty right here in our cities.

I want to find Veterans who want to teach. I want to give them the chance to teach these neglected children. They are teaching in Vietnam now.

One of the things that I am most proud of is the compassion that our soldiers, particularly our Marines right up in the DMZ are showing for poor children—their health problems, their education problems. They fight all day and go at night to teach them. That is where I got this idea.

Four and a half million Veterans have been discharged since Korea. In that 4½ million only 100,000 of them are teaching—67,000 Veterans are discharged every month and only 1500 teach. . . .

I want to encourage more Veterans to teach. If they don't know how to teach now, I want to, with some of my Senators' and Congressmen's help, help them be taught how to teach themselves—and we want to teach them how to teach.

These men and women have something rare, something unusual, and I think something wonderful to offer if they have served in our uniform. They can bring to the ghetto classrooms what few others can.

They can bring there whatever children need—example, experience, integrity, honor, courage, faith, hope and love of country demonstrated by being there when they needed you.

There are too many children who do not have a father or mother in the house. The men of Vietnam can show them what a man can be and what a real man is like—and what a man should be.

I don't know anyone in the world who can show it better than the men who have worn the uniform in Vietnam or other places and come out.

### South Carolinian of the Year

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial which appeared in the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., January 23, 1968. The article tells about Mr. Ellis C. MacDougall, director of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, who was chosen as the South Carolinian of the Year for 1967 by WIS-TV.

Mr. MacDougall has distinguished himself and his State because of his nationwide recognition as an efficient and progressive director of institutions of correction.

In this editorial the editor said:

Mr. MacDougall has revolutionized criminology in South Carolina. Among his other recognitions is his election as president designate of the American Correctional Association, the first time that a Southerner has received that honor in 20 years, and the first time in history that it has come to a South Carolinian.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

#### SOUTH CAROLINIAN OF THE YEAR

Ellis C. MacDougall, director of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, was honored yesterday as the fifth annual South Carolinian-of-the-Year, for 1967.

Others to receive the award sponsored by WIS television and radio station were Donald S. Russell, then Governor of South Carolina, 1963; the late Charles E. Daniel, building con-

tractor and a principal promoter of the state's industrial boom, 1964; Gen. William C. Westmoreland, United States commander in Vietnam, 1965; and Dr. Thomas F. Jones, president of the University of South Carolina, 1966.

Requirements for the South Carolinian-of-the-Year are that the recipient must distinguish himself in some way, enhance the image of South Carolina and contribute to the welfare of the state, nation or world.

Mr. MacDougall was selected "because of his outstanding accomplishments in the realm of inmate rehabilitation and his progressive insights into the South Carolina Corrections System . . .

"His establishment of 'prerelease' centers throughout the state and his emphasis on recidivism have brought South Carolina's rate of return to the state's correctional institutions to an all-time low of ten percent. This is the lowest in the nation, and well below the national average of 30 per cent."

"In many parts of the world modern surgery through heart transplants is reclaiming human lives," said Carter C. Harwick, WIS general manager. "At Cape Kennedy, man once confined to the earth is claiming outer space for our future generations—and here in South Carolina one organization led and inspired by one man is reclaiming and salvaging men and women who have strayed from the moral and ethical values of society.

"We are not talking about penitentiaries, nor walls nor prisons. We are talking about the correctional institutions, rehabilitation and men made useful with a productive future. Our honored guest has developed such ideas and concepts that have made South Carolina's correctional progress a model for the rest of the nation."

Under the MacDougall system inmates are tested upon admittance to determine the cause of their crimes and how they can be best fitted for society after serving their sentences. When Mr. MacDougall found that 40 per cent of the inmates were illiterate and 94 per cent had no salable skills, he instituted a school program to wipe out functional illiteracy and to provide education and training so that upon release the inmates would be self-sustained assets, not threats to their communities. Plans have been developed to give psychiatric care to the large number of inmates who need it.

One of Mr. MacDougall's aims is to organize a system of helping the families, who often suffer most while their errant kinsmen are being fed, housed, clothed and trained by the state. He believes that one way to prevent repetitive crime and distress is to maintain stable family relationships to which rehabilitated prisoners can return.

Mr. MacDougall has revolutionized criminology in South Carolina. Among his other recognitions is his election as president designate of the American Correctional Association, the first time that a Southerner has received that honor in 20 years, and the first time in history that it has come to a South Carolinian.

South Carolina glows in reflected pride in the accomplishments of the 1967 South Carolinian-of-the-Year.

### Lament of a Soldier's Mother

## HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, a notion is widely held that once a family loses a son in Vietnam they are inevitably committed to going on with the conflict. I submit for the RECORD a very compelling expression by a widow who has lost a

son in Vietnam, who yet believes the war in Vietnam is "criminal."

Mrs. Aurora Hodge Ruminski of Highland Mills, N.Y., says:

I don't believe my son died in Vietnam for any good reason. I would feel differently about his death if this country were being attacked.

I salute Mrs. Ruminski, not altogether because she expresses a mother's deep sorrow at the loss of a son. Mainly I salute her because, for all her human emotion, she has a wiser judgment about the conflict in Vietnam than great statesmen in our land who persist in pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp that is costing us so much in Vietnam.

An article about Mrs. Ruminski and her son, Philip, slain in Vietnam, is taken from the Times Herald Record of Middletown, N.Y., January 15 issue. Philip Ruminski was a descendant of General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Polish patriot who served America in the American Revolution. The newspaper article follows:

#### HIS PROMISE WILL NEVER BEAR FRUIT

(By Chris Farlekas)

HIGHLAND MILLS.—"I don't believe my son died in Vietnam for any good reason. I would feel differently about his death if this country were being attacked. All I can think of now is that his promise will never bear fruit."

Sometime this week, the body of Philip Ruminski will be brought back to Highland Mills. After a Requiem Mass at St. Patrick's Church, the soldier will be buried in Hastings-On-Hudson.

The 21-year-old son of Mrs. Aurora Hodge Ruminski was in the Army a year before he was killed Jan. 7, as a result of multiple wounds from an exploding booby trap.

Sunday afternoon, surrounded by her son's paintings, Mrs. Ruminski talked of her son, the effect of his death, and the unfulfilled promise.

Several New York City art critics called his paintings "full of promise" and the New York Times critic John Canaday said "he has a major talent," when his works were exhibited on Fifth Avenue two years ago.

Mrs. Ruminski said Philip began painting when he was 10 when the family lived in Brooklyn.

He was hit by a crippling attack of rheumatic fever. "For 18 months he was forced to stay in a hospital bed. Then for six more months he was allowed only limited freedom in a rest home. It was during this time that he began to doodle, then draw, and finally to paint."

Some of these early works are of the park and the bridge near the hospital.

Shortly after Philip came out of the rest home, the family moved to Highland Mills.

Philip's father is a sailor. The family has not heard from him in nearly five years. Memories of his father's profession permeate some of Philip's paintings. There are different kinds of ships, water scenes, and soaring gulls over distant cliffs.

When the father abandoned the family, Mrs. Ruminski was forced to go on welfare to support the five children.

"Philip was always good to us. He worked odd jobs while attending Monroe-Woodbury High School to help the family. I only get \$262 a month from the state. The rent is \$115 a month. Out of the rest, I have to buy food and clothes and pay for the heat.

"When he was 18 he had to leave school. Relief laws say that a person can't stay in school after they're 18.

"So he worked for an industrial painting company in Suffern every day. Three nights a week he went to Newburgh to get his high school equivalency diploma. And in between,

he would go to a room he fixed up in the cellar and paint."

In a Times-Herald-Record interview two years ago, Ruminski said "Painting is sometimes like love. You pour yourself, your hopes, fears, and dreams into the work. Then you hate like hell to sell the painting."

Mrs. Ruminski said he "usually just gave his work away to people he liked. Neighbors, friends, and sometimes, people he had just met." She said that she would like to collect some of his works and have a memorial showing in the springtime.

As she looked over a large oil painting of umbrellas, Mrs. Ruminski said "The house is so full of my son. I know I can get through the next few days, but it's the thought of the years to come. I depended on Philip for so many things. He could hammer a nail or take the kids out for ice cream.

"He was always so kind. I don't believe too much in organized religion. I've taught all my children that God is the love in our hearts. Philip understood this from an early age. I remember once his dog, "Adam," hurt his paw, and Philip tried to put a band aid on to help him."

She thinks the Vietnam war is "criminal." She said that she'll never understand why they took her son in the service to begin with, because of his medical history. "But once in, why should they send him to Vietnam? The first time he was scheduled to go, Congressman Dow got it postponed because there was a hardship discharge pending.

"I don't know what happened after that. He was shipped over in August. Sometimes now I become frightened thinking of simple things like how I'll even have milk in the refrigerator."

The blonde-haired woman said she tried to have Philip buried in West Point. She said Ruminski's grandfather and uncle were academy graduates, and that he is a direct descendant of Gen. Fesdor Kosciuszko, who helped in West Point's development.

"But West Point said only graduates can be buried there, so Philip will be buried in a family plot in Hastings-On-Hudson. There will be a military funeral."

And for the future, Mrs. Ruminski said she would like to join some peace group in the area. "I don't know what I can do, but I'll do whatever I can to keep another mother from this suffering."

### Resolution of Federal Housing Administration Advisory Council of South Carolina

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Federal Housing Administration Advisory Council for the State of South Carolina, which consists of a number of outstanding South Carolina citizens in the world of real estate and finance, passed a resolution on January 5 calling for removal of the statutory limitation on interest rates on mortgage loans issued by the Federal Housing Administration and guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Because this matter is one which affects the entire Nation, I believe it would be of interest to all Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The following motion was made by Mr. Julian Hennig, Jr., Vice Chairman of the Federal Housing Administration Advisory Council for the State of South Carolina, and carried unanimously by the Council at a meeting on January 5, 1968:

"The housing bill now pending in Congress contains a provision removing the statutory limitation on the interest rates on mortgage loans insured by Federal Housing Administration and guaranteed by the Veterans Administration. It is the sense of the South Carolina Federal Housing Administration Advisory Council that in view of the probable delay in enacting the entire housing bill, that this provision be separately introduced and its approval expedited by Congress. We feel this should be handled as an emergency measure to prevent further serious injury to the housing industry." The following members of Council were present:

Mr. Thomas E. Evans, Builder, Charleston, S.C.

Mr. J. B. Aiken, Jr., President, Aiken Loan & Security Company, Florence, S.C.

Mr. Walter Andrews, Vice President, Stevenson Zimmerman & Company, Charleston, S.C.

Mr. James Lubs, Jr., Vice President, Carolina Natl. Mrtg. Investment Co., Inc., Charleston, S.C.

Mr. Lonnie A. Garvin, Sr., President, Southern Mrtg. Co., Aiken, S.C.

Mr. Julian Hennig, Jr., Vice President, August Kohn & Co., Inc., Cola., S.C.

Mr. Hubert Gunter, Vice President, Cameron-Brown Company, Columbia, S.C.

Mr. Calvin C. Ridgeway, Vice President, C. Douglas Wilson & Co., Greenville, S.C.

Mr. Jim Barber, Asst. Vice President, S.C. National Bank, Columbia, S.C.

Mr. W. E. Sellars, President, C. W. Haynes & Co., Columbia, S.C.

Mr. R. H. Baer, S.C. Real Estate Commissioner, Columbia, S.C.

Mr. Claude McMillan, Engineer, Columbia, S.C.

Mr. George A. Stanley, Credit Bureau of Columbia, Columbia, S.C.

Mr. E. E. Bowen, Executive Vice President, S.C. Assn. of Real Estate Board, Columbia, S.C.

Mr. R. D. Wilson, Chester Concrete Products, Chester, S.C.

Mr. Bernard Jones, S.C. Prestress Corporation, Lake City, S.C.

Mr. Ed Gussio, Planning Director, Sumter, S.C.

### The Amazing Anticrime Crusade of Indianapolis Women

#### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the February 1968 issue of Good Housekeeping magazine shows what happened in Indianapolis when thousands of public-spirited women, deeply troubled by the dropout dilemma and soaring crime rates, got involved in cleaning up their city.

The above-mentioned article follows:

#### THE AMAZING ANTICRIME CRUSADE OF INDIANAPOLIS WOMEN

(By Charles and Bonnie Remsberg)

From all appearances the two housewives, dressed in conservative suits and hats, might have been on their way to a PTA meeting or a church supper. Instead they were headed

for a dimly lit tangle of back streets on Indianapolis' north side known as "the vice strip." Their escorts for the evening, two plainclothes detectives, were out to show these middle-class women, whose lives revolved around their children and homes, "just what kind of jungle it is out here on the street."

For the next six hours, from the safety of an unmarked prowler, the women took an eye-opening look at their city. In the shadows of a parking lot they watched prostitutes work on conventioners. They saw a smooth-talking con man fleece an unsuspecting pedestrian. They stood by while police officers arrested law violators on the strip, broke up savage family fights, mopped up after a gambling raid, helped a bleeding robbery victim to the hospital. They saw skid-row drunks herded into paddy wagons and witnessed a frightened teenage girl, who had been raped by a roving gang, single out her attackers from a police lineup.

By the time they finally called it a night they had become the latest initiates into what has been termed "the most unorthodox campaign since the days of women's suffrage."

The campaign is the Indianapolis Women's Anti-Crime Crusade, a movement without dues, bylaws, budget or constitution—but with an impressive list of achievements. Since its birth less than six years ago, thousands of Indianapolis women, ranging in age from twenty-five to ninety, have, among other things, counseled back to class an astonishing number of high school dropouts, prompted significant improvements in the administration of justice in the city's courts and helped scores of parolees from correctional institutions re-enter their communities.

Already, according to Police Chief Daniel Veza, the women's work is affecting the city's crime toll. When the Crusade began, Indiana's capital city had 300 more crimes per 100,000 of the population than the national FBI average. In 1965, three years after the women launched their attack, the number of reported offenses dropped 2.2 percent below the previous year, the first time crime had waned in Indianapolis in seven years.

Since then the crime rate has crept up again, but much more slowly than in most other major cities. "A lot of the credit goes to these women," says Chief Veza. "They got angry enough to act."

They have acted, without the help of tax money, foundation grants or professional training, as crime-busters or sociologists. "We have just done things," says Mrs. Margaret Moore, a gray-haired grandmother who serves as Crusade coordinator, "that make sense to women."

The Crusade was spawned in an atmosphere of community despair after an elderly retired psychologist, Dr. Margaret Marshall, was fatally beaten by a teenage purse-snatcher on her way home from church one night in October, 1961. In the wake of the attack, police and local newspapers alike were peppered with phone calls and letters from women, demanding that "something be done" to make the streets safe after dark. It occurred to Eugene S. Pulliam, assistant publisher of the Indianapolis *News*, that the women themselves might have some valuable ideas, so he asked Mrs. Moore, of the paper's public-relations department, to look into the matter.

A petite, soft-spoken widow of fifty-six, once Indiana's Mother of the Year, Margaret Moore has spent most of her adult life in journalism. But her closest contact with crime had been nearly thirty years earlier when, as a newly-wed, she chronicled the career of John Dillinger for her husband's weekly newspaper. She was uncertain what she and other "mere women" could do in a field where the "experts" seem so often to have failed, but she called together thirty

leaders of Indianapolis women's clubs for a brainstorming luncheon.

One housewife brought along a scrapbook of news clippings about crimes against women. In discussing these incidents and their own experiences, the club leaders isolated a number of common threads linking a wide variety of lawbreaking: School dropouts and persons with previous police records seemed involved in an inordinate proportion of offenses; often attacks, such as the one on Dr. Marshall, occurred on poorly lighted residential streets; local courts seemed to be handling many cases with inexplicable leniency, and so on. "We decided that if we could bring female ingenuity to bear on these and other problems and thereby prevent just one crime, it would be worth the effort," Mrs. Moore recalls.

Counting on their clubs for fund raising and as reservoirs of volunteers (together they represent some 50,000 Indianapolis women), the leaders mapped out several committees, each to tackle a specific factor which the women felt to be contributing to the city's overall crime pattern.

For the first six months, volunteers did little but study the crime problem and the agencies already established to combat it, beginning their now-customary squad-car rides to help bridge the gap between their relatively insulated lives and the realities of the streets. The police initially were skeptical. "We have a natural cynicism about outside 'do-gooders,'" explains Captain Henry Wolff, vice-squad commander. But in appearances at police roll calls, Mrs. Moore assured the officers that there would be no attempt to meddle in police procedures and that the women would seek the department's guidance on ways they could be helpful. Late in March, 1962, they took direct action.

#### BACK TO SCHOOL INSTEAD OF JAIL

Attention had first been focused on school problems by the fact that Dr. Marshall had been killed by a high school dropout, the son of a murderer. During their study period, the women learned that school dropouts account for nearly ninety percent of juvenile crime, and that as a group they are the most likely candidates for adult criminality. In Indianapolis, with a population of 530,000, youngsters were quitting school at the rate of 1,500 a year.

Several Crusade volunteers, some of them former teachers, suspected that many of these youngsters were giving up on school largely because of a feeling that "nobody cares about me." What would happen, the women wondered, if they approached them as a good mother would, one woman to one child, providing whatever counsel and assistance might be necessary to meet their individual problems? With the names and addresses of twenty-eight recent dropouts provided by school officials, a committee got busy finding out. (Like the police, the schools cooperated reluctantly at first, doubtful about what the women could accomplish.)

Once contact was established, sometimes through "simple, homespun" letters, sometime by tracking leads for days through the city's high-transiency areas, some dropouts seemed surprisingly eager to return to school. The volunteers often discovered that only relatively minor barriers were keeping them from doing so.

Some simply could not afford the bus fare, textbooks or lunches. Others, especially those who had been discipline problems, needed a responsible adult to go with them for moral support when applying for readmission. One sixteen-year-old girl had dropped out because of her weight. She tipped the scales at more than 250 pounds and, since she had no dresses to fit her, wore her brother's army coat, with nothing underneath. Before quitting entirely, she had stayed home from school on days too warm to keep the coat on in class.

The volunteer who drew her name out-fitted her at a specialty shop, found a nurse to help her reduce and coaxed her back to class. The girl was eventually graduated and now has a steady job. "If somebody hadn't helped her when she couldn't help herself," says Mrs. Veneta LaDine, the Crusade president, "she would have landed in prison for sure, probably for prostitution. The police had already picked her up for walking the streets."

Predictably, some hard-core dropouts simply could not be reached. Yet through their one-to-one counseling and practical aid, the volunteers persuaded twenty-six of those first twenty-eight to go back to school.

School officials were so impressed that they promptly turned over a card file on nearly 600 more dropouts, and new names are now supplied every semester. Dropouts away from school as long as ten years, some married and with families and others who have been rehabilitated after serious police records, are being brought back. At least one returnee has managed to graduate in the top ten percent of her class.

Encouraged by their successes, Crusaders rallied more volunteers and turned to trying to prevent dropouts as well as salvage them. Members set up study rooms in local churches where volunteer tutors, available several nights a week, have kept dozens of floundering students from flunking. Youngsters with reading handicaps now are offered special instruction by a volunteer who operates a free reading school. In 1966, the Crusade introduced volunteer "service committees" at 100 Indianapolis schools to help youngsters with problems spotted by perceptive teachers, school nurses and social workers. These groups have done everything from providing breakfast for grade-school youngsters who fainted in class from hunger to ironing shirts for a motherless, clothes-conscious teenager.

By last fall, according to Mrs. Moore, anti-Crime Crusaders had reached nearly 4,000 potential and actual dropouts and had done whatever was necessary to get more than 2,000 of them to stay in or return to school. Of those who went back, roughly half stayed through graduation, a showing that Robert Doyle, head of guidance services for Indianapolis schools, calls "tremendous." Meanwhile Doyle reports, the dropout rate has plunged to fewer than 800 students a year, a decrease of almost fifty percent!

As volunteers became increasingly attuned to what is happening around them, they quickly discovered that clues to anti-crime ideas abound everywhere.

#### THE "FIVE-FINGER DISCOUNT"

On a bus one day, a Crusade member overheard one teenage girl ask another, "Did you take your 'five-finger discount' today?" They were talking, the volunteer deduced, about shoplifting. A little spade work subsequently revealed that merchants all over the city were despairing about a steadily rising rate of light-fingered theft, but most were afraid to act against possible "boosters" for fear of being sued.

Crusaders joined the city police department and business organizations in sponsoring seminars for merchants, where experts demonstrated ways to spot and discourage shoplifting. The women then wrote an anti-shoplifting guide which has been distributed to more than 10,000 store owners. They also pressed vigorously for new legislation that would allow store personnel to detain and search suspicious customers with impunity.

The law was passed last year and, together with the women's other efforts, is credited by Chief Veza with increasing shoplifting arrests in Indianapolis more than thirty percent and hiking the conviction rate to an unprecedented eighty-seven percent. The number of reported offenses, meanwhile, is dropping.

Equally remarkable gains have been noted as the women's war has spread to other fronts.

Determined, for example, to "turn the light on crime" by brightening shadowy streets such as the one where Dr. Marshall was attacked, a street-lighting committee has circulated petitions, attended countless official board meetings and city budget hearings, ridden with the police to photograph high crime areas after dark and publicized carefully researched maps showing the relationship between darkness and crime incidence.

In response to this persistent activity, the city so far has installed more than 9,100 new high-powered streetlights in a multimillion-dollar improvement program. Private-property owners also have been persuaded to buy and use nearly 6,000 dusk-to-dawn mercury vapor lamps to illuminate such crime-prone sites as apartment-house areaways and warehouse docks. According to Mrs. Moore, spot surveys show some street crimes dropping by as much as eighty-four percent in areas affected by the lighting campaign.

The women believe that neighborhood cleanliness, too, can take its subtle toll on crime. Volunteers have backed the formation of more than 600 block clubs for neighborhood maintenance, particularly in areas where families have been transplanted to urban living from the rural South, and have sponsored a series of "spruce-up" days in other slum areas. In one neighborhood, youngsters recruited to work for hot dogs and soft drinks collected fifteen truckloads of debris in three hours, some of it from alleys and areaways that had not been thoroughly cleaned for years. "When housewives saw what was happening outside, they started cleaning inside," recalls Mrs. Mattie Coney, Crusade spruce-up chairman.

Because many slum dwellers want to clean their homes but lack equipment and know-how, Indianapolis women's clubs now regularly stage "broom-and-mop showers." Volunteers have found that after careful demonstrations of household-cleaning techniques, residents usually are able to keep their homes tidy. "Where there is order and pride," asserts Mrs. Coney, "there is likely to be less crime."

Although projects such as clean-up days and the street-lighting campaign mean endless hours of bone-wearying hard work, the women have proved that a lighthearted, creative approach to crime-fighting can pay off, too. When Crusade members noticed that a large downtown park was being overrun by young hoodlums, seedy vagrants and men with suspiciously intense interest in unchaperoned children, they borrowed a tactic that Quaker housewives used in the 1800s to close down troublesome saloons. Volunteers showed up one morning with their yarn baskets, occupied every bench in the park and literally "tended their knitting" until dusk. "Those men were so startled by this unorthodox invasion," says Mrs. Moore, "that they cleared out and haven't been back since. Now daily surveillance of all the parks is a regular part of the police agenda."

#### THEIR DAY IN COURT

Among the Crusade's most ambitious programs is the court-watching project, which has involved some 6,000 women over the last five years. Of all the institutions of government, courts are probably the most ignored by the average law-abiding citizen. Aware of talk about the need for court reform in other parts of the country, the Indianapolis women became curious about just what was happening in their own courts. So a Crusade committee compiled a glossary of courtroom terms to aid uninitiated volunteers and then began booking the volunteers daily, two by two, into the city's municipal, criminal and juvenile courts as observers.

The women make no attempt to second-guess judicial decisions. They merely record on tally sheets for each case such things as the defendant's age, sex, race and past police record; the disposition of the case; any continuances that are granted; and general observations they feel might be important. Periodically the findings are discussed with the judges.

Some defense attorneys have privately criticized the court-watching project, and one, William Erbecker, demanded publicly that the women be ousted from the courtroom on grounds that their presence prejudices judges and juries, making them too diligent. However, the Indiana Supreme Court upheld a lower-court ruling that the women have the same right to witness trials as any other citizens.

"The mere presence of these women in court has been enough to create changes," explains Criminal Court Judge Saul Rabb. "A lot of laxity develops when no one pays any attention to courts. Here we had judges habitually arriving late, prosecutors sloppily preparing their cases, defense attorneys obtaining excessive continuances in hopes of wearing out prosecution witnesses, policemen failing to show up to testify, bail bondsmen illegally soliciting business in the halls. Now things have tightened up significantly all down the line because everyone knows that public watchdogs are in court every day. That can't help but improve the quality of justice we administer."

Occasionally the volunteers spot law violators who can be helped with personal attention. A dramatic instance involved a young prostitute with three children, who told the judge that she wanted to quit the business but feared that her procurer would mutilate or murder her. Overhearing this, the Crusade watchers did some investigating and discovered that the procurer himself was slated for trial that same week. After he was sent to prison, they got in touch with the prostitute, convinced her that now was the time to try to change her life, helped her get a job as a practical nurse and arranged to have her attend a church where no one would know her past but where she could be included in a busy schedule of social events. Nearly two years have passed now, and she has not gone back to the streets.

More than once what observers have heard in court has evolved into broad-scale anti-crime projects. After one young defendant testified in court that hours after he was paroled from a state boys' school he stole a shirt because he didn't have good-enough clothes for a job interview, the Crusade set up a rehabilitation committee to work with persons newly released from correctional institutions. Much of the planning for this project has come from Mrs. O. A. Johnson, a ninety-year-old volunteer who has worked for years with Indianapolis settlement houses. Often establishing contact with prisoners weeks before they hit the streets, volunteers arrange for them to be clothed from a bank of donated apparel, help them locate jobs and sometimes foster homes and give them the same kind of one-to-one personal counseling that is helping reclaim school dropouts.

The committee has made some valuable contributions inside prisons, too. Volunteers have established libraries and sewing classes at the women's prison and have successfully pressed state officials to revamp obsolete work-training programs at the boys' schools. Once, when the suspicions of several women were aroused during a tour of a state correctional school, they managed to expose a "staff psychologist" as a fraud, and to document the fact that he was channeling state funds to other "counselors" who, like himself, did not possess psychological training. In the wake of these disclosures, personnel-screening procedures were tightened throughout the correctional system.

#### DEPRIVING THE DEVIL OF IDLE HANDS

In Juvenile Court the most familiar litanies from defendants are "I didn't know it was against the law" and "I didn't have anything else to do."

Volunteers have helped rectify the latter complaint for many Indianapolis young people by establishing a clearinghouse through

which social-welfare institutions in need of volunteer services can reach teenagers with time on their hands. Some 3,000 youngsters, many of whom previously whiled away hours by joy-riding or hanging around pool halls, now are involved in activities ranging from repairing toys at settlement houses to tending stricken children at a cerebral palsy clinic.

As for familiarizing youngsters with the law, Indianapolis in 1966 began one of the best law-education projects in the nation. Under Crusade auspices, nearly 66,000 children, elementary through high school, are visited annually in their classrooms by policemen who explain the laws that apply to juveniles and answer questions. "We find this as important as traffic-safety programs," says Sergeant Charles Pritchett, one of the officers. "Parents help the police and schools to teach their kids how to cross the street, but parents by and large don't know the laws. No one has been able to tell these kids the legal consequences of being with a friend who shoplifts, going party-crashing, staying out past curfew, buying cigarettes for their dads or playing hooky. Yet doing any of these things can land them in court."

In designing and executing all their projects, the women have allowed themselves only one taboo: They never publicly criticize police department practices or procedures. In part, of course, this approach was necessary to overcome the department's initial skepticism toward a women's anti-crime movement and to obtain police cooperation. But more important, Mrs. Moore explains, "We feel it is far easier to scold the police for failing to catch criminals than to take the responsibility for setting the community's moral climate high enough to discourage criminal activity. We chose the harder way."

Early in their campaign, the women began lobbying for an increase in police salaries, and this year top pay for patrolmen will rise from \$6,300 to \$7,000 a year. To further help morale, the women have instituted quarterly awards for merit and valor. Now for the first time Indianapolis police officers also earn college credits in their own headquarters building without taking leaves from the force, thanks to special teaching arrangements worked out by Crusade volunteers with Indiana University.

The Crusade has had the support of Indianapolis mayors from the start, and Crusade volunteers were the first delegation to meet with the then Mayor-Elect Richard Lugar, thirty-five, after his victory last November. He asked them to conduct a national survey to find out how police departments all over the U.S. are recruiting capable policemen. Within three days Crusade volunteers had questionnaires in the mail.

Praise spread by police officials and other observers has sparked coast-to-coast interest in the Crusade. In the last three years, Mrs. Moore estimates that she has spoken to 1,000 adult and teenage groups, and clubwomen in some 400 other communities have copied at least some of the Indianapolis projects.

"Battling crime is women's work," says Mrs. Moore. "We have the time. There are great masses of women in America looking for something worthwhile to do. We can move in with soft voices and a let's-see-if-we-can-help attitude, and we just may help this society overcome the most serious domestic problem it has ever faced."

#### Respect for Pathologists

HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, quite often, through overzealousness, and at

times through lack of adequate knowledge, or possibly through honest mistake, or misinformation, an improper and unintended impression is created which does an injustice to an entire group. We in Congress are guaranteed not only the freedom of speech allowed under the Constitution to all citizens, but, to protect us from harassment, we may not be called to task for what we say during the course of debate on the House floor. With this extra measure of freedom, we must exercise vigilance to make sure that what we say is responsible and fair.

One of my constituents, Dr. Norman E. Pond, of Albuquerque, has called to my attention an instance in which a fine profession has been treated in a manner which is, in my judgment, less than fair. In order to correct this inequity, I insert his letter as a part of the Record, and respectfully urge my colleagues to look it over. The work of our qualified and dedicated pathologists has resulted in the saving of countless lives. The profession is deserving of our respect. I am sure the practitioners of this profession would be among the first to insist that proper procedures and quality control should be used in this work. Without the work performed by pathologists, most doctors would be indulging in guesswork as to type and extent to most diseases. It should be made very clear that Congress never intended to bring disrepute to the profession of pathology.

The letter follows:

NEW MEXICO SOCIETY  
OF PATHOLOGISTS,

Albuquerque, N. Mex., January 23, 1968.

HON. JOHNNY E. S. WALKER,  
Longworth Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALKER: It has recently been brought to my attention certain statements made to Congressional Committees during the years 1966 and 1967, and I should like to draw attention to certain corrections that have been made in this regard and printed in the daily Congressional Record—House covering pages H17065, H17066, and H17067. Without going into detail, certain comments might be made including the glaring statistical errors in the number of mismatched blood transfusions which amounted to a 90% mathematical error. The statement in regard to a breast biopsy is important because the normal procedure in establishing the diagnosis of cancer, namely submitting tissue to a qualified pathologist for evaluation and diagnosis, was not carried out. The implication of lack of quality control in laboratory medicine is not justified, at least in regard to most laboratories run by pathologists which is clarified in the statement on page H17067. The so-called dollar volume waste listed as \$430 million and the technical error rate of 25% appears to be entirely erroneous, because the laboratories surveyed certainly were not representative. There appears to be insufficient documentation to support either the inaccuracy of tests or the dollar volume loss due to inaccuracy. The dating of these surveys also extends back a number of years in certain instances, and I am sure you realize that, as the scientific aspect of medicine progresses, quality and accuracy increase and any statistics based upon information more than one or two years of age is not applicable.

I do not wish to dwell further on the record but would like to forcefully defend those physicians trained in laboratory medi-

cine who are providing an accurate service at reasonable cost to the population of this country, and single out pathologists as those most qualified and doing the most in this regard.

At the same time I do not wish to criticize other competent individuals who are working in this area as there are others besides pathologists who are striving for the same goals. I do, however, have certain reservations about certain laboratories scattered throughout the country which are considered as "commercial" laboratories and even more reservations about much of the work that is being done in certain private physicians' offices who are apparently not now being suspect. In the latter regard, inadequate training in this area by general physicians themselves as well as their employees, and the lack of inborn volume controls which are so important in maintaining accuracy are important. These are areas that I think are much more subject to questioning than are the large number of hospital and private laboratories which are run by pathologists.

It may be of some interest to you to know that in the state of New Mexico exclusive of the University School of Medicine and the Veterans Administration Hospital, there are twenty private practicing pathologists in the state of New Mexico who in one way or another cover almost all of the hospitals in the state of New Mexico, and 85% of these are subscribing to one form or another of quality control program or survey program as established by the College of American Pathologists. Information has been forwarded to me indicating only three pathologists who are not actively participating in one of the programs established by the College of American Pathologists. This I feel speaks very highly for the coverage of the hospital laboratories and most of the pathology-run private laboratories here in the state of New Mexico.

Hopefully, this information will clarify some of the apprehension that has been publicized throughout the country in regard to laboratory medicine because I personally feel that where laboratory medicine is controlled by people specifically trained in this area, there should be no question as to quality. Of course, there are areas which may not fit into this category, but to question those dedicated people in the area without qualification is unjustified.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN E. POND, M.D., *President.*

Medical Administration Organization 10th  
Anniversary of Founding Noted

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks information concerning the American Academy of Medical Administrators. This is an organization which has just noted the 10th anniversary of its founding. Its membership includes medical administrators from all types of medical installations, not just hospitals alone, but clinics, nursing homes, extended care facilities, and community medical centers.

This all-embracing membership comprised of administrators in each of the 50 States and foreign countries has done much in the past decade to improve medical service to the public. This important area of our national economy has benefited greatly from the efforts of this fine organization. It gives me

great pleasure to note that the organization was founded in Boston and granted its charter by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 10 years ago. The history of this great organization follows:

THE ACADEMY STORY

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF MEDICAL ADMINISTRATORS, BOSTON, MASS.

Founding.—The American Academy of Medical Administrators was founded in Boston, Massachusetts in October, 1957.

The Charter Signators comprised a group of men practicing administration in various medical activities and these responsible individuals drew the plans for the founding of this non-profit professional society. The seven incorporators alone at that time had a combined medical administrative experience of over one hundred years in the profession.

Name.—The name of the Academy was chosen after great thought and research as to its etymological significance and appropriateness. Because the Academy is to compose members who administer the affairs of various medical activities, the adjective "medical" was chosen as the modifier of the noun "administrators".

Historically, however, the term "medical administration" is not new! For example, during World War II, in the crisis of establishing, staffing and equipping military hospitals to serve and care for the sick and wounded, a Corps of Medical Administration was established within the Medical Department of each of the Armed Services.

Because of the shortage of physicians, some individuals with medical administrative experience were given direct commissions as officers in this Corps; other especially qualified individuals were given intensified training programs in officer candidate schools, upon successful completion, they were also commissioned in the Medical Administration Corps.

Establishment.—The original founders, recognizing the requirements for a thoroughly comprehensive objective, in their foresight assumed the responsibility for drafting the Constitution and Bylaws, elected equally responsible officers and began to develop a program for the Academy. Numerous meetings and contacts with others in the field of administering to the medical setting throughout the United States and Canada were held. It was agreed that there exists a pressing need for the establishment of a professional society such as the Academy's approach would be based on the theory of appropriate recognition to those dedicated individuals engaged in the many specialties of medical administration. Men and Women who administer the affairs of the hospitals, clinics and other medical activities, caring for the sick in mind and body at the executive, as well as the middle management levels.

It was determined that a part of the Academy's approach would be based on the theory that the scope of knowledge required to understand an organization and to make it function effectively is based on several fields of knowledge and that the approaches to a general theory of medical administration had been slow in emerging from a one-discipline approach to a more penetrating analysis on an inter-disciplinary basis.

Development.—As soon as the program of the academy had been developed, a Charter of the Academy was granted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This Charter recognizes the Academy as a non-profit organization. At the time of the founding of the Academy and today, Boston is considered by many authorities as the medical center of the hemisphere. The appropriateness of the Academy's founding in this same center is apparent.

The next obvious decision on the part of the founders was to place this program into the hands of the future members. This phi-

osophy was in keeping with the firm conviction that the members are not only the sines, blood and life, of an organization, but are in fact, the organization itself!

Invitations were issued by mail to those potentially eligible for membership. The faith and belief of the original incorporators that there was a pressing need for a society such as the Academy was clearly demonstrated and justified when in a matter of months hundreds of medical administrators from all parts of the United States, its territories and Canada responded enthusiastically to the initial invitation to Charter Membership. The organization and development of the Academy proceeded rapidly from that point on.

Organization.—In keeping with the precept that the program of the Academy should be carried out by its members, regions were established and Regional Vice Presidents appointed. Six basic councils in areas of vital interest, not only to the membership, but to the profession in general, were also established and staffed. The councils are: Council on Education, Council on Voluntary Hospitals, Proprietary Hospitals and Government Hospitals, Council on Hospital Administrative Practice, and Council on Clinic Administrative Practice.

To determine and evaluate application for admission and advancement, a Credentials Committee was established.

Also organized within the Academy were permanent institutes in the medical administrative specialties. Nominees, Members, Charter Members and Fellows are assigned to the institute appropriate to and in keeping with their particular education and/or experience, as recommended by the Credentials Committee and approved by the Board of Directors.

Institutes are permanent structural departments within the Academy and encompass specialties in: Accounting, General Administration, Clinics, Dietetics, Engineering, Housekeeping, Group Practice, Management, Nursing, Personnel, and Purchasing.

The Academy is, therefore, an inclusive society which brings together in one organization the entire medical administrative family.

#### Purposes.—

To encourage and foster a scientific approach to the practice of medical administration.

To provide a means of intercommunication between medical administrators.

To promote, conduct, and foster educational courses in the various specialties of medical administration.

To provide for employment opportunity and professional advancement through recruitment, referral, and placement services.

To offer referral and consultant opportunities in the various specialties to members, persons and institutions requiring or requesting such services.

To establish and maintain a criterion of competency for those engaged in the practice of medical administration.

To provide for recognition to those who are making their life's work medical administration by electing those who qualify as Nominees, Members and Fellows of the Academy.

To offer to those who are doing noteworthy service in this field scholarship, and grants in order to further their work.

During the Academy's relatively brief history, many of the ambitious purposes and goals have been achieved. Formal courses in the Fundamentals of Hospital Administration have been conducted in Boston University; scholarships and grants have been awarded; independently and in cooperation with other professional groups various institutes and colloquiums have been conducted in various parts of the United States; publication of noteworthy topics have been published in the Academy's publication the AAMA Executive; placement and referral opportunities have been offered to the membership in several of the specialties. And, annually, the

Academy has sponsored its Convocation in Boston, Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and Atlantic City.

### Business and Professional Women's Club of Jersey City, N.J.

#### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the legislative program of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Jersey City, N.J., as well as the program of the 81st anniversary celebration which was held at Liberty Island, N.Y., on October 28, 1967, in the RECORD following my statement.

The Business and Professional Women's Club is a highly respected voice for women's rights in Jersey City and I would like all Members of this House to know of my high regard for the able women who make up this highly respected club.

The material referred to follows:

1886-67: 81ST ANNIVERSARY, STATUE OF LIBERTY, LIBERTY ISLAND, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1967

Program of Business and Professional Women's Club of Jersey City, New Jersey, in cooperation with the National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, 11:45 a.m., at Grand Promenade, Pedestal of Statue of Liberty.

Presentation of B.P.W. birthday gift to Statue of Liberty, Mary R. York, B.P.W. World Affairs Chairman.

Acceptance, Lester F. McClanahan, Assistant Superintendent, National Park Service.

Symbolic Flower Ceremony, Future Business and Professional Women: Mademoiselles: Susan Bolye, Joyce Diamond, Mary Ann Jordan, Ann Joan Trimble.

Relaxation Period: Another activity on Liberty Island will be an afternoon ceremony by the Ladies Auxiliary to Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB, JERSEY CITY, LEGISLATION, OCTOBER 1967

An American Flag which has been flown over the Capitol of the United States in the name of the Jersey City Business and Professional Women's Club has been presented to our membership as a gift. The honorable Dominick V. Daniels, United States Congressman, has graciously consented to visit us at our October Meeting and formally present the Flag to the Jersey City Club.

How proud we may be of our Women's Army Corps (WAC); of the 10,409 women, all volunteers who love the military life. They live it, work at it, reap and revel in its rewards. They will tell you that basic training develops a wide range of attitudes, knowledge and skills. It emphasizes team work, discipline and responsibility. How proud we may be, also, of our National Organization which strongly backed legislation in 1941 and 1942 to create the Women's Auxiliary Corps, and in 1963 to make the Corps a part of the Army of the United States. With continued interest, we look for bills to raise the rank of our military women. Regretfully, our women officers will go no higher than Colonel until Congress ratifies a bill allowing women to achieve general and/or admiral rank. The legislative measure which failed to pass in 1966 is expected to come up again this year and of course will be supported as part of the National Business and Professional Women's Legislative Platform.

Sergeant Martha McBroom, Counsellor of

the Women's Army Corps stationed at the Recruiting Station in Newark will join our members on Thursday evening, October 26th, at the Jersey City Women's Club, in a program that will both delight and inform us. Come and see for yourself that Legislation need not be dull . . . you will be pleasantly surprised.

Our Legislative Chairman, Julia Frishberg is Chairman of the evening's program and will be assisted by Beulah Silver, Julia Sturm and hostess, Audrey Morris.

Look for a Special Bulletin from our World Affairs Chairman, Mary York concerning a very important event on October 28th.

A Reminder: Our member, Jane Atkinson, just home from the hospital. Speed her recovery with a little message. Let her know we are all thinking of her.

### Captive Ukraine: Challenge to the World's Conscience

#### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, January 23, 1968, was the 50th anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

To mark this important date in the history of the largest captive non-Russian nation, the following account of the Ukraine's struggle for freedom and national independence is submitted:

CAPTIVE UKRAINE: CHALLENGE TO THE WORLD'S CONSCIENCE

#### INTRODUCTION

The year 1967 marks an important date in the modern history of the Ukrainian people; the 50th anniversary of the Ukrainian National Revolution. It was in 1917, half a century ago, that the Ukrainian nation, after 250 years of ruthless Russian domination and oppression, rose to freedom and proclaimed its full and unqualified independence. For almost four years, beginning in March 1917 and ending in the fall of 1920, the Ukrainians waged a gallant struggle in defense of their state, at times struggling against three aggressive neighbors simultaneously.

Today, 50 years since the inception of the Soviet regime, not only the Kremlin but its puppets in Ukraine collectively called the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," also are observing the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, which they claim brought "freedom and independence" to Ukraine.

History, of course, does not agree. It has fallen upon Ukrainians in the free world to speak up for their enslaved and oppressed brothers and sisters in captive Ukraine, to tell the world the true story of Ukraine—the martyrdom and persecution of the Ukrainian people and their undying desire and determination to regain their national statehood, established fifty years ago.

It is with this in mind that national organizations of free Ukrainians in the diaspora, especially those countries of the free world in which there are substantial numbers of Ukrainians and their descendants, have been planning for some time to call the first World Congress of Free Ukrainians. To be convened in New York City, the seat of the United Nations, the Congress will manifest the free will of the Ukrainian people, now in the political bondage of Communist Russia, as manifest in their incessant struggle for freedom and national independence.

In the past few years extensive preparations and discussions have been conducted by the Preparatory Committee for the first World Congress of Free Ukrainians, which

was established by the Pan-American Ukrainian Conference (PAUC), a coordinating body of Ukrainians national and central organizations in the Western Hemisphere. Founded in 1948, the PAUC has been instrumental in bringing together various Ukrainian organizations not only in the Western Hemisphere (those in the United States, Canada and the countries of Latin America), but embracing those in Western Europe and Australia as well.

In its Manifesto, issued on January 22, 1967, anniversary date of Ukraine's independence, the PAUC outlined the overall objectives of the First World Congress of Free Ukrainians.

1. To demonstrate before the world the unbending will of the Ukrainian community in the free world with the struggle of the Ukrainian people and proclaim its readiness to help them by all means at their disposal.

3. To knit all forces of Ukrainians who are citizens or residents of the countries of the free world into a closely collaborating body.

4. To establish goals and means toward a strengthening and all-embracing expansion of all sectors of life of the Ukrainian community in the free world.

The Manifesto states:

"We are aware of the fact that our lot is inseparably tied to the fate of the Ukrainian people; spiritual unity with the homeland is an indispensable source of our spiritual strength. To maintain it is our moral duty.

"We are therefore gravely perturbed by all which takes place in the homeland; Ukraine remains cruelly enslaved by the shackles of Russian Communist imperialism. For almost half a century we have witnessed the relentless political enslavement and economic exploitation of our people by the Red Russian occupier. Now, in addition, the very souls of the Ukrainian people are being subjected to genocide in the form of a consolidated Russification and destructive of the cultural treasures of the Ukrainian nation."

In its conclusion the Manifesto warned the free world "that Russia incessantly and systematically is preparing an aggression against the free world and is shaking the foundations of a lasting peace in the world."

Thus, the first World Congress of Free Ukrainians has a lofty, important and definite purpose. It will seek to mobilize the liberation forces of the Ukrainian people scattered throughout the free world and to channel them into highly organized and effective directions. It also will manifest the will and determination of the Ukrainian people in captive Ukraine towards self-determination and national statehood, national goals of the Ukrainian nation for the realization of which hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian patriots have paid with their lives or with long years of suffering, persecution and torture in Russian Communist jails and concentration camps during the past fifty years.

This brief account of Ukraine's unequal struggle for freedom and national independence is written on the occasion of the first World Congress of Free Ukrainians, which will be held November 16-19, 1967, in the City of New York.

#### PART 1—20TH CENTURY: ERA OF SELF-DETERMINATION AND DISAPPEARANCE OF COLONIAL EMPIRES

##### 1. World War I and Wilson's 14 Points for "Peace and Democracy"

The twentieth century has initiated a massive process of disintegration of the great colonial empires and brought about a new era of self-determination for and emancipation of formerly subjugated peoples the world over.

The First World War, breaking out in 1914, wrecked the two great empires that had dominated Ukraine: the Czarist Russian and the Austro-Hungarian.

The American principles of freedom and independence, embodied in the Declaration

of American Independence, were loftily expounded in President Wilson's 14 Points for "Peace and Democracy." His message advocating national self-determination for all peoples resounded throughout Ukraine, eliciting a fervent response from the people, then engaged in building their own free independent state. But all appeals of the Ukrainians to the Western powers for help against the invading Bolshevik troops remained unanswered. Attempts at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 to secure consideration of the claims of Ukrainian independence met with no success. Ukrainians were denied the right of self-determination, although at the very same time the victorious allies were busy creating multinational states in Eastern Europe. Ukraine, of distinct origin and with one language, culture and people, was ignored.

France, at the time obsessed by the possible resurgence of German militarism, committed itself to the concept of a "strong Poland." In fact, it went so far as to support the Poles against the Ukrainians and the White Russian generals against the Ukrainian national government in Kiev. Great Britain wavered between the aggressive anti-Bolshevik policies of Winston Churchill, then Secretary of War, who aided White Russian Generals Denikin, Wrangel and Kolchak with arms and ammunition, and the more moderate policies of Lloyd George. But neither of these policies favored the Ukrainian claims and aspirations to independence.

The United States, although not directly involved in European power politics, showed little interest in Eastern Europe. Its official attitude was one of waiting and of doing nothing which would prejudice the eventual rebirth of anti-Communist Russia, or even the emergence of a moderate Soviet regime.

Thus, in varying degrees all three allied powers supported the White Russian reactionary elements and reborn nationalist Poland. For their part, Ukrainians found a century and a half of inimical anti-Ukrainian propaganda, denying the very existence of Ukraine, to great an obstacle to overcome. The restored independent Ukrainian state encountered abroad naught but a biased hearing and a hostile attitude. Ukraine had no influential friends, there was no one to supply it with desperately-needed arms, ammunition and medical supplies and there were few who would extend meaningful diplomatic support. Ukraine found itself unable to survive.

Ironically, the principles of national self-determination and the slogans of peace and democracy under which World War I was ostensibly waged were denied one of the most deserving of peoples.

The League of Nations proved to be too weak: it would not safeguard the rights of those nations which, like Ukraine, had had to endure foreign domination and oppression. Its overall purpose was to maintain the new status quo which emerged in Europe after World War I.

##### 2. World War II: Freedom Versus Totalitarianism

World War II has often been characterized as the war of "freedom against totalitarianism," calling forth the great coalition of the Western democratic states against Nazi Germany. But this characterization is far from accurate, inasmuch as one important member of the Western alliance against Nazi Germany was the Soviet Union, one of the worst totalitarian and dictatorial regimes in mankind's history.

During the German-Soviet war in 1941-1945 Ukraine became a bloody battleground across which the German and Soviet armies swept back and forth. Both regimes, Hitler's and Stalin's, strove to eliminate the Ukrainian people if possible, and at the least to stifle all Ukrainian national life and thought. Despite the inhuman persecution, the Ukrainians succeeded in mustering a powerful and effective underground resistance

movement. This popular force resisted both invaders of Ukraine, the Nazis and the Russian Communists, during World War II, and after the war's end, it continued to wage underground warfare against Soviet army and security troops as well as against those of Communist Poland.

In 1945, with the collapse of Hitler's Germany, the United Nations was born in San Francisco. Among the charter members of this world organization was the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. It was admitted, along with the USSR and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, upon the insistence of Stalin. It is one of modern history's ironies that the existence of a Ukrainian state, even if under Communist tutelage, should have been accepted by the Western world upon the recommendation of the Russian Communist dictator rather than on the demand of the Ukrainian people.

With the emergence in 1945 of the United Nations, which has represented a marked improvement over its predecessor, a new political development engulfed the entire world: the process of a slow but steady decolonization of the peoples of Asia and Africa and the appearance of a series of new and independent nations.

It is a historical fact that the Western colonial empires have gradually given way to the new nations and states. Sometimes the process occurred peacefully, sometimes it was accompanied by war and violence. In any event, the Western world relinquished its long-held colonial possessions in Asia and Africa.

Canada's Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker, addressing the U.N. General Assembly on September 26, 1960, rebutted Nikita S. Khrushchev's attacks on "Western colonialism":

"Mr. Khrushchev in his speech advocated a declaration at this session for the 'complete and final elimination of colonial regimes.'

"He has spoken of colonial bondage, exploitation and foreign yokes. These views, uttered by the master of the major colonial power in the world today, followed the admission of fourteen new member nations to the United Nations . . .

"Since the last war seventeen colonial areas and territories, comprising more than 40,000,000 people, have been brought to complete freedom by France. In the same period some fourteen colonies and territories, comprising 500,000,000 people, have achieved complete freedom within the Commonwealth. Taken together, some 600,000,000 people in more than thirty countries, most of them now represented in this Assembly, have attained their freedom with the approval, encouragement and guidance of the United Kingdom and France alone, and I could go on to name others.

"These facts of history invite comparison with the period of Soviet domination over peoples and territories, sometimes gained in the name of liberation, but always accompanied by the loss of personal and political freedom.

"The General Assembly is still concerned with the aftermath of the Hungarian uprising of 1956. How are we to reconcile that tragedy with Mr. Khrushchev's confident assertion of a few days ago in this Assembly:

"It will always be the Soviet stand . . . that countries should establish systems . . . of their own free will and choosing."

"What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of the freedom-loving Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples?"

Mr. Khrushchev said at the same time: "The very course of historic development at present poses the question of complete and final elimination of the colonial regime . . . immediately and unconditionally."

There must be no double standards in international affairs. . .

What Mr. Diefenbaker obviously had in mind is Russian Communist colonialism,

which has kept under its brutal rule such ancient countries as Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and White Ruthenia (Byelorussia), and the Moslem peoples of Turkestan.

The territorial aggrandizement and colonial expansion of Communist Russia was concisely summed up by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, when he testified on June 21, 1951, before the House Foreign Relations Committee in Washington:

"Historically, the Russian state has three great drives—to the west in Europe, to the south into the Middle East, and to the east in Asia . . . The Politburo has acted in the same way. It carried on and built on the imperialist tradition. What it has added consists mainly of new weapons and new tactics. . . . The ruling power in Moscow has long been the imperial power and it now rules over a greatly extended empire. . . . It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the Duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped."

Another great American statesman, the late U.N. Ambassador, Adlai E. Stevenson, in his Memorandum on Soviet Colonialism sent to U.N. members on November 25, 1961, took to task the "Self-Determination in the Soviet Empire":

"We are told that the peoples of the Soviet Union enjoy the right of self-determination. Indeed, the Soviet regime at its inception issued a 'Declaration of Rights' which proclaimed 'the right of the nations of Russia to free self-determination, including the right to secede and form independent states.'"

"How did this 'right' work in practice? An independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by the Bolsheviks in 1917, but in 1917 they established a rival Republic in Kharhov. In July, 1923, with the help of the Red Army, a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was established and incorporated into the USSR. In 1920, the independent Republic of Azerbaijan was invaded by the Red Army and a Soviet Socialist Republic was proclaimed. In the same year, the Khanate of Khiva was invaded by the Red Army and a puppet Soviet People's Republic of Khorezm was established. . . . In 1918 Armenia declared its independence from Russia and a mandate offered to the United States Government was refused by President Wilson. In 1920, the Soviet Army invaded, and Armenian independence, so long awaited, was snuffed out. In 1921, the Red Army came to the aid of Communists rebelling against the independent State of Georgia and installed a Soviet regime."

In 1940 the Soviet Union, in defiance of solemn treaties, seized the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and installed therein Communist puppet regimes against the will of the peoples.

After World War II the Soviet Union, in violation of treaties and promises, installed Communist regimes in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and East Germany. It also extended its colonial power to North Korea and North Vietnam. Recently, it throttled Tibet and helped to establish a puppet Communist regime in Cuba.

Yet the Soviet Union was one of the most vocal advocates in the U.N. General Assembly for the establishment of a Committee to be charged with the supervising and promoting of the de-colonization of the colonial countries of Asia and Africa.

It is clear that the Soviet government is now subverting the process of de-colonization into a formula for establishing pro-Communist regimes, subservient to Moscow. In the same vein it promotes "wars of national liberation," such as that in Vietnam, and subverts the independent nations through military assistance, as evident in its attempt to penetrate into the Middle East and North Africa.

#### PART 2—50 YEARS OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL REVOLUTION

##### 1. General Data on Ukraine: Land, Resources and People

For a proper understanding and evaluation of the significance of the Ukrainian problem and Ukraine's geopolitical and economic position in the Soviet Union, a brief account of Ukraine and its people follows.

**Geographic Location.** Ukraine is situated in the southeastern corner of Europe. It possesses common borders with Rumania, Hungary and Slovakia in the southwest, Poland in the west, Byelorussia in the north, and Russia in the north and east. Ukraine also is bounded by Moldavia and the Black Sea in the south.

Ukraine's territory exceeds that of England, Austria, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Portugal and Switzerland put together.

According to Ukrainian ethnographers (cf. Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia), the Ukrainian ethnic territory embraces a total of 289,000 square miles. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (Ukrainian SSR)—which does not encompass all the Ukrainian ethnic territory—comprises a total of 232,000 square miles.

Thus, over 57,600 square miles of Ukrainian ethnic territory are outside the political borders of the Ukrainian SSR, specifically: in Russia (the regions and areas of the Belgorod, Kursk, and the Voronezh oblasts), Byelorussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

**National Economy.** Ukraine belongs not only to the richest countries of Europe but to those of the world as well. A recent account of Ukraine's industrial capacity was given by Soviet official sources. (Narodnoye Khozyalstvo SSSR v 1965 godu, Moscow, 1966), which expressed the industrial and agricultural output of Ukraine as percentages of the aggregate output of the USSR:

Electrical power production, 18.7; oil production, 3.1; gas production, 30.4; coal, 33.6; pig iron production, 49.2; steel production, 40.6; finished rolled products, 42.2; iron ore production, 54.7; mineral fertilizer, 23.4; sulphuric acid, 22.2; chemical fibres, 10.8; automobile tires, 9.0; metal cutting lathes, 13.4; metallurgical equipment, 48.0; oil-production machinery, 11.6; chemical equipment, 31.9; diesel locomotives, 96.8; electrical locomotives, 28.7 (in 1964); automobiles, 9.5; tractors, 33.4; tractor-drawn plows, 43.4; excavators, 28.9; wood export business, 3.5; paper, 5.1; cement, 17.0; building bricks, 21.9; cotton fabric, 2.6; woolen cloth, 6.5; silk cloth, 5.2; hosiery, 20.0; leather footwear, 19.5; radio receivers and radio transmitters, 10.7; television, 14.2; home refrigerators, 16.8; washing machines, 8.6; motorcycles and scooters, 3.7.

In the food industry: granulated sugar, 60.6; meat (including byproducts), 21.1; fishing industry, 10.2; butter, 26.2; vegetable oil, 31.5; canned goods, 23.5; grape wine, 27.4; grain cultures, 26.1.

In per capita production of pig iron Ukraine surpasses England, France, Italy and West Germany; in steel production it leads France, England and Italy. In mining of iron ore Ukraine is ahead of all major countries, including the United States.

The primary industrial area of Ukraine is the Donets Basin. Ukraine also possesses a large shipbuilding center in Mykolaiv.

The actual industrial potential of Ukraine is much greater than the official Soviet figures indicate, since under the present imperialistic and colonial policy of Moscow the development of Asiatic areas is favored for political and strategic reasons over the industrial development of Ukraine. Ukraine also serves as the "bread-basket" and "sugar-bowl" for the far-flung Russian communist empire.

The Ukrainian People. Historically speaking, Ukrainians constitute a compact national, political and cultural entity. Ukrain-

ians are the largest Slavic people, surpassed numerically only by the Russians.

According to the latest Soviet population census (1959) the population of Ukraine was 41,869,000, of which number Ukrainians constituted 77 percent and Russians 17 percent, with the remaining 6 percent distributed among various national minorities: Jews (1,025,800), Poles, Germans, Greeks, Byelorussians, Rumanians and Tartars.

On January 1, 1967, according to Soviet official sources, the population of Ukraine was 45,900,000 and on July 1, 1967, 46,200,000. By 1970 it should attain 47,518,220. In 1980, the projected Ukrainian population is 52,750,000, or approximately a 25.98 percent increase based on the population census taken in 1959.

Not all Ukrainians live in Ukraine. A substantial number are scattered throughout the Soviet Russian empire. According to official U.S. sources (The Soviet Empire: A Study in Discrimination and Abuse of Power, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., 1965) Ukrainians in the various Soviet Republics numbered as follows:

Russian SFSR: 3,359,000; Byelorussian SSR, 133,000; Uzbek SSR, 88,000; Kazakh SSR, 762,000; Georgian SSR, 52,000; Lithuanian SSR, 18,000; Moldavian SSR, 421,000; Latvian SSR, 29,000; Kirghiz SSR, 137,000; Tadzhik SSR, 27,000; Turkmen SSR, 21,000; and Estonian SSR, 16,000. Over 5,063,000 Ukrainians live outside of what is known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. This is the official Soviet estimate. The number of Ukrainians outside Ukraine actually is much higher; it is conservatively put at 10 million by Ukrainian population specialists.

**Satellite Countries:** There are about 450,000 Ukrainians in Poland, 118,000 in Czechoslovakia and 119,000 in Rumania. There are over 40,000 Ukrainians in Yugoslavia, especially in the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

##### 2. Ukraine Before World War I

On the eve of World War I the Ukrainian people lived in two powerful empires: the Russian and the Austro-Hungarian.

In Russia all the Ukrainian political institutions had been wiped out, the Czarist government long having determined to obliterate Ukraine as a distinct ethnic entity. The Ukrainian language was proscribed, and surviving Ukrainian national customs and folklore were derided as backward, while at the same time the official Russian policy propagated the notion that there was no recognizable difference between Ukrainians and Russians. At its worst, the Russian government resorted to such crass propaganda as that the Ukrainian national movement stemmed from "Austrian-German" intrigues, a fiction that was propagated by the Russian intelligentsia, including some of liberal hue. Scorn was heaped upon Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's national hero and poet laureate, as well as upon many Ukrainian writers and poets who followed the great bard. It was only in 1905 that the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg admitted officially that Russian and Ukrainian were two disparate and independent Slavic languages: Ukrainian was not a mere "dialect" of the Russian.

The plight of the Ukrainians was improved somewhat after the first Russian revolution in 1905. The first Russian Duma (Parliament) included a number of Ukrainian deputies as well as some hailing from the other non-Russian nationalities, who sympathized with the Ukrainian cause. Permission was granted to publish newspapers and books in Ukrainian.

There was a total of 22,300,000 Ukrainians in the nine administrative provinces of Ukraine, according to the 1910 population estimate. Some 7,426,982 Ukrainians lived in the neighboring provinces, central Asia and the Far East. Thus the Ukrainians in Russia totaled 29,726,982 on the eve of World War I.

In the Austro-Hungarian empire the Ukrainians lived in a compact mass in Eastern Galicia, numbering about 3,580,000, numbered 300,000 in Northern Bukovina, and mustered 470,000 in Carpatho-Ukraine, for a grand total of 4,150,000 Ukrainians.

The situation of Ukrainians under Austria-Hungary was a much better one than that of the Ukrainians under Russia. From 1860 on, when Eastern Galicia had been granted autonomy, the Ukrainian national rebirth had continued to flower. The Ukrainian language was officially recognized as one of the languages of the empire. Ukrainians could form political parties, cultural, social and economic organizations; they had representatives in the Galician Diet and in the Central Austrian Parliament in Vienna. Playing an important part in this general Ukrainian national rebirth in Eastern Galicia, Northern Bukovina and Carpatho-Ukraine was the Ukrainian Catholic Church, especially under the able leadership of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky, who headed the church from 1900 until his death in 1944.

So, while the Ukrainians in Russia were suppressed and deprived of their national and political rights, their brothers in Western Ukraine under Austria-Hungary enjoyed considerable freedom in their national and political development.

The outbreak of World War I aroused the hopes of all submerged peoples of Europe, and not least of all the Ukrainians.

The Western powers had no objection to a division of the Austro-Hungarian empire, and readily granted that the Czechs and the peoples of the Balkans had their right to independence. The case of the Poles and Ukrainians was more complex, however, as there were millions of Poles and Ukrainians on both sides of the front lines. Russia was willing to "liberate" the Poles in Western Galicia under Austria-Hungary, especially if it could annex the Ukrainian ethnic territory of Eastern Galicia. The Central Powers, on the other hand, regarded the independence movement among the Czechs as a Russian intrigue, but were willing to "liberate" the Russian part of Poland. This policy divided the Poles sharply into two camps: one pro-Central Powers and the other pro-Entente.

The Ukrainians immediately found themselves burdened by special political handicaps, compounded by the fact that their cause was little known in the world. The Russians did everything they could to convince the world that the Ukrainian nation was a "fiction" and that the entire Ukrainian movement was an "invention" of the German and Austrian governments. At the same time, the Poles in the German-Austrian camp demanded that a great part of Ukraine be included in a revived "historical" Poland. Moreover, the Central Powers would not commit themselves in any way regarding the future status of the Ukrainians. True, the Austrian government allowed the Ukrainians to organize Ukrainian military formations, on a voluntary basis, which were sent to the Russian front. (Although under overall Austrian command, these Ukrainian military units, known as the Ukrainski Sichovi Striltsi—Ukrainian Sich Riflemen—regarded their struggle against the Russians as one for a free and independent Ukraine. They also furnished the nucleus of the Ukrainian armed forces which subsequently sprang up when Ukraine became free and independent.)

Also, in Vienna and Geneva, Ukrainian political exiles from Ukraine under Russia established a political organization, the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine," which propagated the cause of Ukrainian liberation not only in the countries of the Central Powers, but among the neutral states as well.

Anti-Russian feelings and attitudes among Ukrainians grew considerably in the first months of World War I, in the course of

which the Russian Czarist government embarked upon a policy of total suppression of all Ukrainian institutions and the Ukrainian press, and as a consequence of its ruthless persecution of Ukrainians in Eastern Galicia, when this land was occupied by Russian troops in 1914-1915.

### 3. Rebirth of the Modern Independent State of Ukraine

The fall of Russian Czarism in March, 1917 evoked great enthusiasm not only among Ukrainians but among all the other non-Russian nations as well.

Ukrainians were nothing if not quick to seize the great opportunity to restore their independent state.

(a) Period of the Ukrainian Central Rada: On March 17, 1917, the Ukrainian Central Rada (Council) was established in Kiev under the presidency of Prof. Michael Hrushevsky, Ukraine's foremost historian. Between March and October of 1917 the Rada dealt with the Russian Provisional Government under Alexander F. Kerensky, who refused to recognize the independence of Ukraine. The Rada issued four Universals (proclamations) which served to mark the stages of the rebirth of Ukrainian statehood:

(1) The First Universal, June 23, 1917, announced the autonomy of Ukraine; (2) the Second Universal, July 16, 1917, proclaimed agreement between the Rada and the Russian Provisional Government; (3) the Third Universal, November 20, 1917, established the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR), and (4) the Fourth Universal, issued on January 22, 1918, proclaimed Ukraine to be an independent and sovereign state. Within a fruitful period of ten months a Ukrainian national army was organized; the Rada opened Ukrainian schools, established Ukrainian administrative and judicial systems, introduced a land reform, prepared for a Ukrainian Constituent Assembly, provided autonomy for the national minorities of Ukraine and gained the recognition of a number of foreign states, including Communist Russia.

On December 17, 1917, the Soviet government (Sovnarkom) sent a note to the Ukrainian Central Rada, which stated:

"The Soviet of People's Commissars of the Russian Republic recognizes, without any limitations or conditions, and in all respects, the national rights and independence of the Ukrainian Republic." (Of. Organ of the Provisional Government of Workers and Soldiers, No. 26, December 20, 1917, Petrograd).

Although recognizing the independence of Ukraine the Soviet Russian government sent an ultimatum to the Rada demanding that the Rada grant armed Communist bands permission to cross Ukraine to the Don. When their ultimatum was rejected, Lenin and Trotsky launched an armed aggression against Ukraine. It took the Ukrainian and the allied German and Austrian troops, after the Brest Litovsk Treaty, four months to expel the Russian troops from Ukraine—a military success Ukraine was not to duplicate again.

We may note here that France and England recognized Ukraine as an independent state before the Central Powers did. The French government sent General Taboulin and the British government, Picton Bagge, as special envoys to Kiev to extend de facto recognition to the Rada in January, 1918. On February 9, 1918, Ukraine concluded a separate peace treaty with the Central Powers in Brest Litovsk, winning thereby a full de jure recognition from Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria.

Through the provisions of the Brest Litovsk Treaty Ukraine received diplomatic recognition and military help against the Bolsheviks from Germany and Austria-Hungary in exchange for food supplies. It was these troops of the Central Powers that enabled the Ukrainian army to drive the Soviet troops out of Ukraine by the spring of 1918.

(b) Period of the Hetmanite Government: The military aid of Germany and Austria-Hungary also improved the political situation in Ukraine in that the Russian Communists were expelled. But the Ukrainian national cause suffered when the German and Austrian allies abused their privileges, quickly earning the hatred of the Ukrainian population. In addition, the social and economic policies of the Rada, which were largely socialist won no support from the wealthier and conservative classes in Ukraine, which were largely Russian and Polish. Also, many of the Russian aristocracy had fled from Russia to Ukraine. The German army and its command, too, was conservative. Lastly, a small group of Ukrainian landowners, proud of their Ukrainian Kozak traditions, organized a conservative Ukrainian party which pressured the Rada with a series of demands, especially one calling for restitution of private property. This party held a congress in April, 1918, at which it elected General Paul Skoropadsky as the new hetman of Ukraine. The German army, displeased with the socialists and radical policies of the Rada, committed an unpardonable act: it forcibly dispersed the Ukrainian Central Rada, despite the protest of Prof. M. Hrushevsky, the Rada's President, and gave its full support to Hetman Skoropadsky.

Paul Skoropadsky was a descendant of the old Ukrainian family of Hetman Ivan Skoropadsky and had been educated in St. Petersburg. He was first to Ukrainize his Russian army corps immediately after the establishment of the Rada.

In contrast to the Rada, the rule of Hetman Skoropadsky admittedly was conservative. For a short time order was established in Ukraine. The new government repealed, however, most of the land reforms of the Rada, re-establishing landowners in their former estates. Strikes were forbidden, and the German troops began wholesale requisitions of foodstuffs throughout Ukraine.

Popular discontent and Bolshevik agitation grew rampant in Ukraine. The defeat of Germany in the west in the fall of 1918 foreshadowed the end of the rule of Skoropadsky.

(c) The Directorate of the Ukrainian National Republic: During the rule of Skoropadsky, the Ukrainian socialist and liberal democratic parties were not idle, marshaling their forces and drawing up their programs. In the fall of 1918 they established a Directorate of five men, headed first by Volodymyr Vynnychenko and then by Simon Petliura. Relying on the Ukrainian corps of the Sichovi Striltsi under the command of Col. Eugene Konovalets the Directorate proceeded to overthrow the government of Hetman Skoropadsky. The now weak German authority in Ukraine quickly collapsed, the German troops retreating hastily from Ukraine.

Nonetheless, the Directorate took over in Ukraine under extremely difficult circumstances. The Bolsheviks had reorganized their forces and had begun a new aggression against Ukraine. At the same time the White Russian forces under the command of General Anton Denikin were fighting not only against the Bolsheviks but against the Ukrainian national armies as well. In addition, with the establishment of the Western Ukrainian National Republic, the government of reborn Poland attacked Ukraine from the west, thus opening a new war front for the hard-pressed Ukrainian people.

(d) Establishment of the Western Ukrainian National Republic: The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire spurred the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia, Northern Bukovina and Carpatho-Ukraine into greater efforts for freedom and self-determination. A Ukrainian National Rada was established in Lviv, capital of Western Ukraine. On November 1, 1918, Ukrainian military units of the Austrian armies took over all government buildings in the city, and the National Rada

proclaimed the Western Ukrainian National Republic. But the Poles challenged the Ukrainians, opening up a Polish-Ukrainian war, first for the city of Lviv, then for all Eastern Galicia. In Bukovina the Ukrainians established their own National Committee and asked to be integrated into the Ukrainian Republic; the Ukrainians of Carpatho-Ukraine followed suit on January 22, 1919.

In the meantime the Ukrainian government—the Directorate in Kiev—and the government of the Western Ukrainian National Republic headed by Dr. Eugene Petrushevych decided to merge and form one united Ukrainian Republic and government.

All these trends of nationalism culminated with the Act of Union of January 22, 1919, in Kiev, whereby all Ukrainian ethnic lands became part of a united Ukrainian independent state. The Act of Union, among other things, stated:

"From today on there shall be united in one Great Ukraine the centuries-separated parts of Ukraine—Galacia, Bukovina, Hungarian and Dnieper Ukraine. The eternal dreams, for which the finest sons of Ukraine lived and died, have been fulfilled. From today on there shall be only one independent Ukrainian National Republic."

Although the two Ukrainian republics had united and although the army of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Ukrainian Galician Army were placed under one unified Ukrainian command, the rush of events proved to be overwhelming. In May, 1919, for example, the Polish troops fighting against the Ukrainian Galician Army were reinforced with six fresh Polish divisions under the command of General Joseph Haller, organized, trained and equipped by the Allies in France. Ostensibly sent to prevent the advance of the Bolsheviks, in reality they were intended to push the Ukrainian troops from Eastern Galicia into Ukraine proper.

At the Paris Peace Conference two Ukrainian delegations (one from the Directorate of Kiev and the other from the Western Ukrainian National Republic) vainly endeavored to secure support and recognition from the victorious Allies. The "Big Four"—Wilson, Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Orlando—tried to mediate the Polish-Ukrainian war, but failed. With the collapse of Turkey the Dardanelles were opened, and the Western Allies sent supplies to the White Russian Generals Denikin, Wrangel and Kolchak, but none to the hard-pressed Ukrainians, who, astonishingly, were holding two fronts against the Bolsheviks and the White Russians in the east and south, and yet another against the Poles in the west.

Midsummer in 1919 the united Ukrainian armies mounted a last-gasp, all-out offensive against the Bolsheviks, and expelled them from Kiev in a heroic effort. Had the Western Allies given them material support the Ukrainian Republic might well have survived. But the Ukrainian army found itself hemmed in a "rectangle of death," decimated by typhus and other diseases, without adequate medical supplies, without food, without arms. That it had survived so long had been made possible only by the support of the Ukrainians in city and countryside.

In the spring of 1920 the Ukrainian government of Petlura in desperation concluded a military alliance with Pilsudski of Poland, thereby tacitly recognizing the conquest of Western Ukraine by Poland. A joint Polish-Ukrainian offensive in the summer of 1920 managed to push the Red armies beyond Kiev, but a counter-offensive of the Soviet armies threw back the combined Polish-Ukrainian forces. By the summer of 1920 the whole of Ukraine was in the hands of Soviet troops.

On March 21, 1921, a peace treaty was signed between Poland and Communist Russia and the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," in Riga-Latvia.

In this treaty no mention was made of the Ukrainian National Republic, nor of the

Directorate nor the Ukrainian army. Nor was there any mention of the Soviet Russian recognition of the Ukrainian National Republic, which the Soviet government had granted Ukraine in the note of December 17, 1917, and had confirmed in the peace treaty signed with the Central Powers on March 3, 1918.

For all intents and purposes Ukraine was now again divided between Soviet Russia and Poland. A new factor, however, had been introduced, namely, the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," which now allegedly represented the Ukrainian people.

Thus for almost four years, from March 1917 until the fall of 1920, the Ukrainian people fought valiantly to preserve their freedom and national independence under the most adverse and trying conditions. They achieved their freedom and independence after centuries of oppression only to have them wrenched away by more powerful neighbors in a few short years.

We may well wonder what might have happened had Ukraine survived as an independent state, thereby depriving the Soviet regime of its great natural resources, and, too, eliminating that alleged vacuum which Hitler believed Ukraine and other non-Russian countries to be, enticing him into making his fateful drive for "easy" conquest in the east.

The Ukrainians fought ardently for their self-determination while the world looked on with indifference, even hostility. Poland, and to some extent Czechoslovakia and Rumania, cynically saw themselves profiting by Ukraine's demise as an independent state. The same methods used for the subjugation of Ukraine, however, eventually were to be successfully used against them by mankind's enemy—Communist Russia.

#### 1. Ukraine between two World Wars and during World War II

##### 1. Ukraine Under the Rule of Communist Russia (1920-1939)

The Soviet Russian rule over Ukraine was and continues to be a totalitarian and dictatorial rule, although Moscow exploits every imaginative resource it possesses to show that the new Soviet system is a popular government primarily concerned with the economic, social and cultural welfare of its citizens and, above all, that it is a government of "workers and peasants."

Ukraine was crushed and conquered by the superior strength of Soviet Russian arms, but to give the world the illusion that the Ukrainian people craved a Soviet regime, Moscow established the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic," which it claims is the happy creation of the Ukrainian people. In 1923 the Ukrainian SSR formally became a member of the Soviet Union as a "free and independent member-Republic."

Moscow governed some 30,000,000 Ukrainians with unrelenting severity and harshness. Its rule between World Wars I and II is characterized by these distinguishable stages:

(a) NEP Period: During this period (1921-1924) the Soviet government introduced some alleviations in the economic and cultural spheres in an attempt to win the Ukrainian people over to its side. It allowed a degree of private initiative in the economic field and some latitude in the cultural areas.

(b) Ukrainization: In the middle 1920's the Kremlin was forced to grant some concessions to the Ukrainians and introduced a policy of "Ukrainization," officially favoring the use of the Ukrainian language in Ukraine as the official language of the republic in schools, administration, courts, and government offices. Ukrainian literature so speedily flowered that the Russian Communist leaders became alarmed, suppressing a number of Ukrainian writers and intellectuals under the pretext that they were propagating "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism."

(c) Collectivization: In 1930-32 Stalin introduced enforced collectivization of agriculture in the USSR, a process during the course of which some 5 million Ukrainians died from mass starvation and man-made famine, the price paid in rejecting the collective farms when the Soviet government coercively withheld grain supplies.

(d) Purges, Arrests: The Soviet rule in Ukraine was characterized by frequent arrests, purges and deportations of Ukrainian intellectuals, writers, poets, and professionals, including Communist writers, male and female; in the 1930's thousands of patriotic Ukrainians were executed by the NKVD and MVD for participating in secret, real, sometimes imaginary, anti-Communist organizations. Actual bodies were the "Union for the Liberation of Ukraine," "Union of Ukrainian Youth," "Ukrainian Military Organization," the "Ukrainian National Center," and the like.

(e) Anti-Religious Policy: From the very inception of its power, the official Communist policy toward religion was directed towards its total negation. Tolerated for some time in Ukraine was the Ukrainian Autocephalic Ukrainian Orthodox Church, but soon Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivsky and some 32 Ukrainian Orthodox archbishops and bishops were pulled down from their pulpits and incarcerated.

(f) Large-scale Deportations: Deportation of recalcitrant Ukrainians to Siberia, Central Asia and the Far East became a matter of Soviet policy. These deportations entailed large numbers, such as farmers opposing collectivization, former soldiers of the Ukrainian national armies (in the 1920's), cultural leaders who were pursuing "Ukrainization" too zealously and too well, and even members of the Communist Party of Ukraine. In 1937, Nikita S. Khrushchev, as Stalin's emissary in Ukraine, liquidated the entire organization of the Communist Party of Ukraine and 17 members of the so-called Ukrainian Soviet government as "bourgeois nationalists" and "enemies of the people."

In the economic field, Communist Russia systematically exploited the natural riches and industrial capabilities of Ukraine for the benefit of imperialistic and aggressive designs elsewhere.

##### 2. Ukrainians Under Poland

After the collapse of both the Western Ukrainian National Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic in Kiev, the formal division of Ukraine took place according to the Treaty of Riga between Poland and Communist Russia. Some 7,500,000 Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia and of a part of Volhynia and Polisia, found themselves under the rule of extreme, nationalist Polish governments. Originally, the Allied Supreme Council allowed Poland to occupy Eastern Galicia with the proviso that political and religious freedom be guaranteed to the Ukrainians. On March 14, 1923, the Council of Ambassadors assigned this Ukrainian land permanently to Poland, again with the provision that local autonomy be given the Ukrainians.

But the Polish government embarked on a policy of overt persecution of the Ukrainians and the other minorities: Byelorussians, Jews, Germans and Lithuanians. The Ukrainian schools, which flourished during Austrian rule, were suppressed and the Ukrainian language relegated to a secondary place in a country overwhelmingly inhabited by Ukrainians. Although Catholic themselves, the Poles ruthlessly persecuted the Ukrainian Catholic Church as a natural protector of Ukrainian national and cultural life. The Warsaw government set up the infamous concentration camp at Bereza Kartuska, where it incarcerated rebellious Ukrainians, casting in its own Polish opponents as well.

The Ukrainian reaction to this harsh treatment took two forms: overt, legal political

parties and economic organizations, especially the well-developed Ukrainian cooperative movement and the credit unions, and covert, illegal and revolutionary Ukrainian organizations, such as the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN). Where, the first group, especially the Ukrainian National Democratic Union (UNDO) party, tried to wrest some degree of recognition and tolerance from the Polish government, the second group adopted an intransigent and uncompromising position, advocating a united and independent state of Ukraine. The latter group, bitterly anti-Polish, soon organized a network of clandestine groups which began attacking Polish officials deemed responsible for the oppressive acts of the government. The Warsaw government retaliated harshly, as witness the "pacification" of Ukrainian villages and towns in 1930, which eventually was documented in the League of Nations and other international organizations which sought to protect the rights of national minorities. These oppressive measures cost the Poles abroad much of that wholehearted support accorded them during World War I, when they themselves were striving to achieve their independence.

### 3. Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia

Initially the government of reborn Czechoslovakia was favorably disposed toward the Ukrainians, whose leaders, subjected to harsh treatment by Poland and the USSR, sought refuge and support in Czechoslovakia. A number of Ukrainian institutions, including a Ukrainian Free University, were established in Czechoslovakia, with the acquiescence and, at times, the material support of the Prague government. But the Prague regime became quite antagonistic to the national aspirations of the 550,000 Ukrainians in Carpatho-Ukraine who had tried to be reunited with Ukraine in 1919 but who, by virtue of the Treaty of St. Germain, had been given to Czechoslovakia, again under the condition that national autonomy be introduced in the region. (It never was.) At best, the Czechoslovak government pursued a policy of playing off Russian against Ukrainian influence among the several hundred thousand Ukrainian mountaineers who preserved patterns of Ukrainian culture and folklore despite domination by the Hungarians for several centuries.

In 1938, with the Nazi government throwing Europe into turmoil, Carpatho-Ukraine acquired sudden political prominence. Subsequent to the Munich pact it received national autonomy within a diminished Czechoslovakia. On November 2, 1938, a substantial part of Carpatho-Ukraine along with the cities of Mukachiv, Berehovo and Uzhorod was handed over to Hungary by Hitler and Mussolini. Finally, when on March 14, 1939, the Hungarian troops were given the "green light" by Hitler to attack Carpatho-Ukraine, its Parliament in Hust proclaimed independence and elected Msgr. Augustine Voloshyn, a Ukrainian Catholic priest, its first President, with Julian Revay as Prime Minister. The Sich sharpshooters, untrained and ill-armed, put up a gallant resistance, but were decimated by the regular Hungarian army, and the country was incorporated into Hungary.

### 4. Ukrainians Under Rumania

There were about 1,000,000 Ukrainians in Northern Bukovina and Bessarabia, provinces which had been acquired by Rumania from Austria and Russia. The Rumanians, a Latin race, tended to be suspicious of the Eastern Slavs, despite the fact that their predecessors in Moldavia and Wallachia had enjoyed friendly relations with the Zaporozhian Kozaks, ancestors of the Ukrainians. The Rumanian government passed a number of laws prohibiting non-Rumanian organizations and curbing the Ukrainian language, schools and press. But in 1927 the Ukrainians

succeeded in electing a few deputies and a senator to the Bucharest Parliament, voices to defend the rights of the Ukrainian people. But in general the Rumanian government saw any and all Ukrainian activity as a possible link with Soviet Ukraine. For their part, Ukrainians, who knew intimately of the plight of their brethren in the USSR, could not possibly muster for Rumania the hostility engendered by the USSR. And, in point of fact, the treatment of Ukrainians in Czechoslovakia and in Rumania was not to be compared with the harsh treatment of Ukrainians meted out by the Polish and Soviet governments.

### II. Ukraine during World War II: Struggle against two totalitarianisms

With the signing of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on August 23, 1939, the Nazis were ready to launch a lightning aggression against Poland and thus implement their program for a "new order" in Europe.

The Nazi-Soviet pact shocked Ukrainians wherever they lived; they, in common with everyone else in the world, could not see Hitler and Stalin as allies.

With the defeat of Poland, the Soviet Union on September 17, 1939, moved to annex Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia. Stalin dispatched Soviet troops "to take under their protection the blood-brothers, Ukrainians and Byelorussians." Soon an additional agreement was signed between Moscow and Berlin delineating the new borders: the USSR (which had already begun its expansion in the Baltic States) took possession of all the Ukrainian ethnic territory which was under Poland with the exception of four small districts which remained in German hands: the San and Lemko districts in the Carpathians, and two small areas in the Kholm and Pidlasia regions.

#### 1. Under Nazi Rule

Although there was speculation in the West and undoubtedly some hope among the Ukrainians that Hitler would be moving into Eastern Europe to help the subjugated peoples in their struggle for national independence, such conjectures and sentiments were dashed by the very first action of Hitler.

The Ukrainians were not merely disappointed. They were outraged that Western Ukraine, which had never been part of any Russian state (except during the months of Russian occupation in World War I) should have been handed over to the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, although anti-Hitler feeling rose high, hundreds upon thousands of Ukrainians succeeded in escaping from Soviet-held areas of Western Ukraine to the German side—the ancient enmity for the Russians predominating.

The overall German policy as regards the Ukrainians was apparently intent upon fomenting and increasing hostility between the Ukrainians and the Poles. (Incidentally, despite persecution of Ukrainians by the Polish regime, there were no mass desertions or anti-Polish acts, sabotage, guerrilla warfare or the like on the part of the Ukrainians when the Nazis attacked Poland on September 1, 1939.) The Nazis did allow Ukrainian schools and the publication of Ukrainian books. They also tolerated the restoration of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kholm and Pidlasia, and permitted the establishment of a Ukrainian Central Committee in Cracow to act as a general contact organ, similar to those allowed the Poles and Jews. In some districts and areas, in fact, Ukrainians were placed in administrative posts, relief organizations and other economic sectors—all of which generated a popular assumption that the Ukrainians were receiving "preferential treatment." But above all, no political activities were permitted, although the Nazis did not fail to play on the anti-Communist and anti-Russian sentiments of the Ukrainians.

#### 2. Under Soviet Rules

When the Soviet troops took over Western Ukraine (Eastern Galicia and Volhynia), the Soviet government lost no time in introducing its own oppressive rule. Mass arrests immediately followed the Ukrainian intellectuals, the wealthier elements of the population, Ukrainian Catholic priests, student leaders and the leaders of various economic and financial institutions—all of whom were deemed dangerous to the Soviet regime. Finally, in October 1939, Soviet-type "elections" were held in Western Ukraine. Unsurprisingly, among the one-slate candidates a number of prominent Ukrainian Communists from Soviet Ukraine were to be found. Soon Western Ukraine was integrated with the Ukrainian SSR through a "unanimous" petition of a phony "People's Assembly" sent not to Kiev, but to Moscow, another example, if needed, to show that the Ukrainian SSR has the reality of a department store window display.

The Communists also installed the Soviet economic system, including the nationalization of private property, factories, plants and banks and other privately owned enterprises. Ukrainian cooperatives, an institution which had managed to thrive under Polish rule, were dissolved or merged into the Soviet-type cooperative, run by the omnipotent state.

The Soviet regime followed its now-established tactic of fabricating an outward Ukrainian appearance. Lviv was declared a Ukrainian city, and the University of Lviv was named after Ivan Franko, the greatest poet of Ukraine after Shevchenko.

With all Ukrainian political parties dissolved, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), the largest underground Ukrainian nationalist organization, despite sporadic acts of sabotage, tried to marshal its forces and rebuild the underground network, hoping for a rupture in the Nazi-Soviet alliance.

In 1940, the Kremlin, with the support of Hitler, turned toward Rumania, demanding the provinces of Bukovina and Bessarabia. Those parts of the two provinces with predominantly Ukrainian populations were integrated into the Ukrainian SSR, while the remaining areas were grouped together into a Moldavian Autonomous Republic, which subsequently became the Moldavian SSR. The same process of Sovietization and Communization was inflicted upon the newly-acquired Ukrainian provinces.

#### 3. The German-Soviet War

The German attack on the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941, unleashed the great totalitarian forces of Nazism and Communism. It also served to clarify Nazi policy with respect to Ukraine.

The rapid retreat of the Soviet troops precipitated the wholesale massacre of Ukrainian political prisoners by the NKVD in many Western Ukrainian cities—Lviv, Stryl, Drohobych, Ternopil, Dubno and Lutsk. Hundreds of Ukrainian corpses were also found in the prisons of Kiev, Kharkiv, Poltava, Zhytomyr, Odessa and Dniepropetrovsk.

The attitude of the Nazi government toward Ukraine remained basically the same. True, the Wehrmacht staff organized two Ukrainian Legions (the "Nightingale" and the "Rolland"), which many Ukrainians and others mistook for a change in the German policy toward Ukraine. But the crucial test came on June 30, 1941, when the Ukrainian National Assembly gathered in Lviv, proclaimed the restoration of the Ukrainian state, and appointed Yaroslav Stetzko, a leading member of the OUN, prime minister of the Provisional Government. The government was broadened to include representatives of other political groups. A Ukrainian National Rada was formed with Dr. Kost Levytsky, outstanding Ukrainian parliamentarian and statesman, as its head. The German army command initially was neutral, even participating in the ceremonies attend-

ant upon the proclamation of the restoration of Ukraine's independence. But as the German armies moved east the Gestapo took over. It ordered the leaders of the Ukrainian Provisional Government to revoke their act or face arrest and concentration camps. The Ukrainian leaders chose the latter alternative; both Stepan Bandera and Yaroslav Stetsko, as well as many others, were arrested and sent to the Sachsenhausen concentration camp in Germany.

The hopes of the Ukrainians were finally shattered when in August, 1941, the German government included Western Ukraine in the Gouvernement General of Poland, while the rest of Ukraine was organized under the Reichskommissariat Ukraine and placed under the administration of Gauleiter Erich Koch, notorious for his sadism even in Nazi Germany and a former Communist. It was not long before the Nazis commenced large-scale deportations of able-bodied Ukrainian men and women for slave work in Germany. The overall pattern of Nazi policies was to depopulate Ukraine, in effect destroying the Ukrainian people, thereby paving the way for the German colonization schemes as dictated by the Lebensraum concept.

It became obvious to the Ukrainians that resistance to the new enslaver of Ukraine would have to develop rapidly. In the spring of 1942 large segments of the northeastern Ukrainian territories were seething with discontent and unrest. By the fall of 1942 the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) was established, including a general staff, training schools and other military sub-divisions.

For over two years and a half the UPA under the command of General Taras Chuprynka (Roman Shukhevych) conducted an unrelenting underground guerrilla struggle against the Nazi apparatus of oppression. The UPA gained control over a considerable area of Ukraine, supported solely by the Ukrainian population.

By the middle of 1944 the UPA had become a powerful striking force and numbered well over 100,000 guerrilla fighters. In the fall of that year all the Ukrainian nationalist underground organizations called an assembly and established the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (UHVR), which, by coordinating policies and administration of Ukrainian areas under the control of the UPA, in a real sense became the actual if clandestine government of the Ukrainian people.

Inasmuch as the UPA fighters concentrated their attacks against the Nazi police, Gestapo and Einsatz troops and security units (in 1943 the UPA assassinated SS Nazi General Victor Lutze in an ambush on the Kovel-Brest railroad line) rather than against Wehrmacht troops, the Soviet propaganda trumpeted that the UPA fighters were German "hirelings and collaborators." The Wehrmacht was not a prime target simply because it was not engaged in any punitive actions against the Ukrainian population; the Gestapo and other security troops, on the other hand, systematically were hunting down Ukrainians for deportation to slave labor in Germany.

The anti-Nazi policies of the UPA stood unwavering and unchanged to the last days of the Nazi occupation of Ukraine. It was only a few months before the collapse of Germany that the Nazi government began flirting with the Ukrainians and other non-Russian nationalities in a hopeless attempt to win them over to the German side. The two Ukrainian divisions which the Wehrmacht had organized in 1943 to fight against Soviet troops exclusively were now made a part of a Ukrainian National Army that a newly-organized Ukrainian National Committee tried to establish. But to the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian people the Germans were beyond the pale. The Ukrainian division suffered heavy casualties in a major engagement against the Soviet

troops near the city of Brody in 1944; many of its survivors went over to swell the ranks of the UPA.

Before the general retreat of the German troops from Ukraine the Soviet government undertook a tremendous propaganda campaign to soften the hostility of the Ukrainian people. Simultaneously, thousands of Red partisans were sent behind the German lines, ostensibly to fight against the Germans but in reality to combat the UPA. Led by General Sydir Kovpak, a descendant of the Zaporoshian Kozaks, the Red partisans glibly spoke of a "free and independent Ukraine" and of "friendship with the great Russian people." Also, the Kremlin relaxed repressive measures somewhat; Ukrainian writers and poets were allowed to sing of the glory of Ukraine. Vague promises about forthcoming "national concessions" floated in the air. Stalin ordered the restoration of the Russian Orthodox Church, and in Kiev a new Ukrainian Communist government was organized with Dmytro Z. Manulsky, a veteran Comintern leader, becoming Foreign Minister of Ukraine! Vast Soviet armies, some of them being renamed as "Ukrainian Armies," were staffed and commanded by such marshals and generals of Ukrainian descent as Malinovsky, Moskalenko, Grechko, Dibrova, Rybalka, Derevyanko, Timoshenko, and others—in a transparent effort to impress the Western world that Ukrainians were on the side of the Soviet Union, that Ukraine was one of the major republics of the USSR, and that it was worthy of membership in the organization of the United Nations, soon to be established.

But the UPA, while still fighting against the Nazi security and police forces in extensive areas of Western Ukraine, the Carpathian Mountains and the Ukrainian territory in Poland, now had to commence operations against the Soviet troops, especially the Red partisans. Among the victims who fell in battle with the UPA was Soviet General Nikolai F. Vatutin, member of the Soviet War Council, who was mortally wounded by a UPA unit, dying subsequently in a Kiev hospital (cf. The Penkovsky Papers; also, The Fatherland's War, Vol. IV, p. 78, Moscow).

At the conference at Yalta in February 1945 both Roosevelt and Churchill accepted the proposal of Stalin that Ukraine and Byelorussia be charter members of the United Nations.

By the end of World War II, peace had seemingly come to the world, but certainly not to Ukraine. The UPA, still a strong and powerful fighting force, backed by the people, was now preparing to engage the old enemy of the Ukrainian people, Communist Russia.

#### PART 3—POST-WORLD WAR II OPPRESSION OF UKRAINE BY COMMUNIST RUSSIA

##### 1. Stalin's Revenge on Ukraine

As the Soviet Union emerged one of the great victors over Nazi Germany, Stalin took pains to make it clear that the Soviet victory had been achieved by the Great Russians almost exclusively. Consequently, he initiated bloody purges and persecution in the non-Russian republics. The autonomous republics of the Crimean Tartars and the Volga Germans were liquidated as their punishment for collaboration with the Germans, a fate which likewise befell the autonomous oblasts of the Chechens and Ingushes in the Caucasus (cf. Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine, Special Report No. 4, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1955).

But Stalin's vengeance was wholly psychopathic in Ukraine. His promises of "national concessions" to Ukraine were soon forgotten. The MVD (the new name for the NKVD) hounded all those Ukrainians who were supporting the UPA—a herculean task, indeed. Moscow ordered wholesale requisitions of all foodstuffs in Ukraine and called up a general mobilization of all men from 16 to 60—this was before the final collapse

of Germany. Thousands, untrained and ill-armed, were slaughtered under the fire of German tanks and guns.

(a) Fight against the UPA: One of the primary tasks of the Soviet troops was to liquidate the Ukrainian underground resistance. Special detachments, known as *istrebiteles* ("exterminators"), hunted members of the OUN (whom the Reds called "Band-erites," after Stepan Bandera, OUN leader) and the UPA.

The underground warfare of the UPA embraced the Western regions of Galicia, the frontier zones of both sides of the Curzon Line and the Carpathian Mountains, including some areas of Carpatho-Ukraine and Slovakia. The fighting raged for several months, despite constant appeals on the part of Khrushchev and Manulsky to Ukrainian insurgents to lay down their arms, automatic pardon being their reward. Since there were no surrenders, the Soviet command mounted large-scale offensives with as many as 30,000 special troops. Through the spring and summer of 1945 entire Soviet divisions were engaged in combatting the UPA. In 1946 General Vasyi Ryasny, the Minister of Interior of the Ukrainian SSR, threw large contingents of MVD troops into the fray. In 1947 the seemingly unconquerable UPA units ambushed and killed General Karol Swierczewski, Polish Defense Minister ("General Walter" of the Spanish Civil War).

On May 17, 1947, a tripartite agreement was signed between the USSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia, whereby all three Communist governments agreed to join forces in putting down the Ukrainian guerrilla forces. This blow proved too much even for the Ukrainian spirit to sustain. Hundreds of the underground fighters were killed, several hundred others escaped through Czechoslovakia to West Germany or simply faded away throughout the USSR. On March 5, 1950, Soviet security troops ambushed and killed the UPA Supreme Commander, General Taras Chuprynka, in Western Ukraine.

It is estimated by Ukrainian guerrilla warfare specialists that by 1950 some 38,000 Soviet officers and enlisted men of the security forces had fallen at the hands of UPA freedom fighters. Although large-scale operations and raids by the UPA subsided after 1950, underground resistance, under different forms and techniques, exists to this very day.

(b) Destruction of Ukrainian Catholic Church: Another form of Stalin's revenge over the Ukrainian population was his savage destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine.

After the death of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky on November 1, 1944, his successor Metropolitan Joseph Slipy tried to preserve the church and its 5,000,000 Catholic faithful within the existing Soviet laws and constitution. But in 1945 the MVD arrested all the Ukrainian Catholic Bishops: Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, Bishops Gregory Chomysyn, Ivan Latyshevsky, Gregory Lakota, Mykola Charnetsky, Mykyta Budka, many other high-ranking prelates, and a number of priests, monks and nuns—all on the spurious charges of "collaboration" with the Nazis or of supporting the UPA. In 1946 a Soviet-approved committee of a few apostate priests and laymen, called a "synod" at which they abolished the Union of Brest (1596), by which the Ukrainian Catholic Church had been reunited with the Roman Catholic Church. They liquidated all church properties and schools, closed monasteries, and imposed the Russian Orthodox Church upon the Catholic population of Western Ukraine. Subsequently, other Ukrainian Catholic bishops were arrested or killed, such as Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovsky, who was arrested by the Polish security police and handed over to the Soviet government, and Bishop Theodore G. Romzha, who was killed in Carpatho-Ukraine.

Of 11 Ukrainian Catholic bishops only Metropolitan Joseph Slipy survived. Released in 1963 upon the direct intervention of Pope John XXIII, he was first made Archbishop Major, then Cardinal; he now resides in Rome.

(c) Cultural Russification: Once the Soviet government had reorganized after the critical war years, it again commenced a shrewd and systematic policy of Russification in Ukraine. The Ukrainian language, although the official language of the Ukrainian SSR, was discriminated against. The so-called "linguistic theory" of Stalin was introduced to justify the Russian language as an "international language"; above all, it was the "language of Lenin" and the "language of Communism." Russian books, art, plays, films flooded Ukraine in unprecedented fashion. Ukrainian history and literature were ordered to be revised in order to demonstrate their dependence in the past, present and future on the "elder Russian brothers."

(d) Economic Exploitation: Although Ukraine had been ravaged by World War II, the Soviet government paid scant attention to the economic needs of the Ukrainian people. It did restore a certain number of factories, mines and hydro-electric plants which had been destroyed by the war. But enormous quantities of machinery which had been moved to the east from Ukraine were never returned to Ukraine. Under the pretext of bringing in sorely-needed specialized personnel and technicians, Stalin inundated Ukraine with Russians, while Ukrainian technicians, specialists and engineers were dispatched to other parts of the USSR.

In its agricultural policy the Kremlin revived and tightened the collective farm regime, making life on them even more unbearable. Western Ukraine and parts of Volhynia and Carpatho-Ukraine were collectivized, and all those Ukrainian farmers who showed the slightest opposition were sent to slave labor camps in Siberia and Kazakhstan.

## 2. Ukraine Under Khrushchev's Rule

(a) "De-Stalinization," "Thaw" and Ukraine: The death of Joseph Stalin on March 5, 1953, ushered in a new and uneasy period in the history of the USSR and of Ukraine. "Collective leadership" in the Kremlin masked a bitter struggle for supremacy. An early casualty of the intra-party struggle was Leonid Melnikov, abruptly dismissed as secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine. He was publicly charged with forcing the Russification of Western Ukraine, a charge brought to the fore for the first time anywhere. He was replaced by Alexander Kirichenko, the first native Ukrainian ever to hold this post. With the execution of Lavrenti Beria and the dumping of Georgi Malenkov, the surviving contestants, Khrushchev and Bulganin, embarked upon a policy of "peaceful coexistence" abroad and "peace" with their own hapless citizenry at home.

In 1954 Khrushchev, Stalin's "iron man" in Ukraine in 1938 and the holder of direct responsibility for many of the crimes committed against the Ukrainian people, began a new policy toward Ukraine. He now sought to woo Ukrainians by granting some nominal concessions and by cautiously following and espousing certain pro-Ukrainian policies, all with the obvious intent of appeasing the ever-recalcitrant Ukrainians.

On the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654), the Communist Party came up with new "theses" on the relations between Russia and Ukraine. Advanced was a "theory" to the effect that Kievan Rus had given rise to three Eastern Slavic peoples: the Russians, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians. Hence the Russians could call Kiev "the oldest Russian city," leaving Lviv as the oldest Ukrainian city, since it was founded by the Ukrainians after "the division of languages."

CXIV—98—Part 2

Furthermore, in the same year of 1954 the Council of Ministers of the USSR made the Crimea a part of Ukraine to demonstrate the affability of Russian "brotherhood." (It is to be recalled that it was from the Crimea that Stalin had ruthlessly deported all Tartars for disloyalty to the Soviet regime and collaboration with the Germans.)

These and other gestures were intended to make the Ukrainians amenable to a new "economic scheme" Khrushchev had concocted: cultivation of the "virgin lands" of Kazakhstan. Some 800,000 young Ukrainian men and women were half-persuaded, half-coerced into leaving Ukraine as "volunteers" for the task.

Moreover, during the Khrushchev rule, large-scale strikes and rebellions erupted in the Soviet slave labor camps, most of them organized by Ukrainian political prisoners, notably by former members of the OUN and UPA. The first such insurrection flared up in Karaganda, the movement quickly spreading to slave camps in Vorkuta, Kingir, Tayshet, and elsewhere. Moscow reacted with its customary measures: mass executions and indiscriminate killing, as for instance the brutal slaying of 500 Ukrainian women prisoners in Kingir under the treads of Russian tanks. However, the revolts brought some relaxation of terror in Soviet prison camps (cf. Encounter, April 1956, London).

It was at the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, 1956, that a now righteous Khrushchev assailed Stalin's crimes against the people and his unbridled terror, especially in Ukraine. Khrushchev stated:

"Stalin had wanted to deport all Ukrainians, but there were too many of them and there was no place to which they could be deported."

In fact, it was impossible to effect these deportations because of the activities of the UPA.

This "de-Stalinization" policy of Khrushchev blew up in his face. It resulted in anti-communist and anti-Russian upheavals throughout the Soviet Russian empire, the rebellion in Poland and the world-rousing insurrection in Hungary in 1956.

By 1957 the Kremlin was confronted with a dilemma: whether to revert to the old Stalinist policy, thereby risking even further insurrections, or to initiate a truly liberal policy, which would favorably impress the emerging Afro-Asian nations which the Kremlin had begun to woo, posing as their great "protector and emancipator."

Khrushchev compromised by devising a series of measures which gave the appearance of "liberalization" but which in reality tended to enchain the Soviet Russian empire more tightly. These measures included decentralization of planning and management of agriculture, spiced with a few concessions to farmers; some decentralization of management of industry and some extension of local authority for the non-Russian republics. Much was made of an amnesty granted political prisoners, especially, as it entailed liquidation of a number of the troublesome slave labor camps; "liberalization" of literature, whereby limited criticism was permitted party writers; "liberalization" of travel abroad by a limited number of citizens, and admission of foreign tourists. A number of Ukrainians and other non-Russian Communist leaders were elevated to the highest echelons of the party leadership and the administrative apparatus.

But parallel with this relaxation of terror, Moscow rigorously pursued a systematic Russification course in Ukraine.

(b) Khrushchev's Crimes against the Ukrainian People: In 1959 the ebullient Khrushchev traipsed across the ocean to the United Nations in New York, provoking vast resentment and opposition on the part of U.S. ethnic groups and labor and veteran organizations.

Extensive hearings on the rule and policies of Khrushchev were held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the House of Representatives in Washington. In its final report, The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part II, his brutal treatment of the Ukrainian people were summarized as follows:

1. As a Communist official he played a leading role in the Moscow-made famine in Ukraine in the early 1930's in the course of which over 5 million Ukrainian peasants died from hunger and starvation;

2. As Stalin's emissary in Ukraine in 1937-38, Khrushchev liquidated the entire organization of the Communist Party and the puppet Ukrainian Communist government; his hand was clearly visible in the genocidal murder of 10,000 Ukrainian men and women in the city of Vynnytsia in 1937-38;

3. He played a vital part in the destruction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church and the liquidation of the Ukrainian intellectual elite (for instance, he ordered the arrest of Metropolitan V. Lypkivsky in January, 1938);

4. During World War II, as a General in the NKVD forces Khrushchev was responsible for the wholesale liquidation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), including eradication of its members' families;

5. In 1945-46, teaming with Molotov, Khrushchev ordered the liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. Before it had run its course, over 2,000 Ukrainian Catholic priests were deported, executed or forced to accept Russian Orthodoxy, dominated by the Kremlin;

6. Khrushchev was responsible for the "voluntary resettlement" of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians and other non-Russian peoples in the "Virgin lands" in Kazakhstan, thereby contributing again to the genocide of the Ukrainians as a nation.

7. Finally, he was guilty, as a member of the "collective leadership," of the mass murder of Ukrainian political prisoners in 1954-55 in Karaganda, Vorkuta, Norilsk and Tayshet.

Irresponsible and amoral Khrushchev brought the world to the brink of atomic war when he placed Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962. Alarmed by excesses unusual even in Communist Russia, his cohorts banded together and deposed him.

## 3. Under the Brezhnev-Kosygin Rule

No improvement or change in the position of the Ukrainian people has been noticeable since the removal of Khrushchev in the fall of 1964 and the assumption of power by a new "collective leadership," composed of Leonid Brezhnev, secretary general of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Alexei Kosygin, Premier of the Soviet Union.

The widening rift ideologically and politically between the Soviet Union and Red China began to preoccupy the Kremlin leaders. In addition, the constant unrest and opposition in the satellite countries, notably in Rumania, the perennial crises in agriculture, the rebellious Soviet intellectuals—all added to the trials of the new Kremlin chieftains.

Against this backdrop, the following developments are easily distinguishable during these past few years of the Brezhnev-Kosygin "collective leadership":

(a) Policy of Wooing Ukrainians Continues: The policy of making Ukrainians feel as if they were "junior partners," begun under Khrushchev, has continued under the present regime.

Of the 12 members of the new Politbureau of the Communist Party's Central Committee, three are Ukrainians: Nikolai V. Podgorny (Pridhoryn in Ukrainian), Alexander P. Kirichenko and Peter Y. Shelest, the latter succeeding Podgorny as secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine when the former was elected Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1965.

Podgorny, accompanying Nikita S. Khrushchev to the United Nations General Assem-

bly meeting in 1960, delivered a scathing address in Ukrainian assailing the United States, Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker of Canada and those Ukrainian American leaders and organizations who sponsored "Captive Nations Week" and Ukrainian Independence observances in the United States Congress. (In January, 1967, Podgorny also visited Pope Paul VI in Rome, apparently to discuss the "religious situation" in the Soviet Union. There was no public announcement to indicate whether the religious plight of the Ukrainian people had been discussed at all.)

Another prominent Ukrainian in the top echelon of the Soviet political hierarchy is Marshal Andrei A. Grechko, who succeeded Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, also a Ukrainian, as Soviet Defense Minister. Ukrainian generals and admirals are to be found in the Soviet army, air force, navy and other branches of the armed forces, and a number of Ukrainians serve in the diplomatic service, including the ambassadorial level.

(b) Religious Persecution: The Soviet press in Ukraine periodically reports arrests, trials and deportations of "religious fanatics" and "superstitious people." Such trials were held in 1965 in Lviv, Western Ukraine, at which some 20 persons were charged with practicing underground Catholic religion. Among those arrested were Ukrainian Catholic priests, nuns and several lay persons. In March 1966 the Soviet government sponsored widespread celebrations commemorating the 20th anniversary of the "liquidation" of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Western Ukraine. These jubilees evoked a strong protest on the part of the Ukrainian Catholic hierarchy in the free world. A special pastoral Letter denouncing the destruction of Catholicism was signed by 18 Ukrainian Catholic bishops, headed by His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Slipy. The Soviet presses continue to spew forth books and pamphlets denouncing the Ukrainian Catholic Church as "always in the service of counterrevolutionary imperialists, including the American imperialists."

Religious persecution is not limited only to the Catholic Church in Ukraine. The number of Orthodox Churches has shrunk to a skeleton network. In October, 1966, in the city of Zhytomyr several persons were tried for giving religious instruction to children; all were either of the Orthodox faith or belonged to the Ukrainian Baptists' organization. A vicious attack on the Baptists in Ukraine appeared in the November 1966 issue of *Ludyna i Svit* (Man and the World), published in Kiev.

Anti-religious tactics of the Communists include propagandistic undermining of the people's faith in baptism and matrimony and the discrediting of Christian burial by priests or ministers.

The present Kremlin leadership is thus not unique in betraying its fear of religion as a powerful force against the Communist ideology.

(c) Cultural and Linguistic Genocide in Ukraine: But what is perhaps the most insidious and telling damage the Russian imperialists inflict upon Ukraine is that wreaked by the policy of cultural and linguistic genocide.

In 1966 the world was outraged by the trial and condemnation of two Russian writers, Daniel and Sinyavsky, for their non-conformist literary activities. Regrettably, little attention has been paid to what takes place in the cultural and literary sphere in Ukraine.

In 1965 and 1966 a number of Ukrainian writers, poets, researchers, journalists, literary critics and professors were arrested, tried and sentenced in Ukraine. At least 30 of these Ukrainian intellectuals were meted out this treatment in such Ukrainian cities as Kiev, Lviv, Odessa, Lutsk, Ternopil and

Ivano-Frankivsk. Most prominent among them are Ivan Dzyuba and Ivan Svitlychny, who were accused of writing anti-Soviet works and of smuggling to the West anti-Soviet works of another Ukrainian poet, Vasyl Symonenko, who died in 1963 at the age of 29. Detailed reports on the arrests of the Ukrainian intellectuals appeared in the *Neue Zurich Zeitung* (April 1, 1966) and *The New York Times* (April 7, 1966). Protests by the Ukrainian Writers' Association in Exile were addressed to the International PEN, the European Community of Writers, and UNESCO. Protests to the State Department in Washington were sent by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

The anti-Soviet and anti-Russian opposition in Ukraine was officially if unwittingly acknowledged recently (1966) by Peter Shelest, secretary general of the Communist Party of Ukraine, and Alexander Korneichuk, top-ranking Communist playwright and ideologist. Among other things, they felt impelled to warn Ukrainian youth against listening to Western radio broadcasts, ending by assailing the United States for alleged support of Ukrainian "subversive nationalist elements" which, they claimed, were systematically infiltrating into Ukraine.

#### 4. Moscow-Directed Assassination of Ukrainian Political Leaders Abroad

Moscow's dread of the Ukrainian liberation movement is best exemplified by the methods it chooses in disposing of Ukrainian political leaders deemed dangerous to the Russian Communist domination in Ukraine. Over the decades the NKVD, MVD, and KGB has picked off, among others, these victims:

(a) Simon Petiura, head of the Directorate of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1919 and subsequently leader of the Ukrainian government in exile, assassinated on May 25, 1926, on a Paris street by Solomon Schwartzbart, a Soviet agent (cf. Allen Dulles, *Craft of Intelligence*);

(b) Col. Eugene Konovalts, former commander of the Ukrainian Army Corps of Sichovi Striltsi and head of the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), killed on May 23, 1938 in Rotterdam, Holland, by a time bomb slipped in his trench coat by a Soviet agent, Valukh (later identified as a top-ranking officer in the Soviet security police);

(c) Dr. Lev R. Rebet, a Ukrainian nationalist writer and theoretician, killed on October 12, 1957 in Munich, Germany (his death was initially attributed to heart failure);

(d) Stepan Bandera, outstanding Ukrainian revolutionary leader and head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), killed on October 15, 1959 in Munich, Germany (his death, too, was at first described as caused by a heart attack). Bandera was incarcerated by the Nazis in the concentration camp of Sachsenhausen from 1941-1944.

The Rebet and Bandera murders were committed by Bogdan N. Stashynsky, a trained agent of the KGB who subsequently was awarded the "Order of the Red Banner" by the Soviet government (the certificate was signed by Marshal Klimenty Voroshilov) and was personally praised by Alexander Shelep-in, then head of the KGB (Soviet State Security).

In August, 1961, a remorseful Stashynsky defected with his German-born wife to West Berlin and confessed to the slayings of Bandera and Rebet. Tried dispassionately by the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe, he was condemned to 8 years at hard labor. The leniency of the court was attributed to Stashynsky's recanting of his crimes, his rejection of Communism and, not least, his revelation of a vast Soviet espionage network operating in Western Europe.

#### CONCLUSION

The history of the Ukrainian people for the past 50 years has demonstrated the undying desire of Ukraine to attain its national freedom and independence. Untold sacrifices in human and economic resources have been paid by the Ukrainian nation in quest of that objective. The severe and harsh persecution of the Ukrainian nation by Communist Russia, Nazi Germany and other oppressors and aggressors, past and present, have not been able to deflect the will of the Ukrainian people or to kill what might well be man's deepest instinct—that of being free.

In its search for freedom and national independence Ukraine is by no means alone.

Recognition of its plight, and that of other hapless nations, was formally extended by the United States in its famous "Captive Nations Week Resolution" of July 17, 1959:

"The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others."

In giving a haven to Ukrainians fleeing from oppression and outright genocide in their native land, the United States and other hospitable countries of the free world have, in the last analysis, acted in their own best interest.

Where conditions have at all permitted, the Ukrainian infusion has invariably enriched both soul and body of the host country. Law-abiding, industrious, naturally independent of spirit and deeply aware of God and His grace, Ukrainians have often proved to be an invaluable catalyst on every continent they have reached, anywhere where man seeks to build a viable society, everywhere where Nature's forces have had to be channeled into constructive directions.

But it is in coping with destructive forces within man himself that Ukrainians in the Diaspora have contributed most. Everywhere they have gone they have inevitably awakened man's conscience. They have served—and continue to serve—as the Free World's surrogates in an experience whose very existence too many men refuse to acknowledge: the extinction of freedom for individual and for nation.

It is in this wise that Ukrainians abroad have repaid many times over the many helping hands. The fate of Ukraine, they have demonstrated, is the fate of man and nation everywhere unless man continues to prize and to fight for freedom, not only in his own country, but over a globe that modern technology has miniaturized.

#### The United Citizens Band Radio Association Distributes Food, Clothing, and Gifts to the Needy

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the United Citizens Band Radio Association made its annual Christmas pilgrimage into West Virginia and Tennessee a few weeks ago, distributing several truckloads of food, clothing, and gifts to needy families in communities recommended by the public welfare departments of the States concerned.

I am a member of this fine organization, and I share the pride of other members in the commendations received for this charitable program, typical of which is the following letter from the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C.

HON. FRANK T. BOW,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please permit me this opportunity to express to you my gratitude for your thoughtfulness in writing to me concerning the United Citizens Band Radio Association and the wonderful work they do in providing food, clothing and toys to the needy. I was indeed grateful to this Association for selecting Mingo County, West Virginia as one of the localities to receive benefits from their endeavors.

At the very last moment when Congress adjourned and I was assured that my daughter's operation was successful I left Washington to go to Williamson in order to be present and attempt in my humble way to assist the United Citizens Band Radio Association, under the extremely able leadership of Mr. Robert Thompson, in this worthwhile project. You may be interested to know that those members of the CBRA took their time at their own expense to arrange for this demonstration and they spoke highly of you and several of them expressed to me their admiration and respect for you. Naturally, I agreed with them that you were truly a distinguished member of the House of Representatives who enjoyed the admiration and affection of all of our colleagues in the House.

Mr. Thompson and his very charming wife are unusually able leaders and it was obvious to me that the members of the caravan are dedicated American citizens who have a real and deep feeling for people. The Members of this group enjoyed doing something that will help others and I learned during this trip to admire and respect this dedicated group of American citizens, and it can be truly said that these Members reflect the true spirit of Christmas and because they gave so generously of their time and effort and their own personal financial contribution many deprived children will not only have a finer Christmas than otherwise possible but the recipients will also enjoy a clearer understanding of the spirit of Christmas and the spirit of America.

To you I am personally grateful for advising me that Mingo County had been selected, as well as forwarding a most informative letter from Mr. Thompson.

Be assured that you would have found this event in Mingo County heartwarming and I only wish that it would have been possible for you to be present. Such interest which was so clearly demonstrated by this organization serves to give one a greater confidence in the future of the country we hold so close to our hearts.

With my very best personal wishes, I am  
Sincerely yours,

JAMES KEE,  
Member of Congress.

Our Secretary of Defense-Designate

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the President could have made no wiser choice

for Secretary of Defense during these critical times than Clark M. Clifford.

Mr. Clifford has been associated with some of the great decisions of the Presidency and the Congress for almost a quarter of a century. He is a man of the highest integrity, outstanding ability, intense patriotism, and is devoted to those principles and ideals that made America great.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the following editorial which appeared in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., one of the great dailies of the South, on January 23:

A GOOD CHOICE FOR DEFENSE POST

President Johnson's choice of Clark M. Clifford as Secretary of Defense comes as a great relief to many Americans who wondered what would happen after it became known that Robert S. McNamara was leaving the job to head the World Bank.

Mr. Clifford quite probably will turn out to be an improvement over the brilliant but arbitrary Mr. McNamara. In addition, his appointment gives no comfort to this country's enemies, both at home and abroad.

He has an excellent knowledge of the federal government in general through many years as an adviser to Presidents. He enjoys much influence and respect among members of Congress. He knows how the Defense Department should operate, since he was one of the architects of the combined military establishment.

It is to be noted Mr. Clifford will concentrate his efforts on administering the vast and almost unmanageable military complex, leaving to military commanders the decisions which should be their's on the conduct of operations in the field. He should encourage the Joint Chiefs of Staff to exercise their lawful function as the President's direct military advisers, something Secretary McNamara hampered and even frustrated.

Chances are Mr. Clifford, who is widely respected as a reasonable man, will act as a Secretary of Defense should in these matters of vital importance.

Most probably he will have better relations with Congress than did Mr. McNamara who long refused to implement the expressed will of the people's elected representatives on such important matters as a missile defense system for this country. Mr. Clifford knows how Congress operates and respects its constitutional authority in matters pertaining to the nation's defense.

He will be far less inclined than his predecessor to substitute a computer-oriented judgment for the will of Congress. By the same token congressional leaders probably will tend to rely more upon Mr. Clifford for advice than they did upon the stubborn Secretary McNamara.

Finally, Clifford at 61 has no political ambitions, such as were suspected of Mr. McNamara.

The truth is that he is risking a well-earned reputation in taking on the difficult Defense Department assignment.

He could have refused, secure in the knowledge that he already had accomplished much and had received much recognition. Instead he accepted the President's call to "front line" duty, with full knowledge that failure on his part would tarnish his reputation.

Mr. Clifford personally has everything to lose and little to gain as Secretary of Defense.

This is fine for the nation. The new Secretary will try to do a good job for the President, for Congress and for the people of the United States by maintaining a strong defense, capable of meeting any eventuality.

Mr. Clifford's appointment could turn out to be the best made or yet to be made by Mr. Johnson as President.

A Modern Greek God

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, America has entered 1968 with new hope and determination. The events of the past few months have caused many people throughout the world to wonder if democracy can continue at home and abroad. Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr. are positive thinkers and they are enthusiastic concerning the prospects of tomorrow. They believe in praising the great and supporting programs that will nurture democracy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the paper by Dr. and Mrs. Reuter entitled "A Modern Greek God."

A MODERN GREEK GOD

(By Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

The Greeks, who had a word for everything, called it arete; the Romans, not to be outdone, called it virtus. The word we would use is our equivalent, excellence. Excellence, of course, may manifest itself in many ways. Like the mythological Zeus, it appears often where it is not expected, in guises wholly incongruous with its popular image. Excellence is visitor in the abodes of all, including the towers of scholars and the cloisters of godly men. Excellence makes only one demand; the total surrender of self to the end of accomplishing the highest attainment of which a man is capable. It is this type of excellence, as representing King Constantine, that is being described.

Attention is called to one of the most outstanding ladies of all times. She is the mother of King Constantine, and the description follows:

"Finally, let's view as the principle the finished product of education. These products describe two ladies and the reader must take a choice. The first is represented by the words of William Faulkner: 'A woman needs to know how to ride a horse, how to tell the truth, and how to make out a check.' The second description comes from the printed words on the citation of the honorary doctorate awarded by Barnard College, Columbia University in January, 1964, when that great lady, Queen Mother Frederika of Greece, was honored. 'Her achievements are not ascribable merely to the accident of birth, but to qualities which many women must cultivate today: perseverance, courage, intellectual concern.' Which finished product do you desire for education?"

The question is easy to answer. Queen Mother Frederika and the Greek Royal Family are in the news these days in very dynamic ways. King Constantine, who like his family, is one of the greatest exponents of democracy in the world today. He recently said: "I tried to fight, and I lost. I fought because I believed that by doing so I could more quickly and effectively bring the return of democratic life to my country. Although militarily my effort was a failure, in deeper ways, I am convinced it was not."

THE ATTRIBUTES OF A GREEK GOD

The Greeks and the Romans had many gods. We are in another age, but there are many great statesmen. While we recognize the one true God, it is fitting we pay tribute

<sup>1</sup> George S. Reuter, Jr., and Helen H. Reuter, *Democracy and Quality Education* (Educational Research Association of the U.S.A.: Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. 33.

to great leaders in our day who are as great as, if not greater than, Greek and Roman gods of history. We nominate King Constantine for this honor for the following reasons:

1. He is filled with wisdom and understanding. Wisdom doesn't guarantee earthly success at all times and it may cause doubts in the minds of some. For example, as one reads the *Apology* and the dialogues dealing with the trial and execution of Socrates, the question inevitably presents itself as to whether Socrates made the right choice in going to his death rather than abandoning his mission of being the witness of the truth. Father Constantine Hallick of Milwaukee, in the same vein, has questioned the timing King Constantine used.

Educators were right thirty years ago when they accepted the forward thrust of educational leadership under John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick, George S. Counts, and Harold Rugg. Later, we were right again in the late Fifties when we failed to panic, as some groups did, when the Sputnik supporters wanted to remake education overnight. The Greek King will probably be right when historians describe the events.

2. He is a fundamental believer in democracy. Greece is where democracy began, and King Constantine and the Royal Family insist that democracy is essential if Greece is to remain free. U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania expressed the feelings of all lovers of freedom when he said on the Senate floor: "Mr. President, the wires carry the heartening news from Greece that King Constantine has left Athens and has called upon the Greek Army and the Greek people to overthrow the fascist junta which has been governing Greece for the past many months. I have the most enormous admiration for the bravery of the King in taking this step. Senators will recall, only recently that he had coffee with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that he told us, off the record, something about his plans, and indicated he had never supported the junta despite false stories to the contrary which had been spread during the early days of the coup. King Constantine indicated his strong desire to see constitutional government return to Greece at the earliest possible moment."

Some have criticized the King for being slow in acting. In other words, they ask why he didn't act in April rather than in December. The answer is simple. He attempted to make the change back to democracy via evolution rather than revolution, but he had to resort to the latter when the former failed.

This same approach may be viewed in another setting. Schubert Ogden has reminded us in another area that we should begin to understand God where we are in the present moment. We should begin with our present circumstances. We should begin with the understanding that God relates to us as persons in the circumstances of the moment. He relates to us in our contacts with others, in our sufferings, our frustrations, our anxieties, our joys, our fears, our loves. He relates to us where we are. If we understand this, then from that understanding we may contemplate his absoluteness.

3. He is a believer in peace, but he recognizes war is sometimes necessary. Just as any thinking American must admit, our actions in Vietnam are necessary. Currently a positive approach to world issues is possible. The Bible recognizes that war may be the only really viable solution to some problems in the kind of world mankind has built for himself. The second issue is facing aggressive Communism and defeating it. The third issue involves man's right to be free. Finally, we must lend the weight of our influence to the principle of government by law under duly elected persons.

There are 247 times in the Bible when the word "war" is used—most of these times

in reference to armed conflict between tribes or nations. Most of these are in the Old Testament, some in the New. Two things stand out in bold relief in a study of these passages. First, God often commanded His people to engage in war. Second, the Old Testament in particular, but the New Testament to some degree, looks toward a time in history when peace shall reign and war shall be no more.

King Constantine has been willing to fight—and die if necessary—for the return of democracy to Greece. If he returns to Athens, he is demanding the following:

1. Publication of the new constitution.
2. Announcement of the date for a plebiscite on it.
3. Free parliamentary elections.
4. Appointment of a committee, including judges, to investigate political prisoners in jails and those confined to certain islands.
5. Retirement from the armed forces of all Government ministers who were officers.
6. Complete freedom of the press so there can be full and open discussion of the new constitution.

4. He is a true Greek in every way—a man of great ability, an ideal family man, and a great patriot. His family has ruled Greece for over 100 years. By using American standards, this makes him an ideal Greek. He thus is a blend of many cultures and civilizations. His blood is as Greek as John F. Kennedy's was American, and this type of "blood" is very desirable for any nation.

Greece under King Constantine is stable. One must remember when patriotism dies the country is not far from collapse. Arnold Toynbee, the historian, says that of twenty-one notable civilizations, nineteen perished not from external conquest but from evaporation of belief within. The British statesman Edmund Burke said, "For evil to succeed it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Greece under King Constantine will never falter at the helm.

Some royal families and businesses have failed because of the lack of leadership. The Greek King hasn't. The recent misfortune of the Douglas aircraft enterprise, which forced it to merge with McDonnell, did not arise from lack of customers or orders—perhaps from the opposite, from a volume of business beyond the capacity of its working capital. The Krupp interests of Germany have recently experienced the same pinch of an insufficiency of cash to support the business being done, compelling a financial reorganization.

5. He is dedicated to the principle of improving the life of all Greeks. A Greek of the 6th Century B.C., Alcaeus, said of Athens: "Not houses finely roofed or the stones of walls well-built, nay nor canals and dockyards, make the city, but men able to use their opportunity." Then there is the vision of a Pax Atomica, of a world in which tensions have relaxed because scarcities of raw materials are no longer rational bases for conflict. It is a golden vision, one to which all of us in the nuclear business are dedicated.

Of course, there are difficulties in promoting progress in any nation. Some difficulties may result in progress, however. Ours is the first age in which mankind everywhere can see one another and hear one another. The faces and voices of Africa, Asia, Europe, and America are known now. Mankind can learn together, grow together—or die together.

Greece's problems are more acute than our own. Minorities have been helped in America in many ways in the past few years, but the road ahead is still long and the problems grave. The Christian approach to the race problem is via evolution,<sup>2</sup> and it would seem all true Americans would accept this, but when well-known and highly-respected citi-

<sup>2</sup> George S. Reuter, Jr., August M. Hintz, and Helen H. Reuter, *One Blood* (Exposition Press: New York 1964).

zens, like Eartha Kitt, attempt to relate Vietnam to civil rights, mankind dies a little. President Johnson's program is providing both "guns and butter," and if Miss Kitt would join hands with all the other dissenters of the war and support the President, the war would soon end and then all the money could be used for "butter." It is as simple as that.

The situation of the Negro masses today is startlingly like that of Yank, the quintessential, apolitical proletarian stoker in one of Eugene O'Neill's plays. Determined to make the world of the first-class passengers recognize his existence, he makes his way to Fifth Avenue and the 50s and begins jostling top-hatted gentlemen and insulting bejeweled, befurred ladies. He elicits only politeness, which, actually is a refusal to acknowledge that he is as he knows himself to be. He is driven mad by "I beg your pardons," finally turns violent, and in the end is destroyed. Miss Kitt's actions at the White House was in the same vein and injured the status of the Negro everywhere. Even the young people of America were slandered by her remarks, but Mrs. Richard J. Hughes saved the day by pointing out that most American youth are willing to serve our nation and refuse to use "pot."

The distinguished English economist, Barbara Ward, in her book, *Spaceship Earth*, suggests that the material abundance made possible by the new technologies will change qualitatively the relations between nations. One is reminded here of Ralph Waldo Emerson, poet-essayist of the century past, who on one occasion observed: "It needs a whole society to give the symmetry we seek." In facing the sprawling, spreading, urgent plight of mankind, we do indeed need a whole society, if our unique form of society is to survive and flourish, and fulfill the symmetrical American dream. With the problems of Greece more acute, one can appreciate the efforts of King Constantine.

#### CONCLUSIONS

As all great statesmen, King Constantine is extremely humble, and he continues to think only in terms of the welfare of his people. It is thus easy to recognize the greatness of the King. Here are a few citations from a long list to justify our confidence:

1. "Today I blame no one for the way things turned out. That I did not succeed is well-known, but now more than ever I know for sure that I have won the approval and love of every single one of my people."

2. "My influence might be limited, but I could frustrate any movements in the wrong direction. By going back, if nothing else, I would be an obstacle to any attempt to create an authoritarian state. I could serve as a guarantee of the right thing by my presence. And if there were any trend in the wrong direction, I would oppose it."

Yes, King Constantine is a mighty Greek god in the modern world in the best possible way!

Ray Bliss

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we who have known Ray Bliss over a 20-year period are not surprised at the great strides that the Republican National Committee has made since he has assumed the chairmanship of that body.

Mr. Bliss began his political efforts while still a college student. Fortunately

for us in the Akron area, he confined his early activities to the Summit County Republican Organization. His success in what was normally a Democratic district received statewide attention and he was soon elected to the chairmanship of the Ohio State Republican Organization.

Our Republican National Committee recognized his great talents and elevated him to the position of chairman of the National Republican Committee. Ray Bliss has always subordinated any political ambitions of his own and has constantly devoted all of his energies toward the election of more Republicans to office.

I could write chapter after chapter about the successes that Ray Charles Bliss has achieved.

One of the most intelligent and knowledgeable writers in America, Walter Trohan has recently written a story about Ray Bliss that I believe should be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune Washington Bureau, one of the largest and finest newspaper bureaus in Washington, is now in his 35th year of service and is considered one of the most astute judges of political ability in our Capital. Coming from such a great evaluator, the tribute that he pays to Ray Bliss must indeed be well deserved.

We who are longstanding friends of Chairman Bliss are indeed gratified that such a great newspaper as the Chicago Tribune has given voice to these fine words of commendation.

Mr. Trohan's column follows:

RAY BLISS SEEN AS MAINSPRING IN NEW, VITAL GOP  
(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—With quiet determination and extraordinary organizing ability, Ray Charles Bliss, chairman of the Republican national committee, has transformed an ailing G. O. P. into a fighting bull elephant.

In less than three years the former Ohio G. O. P. state chairman has shifted the losing image to one of a winner. The Republicans have pulled up to the Democratic opposition in capturing state executive mansions and increased strength in Congress.

It is possible that the G. O. P. may capture the House in 1968. It is also possible that it may pick up seven to eight governors and possibly as many as six senators. Some of the more optimistic Republicans talk of capturing the Senate as easily as the House. However, chances of winning the Senate are lower than those of picking up enough seats to win the House—and they are tough enough.

On the White House, itself, Bliss is cautious. The most he will say is that his party has an opportunity to win. He urges that that opportunity be exploited to the full by the development of unity. He is providing an example to all Republicans by maintaining a strict neutrality on the pre-convention struggle for the party's Presidential nomination, so that he can work for whomever the convention selects.

COMMITTEE IS FREE OF FETTERS

The National Committee is without special devotion to any one candidate for the first time in years. Bliss wants to present the candidate with an effective and able party organization for the campaign.

Bliss has gone about rebuilding the party from the ground up without any fanfare or tub thumping. His secret is a rather simple one—hard work. He is a professional, a poli-

tician's politician. The pros understand him because he talks their language.

Before his time, organization was pretty well limited to regional meetings of the national committee and sessions in Washington. Bliss switched that to workshops around the country. A map in the G.O.P. headquarters here demonstrates that workshops have been held in almost every sizeable area and that they paid off.

Bliss knows how to work with his tools. He has worked well with Rep. Bob Wilson (R., Cal.), head of the G.O.P. congressional campaign committee; Rep. Gerald Ford (R., Mich.) Republican House leader; and Rep. Melvin Laird (R., Wis.), head of the House Republican conference, who beat the bushes to encourage young and good men to run.

WORKS WELL WITH SENATOR MURPHY

He has also worked well with Sen. George Murphy (R., Cal.), head of the Senate Republican campaign committee, who is convinced the party can capture the Senate. The former actor works at a pace that matches his enthusiasm.

Bliss has picked able subordinates, such as Mary Thomas Brooks, the daughter of one senator and widow of another, who has aroused enthusiasm among Republican women. Under Mrs. Brooks the old pattern of one women's gathering a year in the capital has been shifted to the far more effective pattern of regional workshops. Four have been held up to now and more are to come this year.

The Republican leader is not a magnetic personality nor a spellbinder. He is a steady and sincere man of about average height and weight, who hates losing more than he hates anything else. He drives himself at an exhausting pace and expects others to match his dedication and purpose.

Garment Workers' Union Backs President's Civil Rights Proposals

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has provided strong support for President Johnson's civil rights message to Congress—describing it as "an act of outstanding wisdom and courage."

We have passed two historic civil rights bills in 4 years but we must not retreat from this commitment. The Nation's welfare will not permit any turning back on the struggle for equal rights for all.

We must strike the remaining vestiges of discrimination from our midst by assuring every American of equal access to housing, fair representation on juries, security against violent interference with their civil rights, and greater opportunity for equality in hiring.

Negroes can see a better and brighter road ahead—and they mean to follow that road unimpeded by prejudicial roadblocks. Enlightened Americans must help them speed down that road to the self-respect and dignity other Americans already enjoy.

We cannot turn our backs on 20 million people or we will be turning our backs to centuries of deprivation and generations of discrimination. To be true to our Constitution and our heritage we

must be faithful to the minorities among us.

I know of no organization which has done more to help all Americans share in the fruits of our prosperity than the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. The ILGWU, headed by Louis Stulberg, has for decades been in the forefront of American social progress—as it is today in supporting President Johnson's civil rights proposals.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD their statement of support.

The statement follows:

Louis Stulberg, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, today called President Johnson's civil rights message to Congress "an act of outstanding wisdom and courage." He did so in a message, pledging support of the union's 435,000 U.S. members, in which he told President Johnson:

"On behalf of our members I express, our gratification with your moving message to Congress in the matter of civil rights legislation for the coming year.

"Your proposals for equal access to housing, for fair representation on juries, for security against bigoted violence, and for equal opportunity in hiring represent major measures in the long, difficult struggle to create an America where no one shall suffer because of race, creed, color or national origin.

"We convey to you the support of a membership that is as varied as the nation itself. We know from our experience the added strength that comes with peaceful cooperation of varied elements. We know that our great nation can move to greater strength as we learn to create a place for every American commensurate with his or her talents.

"In these troubled days, your message is not only an act of wisdom but of outstanding courage. We are proud to have been among those who gave you the opportunity to provide this inspiring leadership to the Congress and people of America. We are pleased to join you in the fight to realize this measure. We look forward to many years of leadership from you in the great challenges ahead."

Recognition of the Centennial of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the West

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, this year the Pacific Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists—the organization of the denomination in California, Arizona, Nevada, and Hawaii—will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of their faith in the West. Their history is part of Americana. In 1868 two Adventist ministers came to California and began evangelistic meetings. Soon several groups of Seventh-day Adventists were meeting, and the organization of their church in the West had begun. Previous to 1868 there were no Adventist churches west of the Mississippi River.

This year there are 432 Seventh-day Adventist churches in the Pacific Union Conference with a total membership of nearly 100,000 members. The 100,000

mark is confidently expected to be crossed in mid-1968, the centennial year of the beginning of the Seventh-day Adventist faith in the West.

Also located in the Pacific Union Conference are 14 hospitals with a total bed capacity of 1,820; and 175 schools ranging from elementary through university level, with 23,537 students enrolled for the 1967-68 school year. Seventh-day Adventists operate the third largest parochial school system in America—after the Roman Catholics and Lutherans—and the second largest—after the Roman Catholics in the world.

It is fitting that we commend the Pacific Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists on the 100th anniversary of their faith in the West, and recognize the spirit of their good works and accomplishments not only in the Western United States but in foreign missions as well. In foreign missions the five-State Pacific Union Conference has since 1920 contributed more than \$64 million to operate the largest foreign missionary force in Protestantism. Since 1950 volunteer health and welfare service personnel of the church in the five-State western area have given aid to 5,068,356 persons, including in the aid more than 16 million articles of clothing and almost \$10 million in cash and value of food given.

Truly, this spirit of Christian concern and desire to help merits the recognition and continued good wishes of all Americans.

**Dr. Stewart H. Smith: A Most Remarkable Man**

**HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay public tribute to the career of a most remarkable man. We who serve in the Congress are conditioned to controversy. Our daily affairs are conducted in a welter of differences, expressed or implied, and our final agreements on major issues are most often the products of compromise.

Perhaps this is as it should be in a functioning democracy whose laws rigidly protect freedom of expression. But equally it is true that our concentration on daily events—on problem and answer, emergency and counteraction, crisis and response—causes us to overlook the calm, unruffled yet forceful progress of those who work and plan because achievement is their watchword.

With little fanfare and no demand for public plaudits these men and women march down through the years practicing their specialties with single-minded determination to improve in some respect a portion of the human condition. Always our country is the better for their presence. Always they leave behind a stone or two on which to build further or a morsel of shining new knowledge to light the darkness. They are the remarkable Americans.

One of these is Dr. Stewart H. Smith,

who will retire before long from his position as president of Marshall University. After more than 40 years of activity in the field of education, including 22 years at Marshall, Dr. Smith will close out a career which has been pursued with ordered purpose and astonishing success.

He will leave behind a university whose student body has grown from 3,300 to 8,500 students during his tenure. He will have seen an increase of over 300 percent in the number of full-time faculty members, and over 1,000 percent in the annual budget. His leadership will have brought over \$21 million in capital improvements, with another \$7 million worth of construction under way, and over \$8 million in funds available for projects in the planning stage.

All of this was done while riding out the peaks of pressure exerted by postwar demand for higher education, by mounting costs, by the complications introduced by desegregation rulings, by the need to speak convincingly each year to a State legislature and obtain public revenue support.

Now there are those who teach, and those who compile the textbooks in which knowledge is preserved and passed from one generation to the next. But there must also be those rare individuals who dedicate themselves to the improvement of conditions in which the teaching shall be done and the knowledge shall be transmitted.

This is the task to which Dr. Smith addressed himself in 1946, with results comparing favorably in growth ratio to those achieved by any university in the country. It would appear that he was determined to put the weight of his personal effort behind attainment of that major requirement for American progress expressed by Thomas Jefferson over 150 years ago:

It is highly interesting to our country, and it is the duty of its functionaries, to provide that every citizen in it should receive an education proportioned to the condition and pursuits of his life.

America is a land of success stories, but the years during which Dr. Smith has served as president of Marshall University are remarkable for more than the record of material success. The manner of achievement bespeaks the quality of the man. Always the modest, unassuming, but relentless pursuit of a goal. Always the unflinching courtesy, the calm exercise of sound judgment. Always the patient determination in the face of disappointment, secure in the knowledge that the goal justifies any amount of effort.

The achievements have been recorded, and the career nears its conclusion, and I have yet to hear a West Virginian speak badly of Dr. Smith. He is a man without an enemy, and this must be the finest accolade of all.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of my constituents have studied and prepared themselves at Marshall University, and hundreds of their sons and daughters do so today. In their behalf I take this opportunity to wish him bon voyage wherever he may go in his well earned travels.

Bon voyage but I hope not final good-bye to a most remarkable American.

## Michigan Bell Sets Outstanding Student Job Training Example

**HON. MARVIN L. ESCH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the need for involvement of private industry in solving the problems of unemployability cannot be overemphasized. For some time now, the Republican Party has been stressing this need and pointing the way for Federal programs of manpower training and development to utilize effectively the boundless resources in the private sector and to enable rapid and extensive improvement in the training gap that exists among the economically disadvantaged citizens of the Nation. It was encouraging to note in the state of the Union message some indication that the administration may soon begin to move toward endorsing this long-established Republican goal.

Many industries throughout the Nation have taken the initiative in job-training programs, recognizing the benefits to be derived from offering vocational aid to members of their communities. Recently, the Michigan Bell Telephone Co. began a landmark program of "employment readiness," making available its manpower resources, skills, and training facilities to Northern High School students and teachers in Detroit. This constructive effort, undertaken in a cooperative effort with the New Detroit Committee, will provide a meaningful alternative to conditions which promoted the unrest and violence of last year.

In announcing the new program, W. M. Day, president of Michigan Bell, made the following statement:

We believe we can make a significant contribution with the knowledge and skills of Michigan Bell employees. By concentrating our efforts on one particular school, I think we can achieve the kind of results that will encourage other businesses to follow suit. We see ourselves first as bridge builders helping the students to pass with confidence between the classroom and the world of business.

In praise of the initiative and involvement of Michigan Bell, and with the hope that other industries will follow this lead, I am inserting excerpts from an article by President Day which appeared recently in a Michigan Bell "Management Letter":

**WE MUST BRING THEM OUT OF THE SHADOWS**

(By W. M. Day, president)

In recent weeks Michigan Bell has put into effect some rather far-reaching changes in its employment practices and education requirements for new job applicants . . .

**COMMUNITY WORK A TRADITION**

For as many years as I can remember, the telephone company has been recognized as a major contributor to the well-being of the communities it serves. We earned this reputation partly because telephone service plays such an important role in community life, and partly because, being helpful by nature, telephone employees themselves took a willing hand in home-town affairs. They have helped with business and professional organizations, scouting, Junior Achievement,

church work, PTA, school boards and other local and state government units. They have helped to raise funds for worthy causes and they have worked diligently for the political parties of their choice. We encourage this, and the good work should continue.

The Company itself, as a supporter of the community, has also sought to do the right thing. Michigan Bell was a forerunner in its employment of minority-group members, and this goes back some 30 years. We furnished telephone service to all segments of the community, and from all segments we sought job applicants, regardless of which side of the tracks they came from. We thought we were doing all right—until this past summer.

**AFTER ALL THE EFFORT**

No one was more disheartened than I at the outbreaks of civil revolt that erupted in our cities this summer. I found it hard to believe that, after all the community effort—including the emphasis on Plans for Progress—this sort of thing could happen.

But happen it did, and suddenly we recognized clearly something only barely visible before: the existence of a forlorn segment of humanity at the very bottom of the social scale. These were uneducated, unskilled, unemployable human beings who felt they had never been given a chance, who had given up all hope of reaching a better life and who had become lost in the shadows of the inner city. Most of these people lived in silent isolation; others, convinced they had nothing more to lose, took the riot road as a last desperate effort.

These victims of injustice are still with us. They have no place to go—unless all of us in the community do everything we can to help them help themselves.

**GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL**

People ask: Since the Federal Government seems to be running our lives more and more anyway, why not let Uncle Sam do the job? To them I say: Government *can* help some, but it can't do it all. Rebuilding a city and its people is a local undertaking requiring local citizens working together. Private business is in a prime position to help; it has organizational experience, manpower and special employee skills that can be extremely valuable if used in the right way.

Out of the July rioting was born the New Detroit Committee, composed of people representing all parts of the city and dedicated to the rebirth of Detroit—socially as well as physically. I am proud to serve on this Committee, as chairman of the Education and Employment subcommittee, and I know that telephone people in other Michigan cities are also proud to serve on similar committees. We who are close to this thing have learned that the complaints of the inner-city people are very real, and we are convinced that, if this "underclass" is not lifted from its plight—through special training and special job opportunities—to become first-class citizens, then the problem will worsen and the summer of 1967 will return.

**A VERY REAL STAKE**

Aside from the purely humanitarian aspects, we have a very real stake in helping to make Michigan's cities better, more pleasant places to live and work. Michigan Bell is a major employer and furnishes an essential communications service. Our cities are an important source of new employees needed to operate the business, and their citizens are also our customers.

This then is the background for our recent moves. They are simply further steps in our efforts to help the disadvantaged—Negroes and whites alike—to find their place as useful members of society.

On the matter of high school diplomas, there is no question we will continue to encourage young people to stay in school and get all the education they can. And certainly we will continue to prefer high school graduates as applicants for telephone

jobs. But if an applicant meets all other qualifications for employment, we will not *automatically* reject him because he doesn't have a diploma. We want to offer an opportunity to those who, for one reason or another, cannot graduate, but who have the motivation and talent that can be applied to a given job. . . .

**OTHER PROCEDURES**

We've looked into some of our other procedures as well. The job application form itself is sometimes a real tough obstacle. Some applicants may never have been confronted with an application blank before; others are not sure precisely what information is asked for; still others actually don't know the basic information about themselves they should know.

So, for those who find application blanks a formidable ordeal, we've tried to simplify things. This consists mainly of going over the questions with the applicant and helping him to complete the answers. We see no good reason to make the process any more painful than necessary.

We've also realized it's not necessary to check prior work references in every instance, but only in the doubtful cases. This saves unnecessary paperwork and time and expedites the processing. We've lost some promising people while waiting for reference replies.

We are always interested in the overall picture of an individual applicant. In using tests, to identify special strengths and weaknesses, we formerly expected the applicant to pass each single test. Today we are using the same tests but are looking now at the composite score. In other words, we are using the same group of tests but recognizing that a person might do very well on one and very poorly on another—yet in total be quite capable of doing a good job. . . .

In education and training, we "adopted" Northern High School because students in schools like Northern need to get better acquainted with business if they expect to move into the working world after graduation. These young people are not the ones who come to our employment offices; we've never seen them. They can't relate themselves to either the business or social world, and what contacts they've had have been poor and unsatisfactory. They think they don't have a chance and they've just about given up.

We hope to establish with these boys and girls at Northern a continuing relationship so they will understand and believe that business really cares what happens to them. If they can be sure that a better education means better jobs, they can get somewhere. All they need is a new set of values, new hope and a renewed confidence in themselves. We want to help them get these things.

Many of these young people, both Negro and white, feel they are inferior. This must be changed. We need to help them develop confidence in themselves. Given the proper training, they can do a good job for someone; there's no reason they can't be even superior. The community must do everything it can to bring them out of the shadows of desolation.

**Michigan Polar-Equator Club Expresses Concern Over the Status of Gun Legislation**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter just re-

ceived by me from one of the outstanding sportsmen's and conservation groups in the State of Michigan in opposition to the Dodd-Celler bills:

MICHIGAN POLAR-EQUATOR CLUB,  
East Lansing, Mich., January 22, 1968.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Our Club (68 Michigan big game hunters, world travelers, photographers and students of nature) at the Annual Meeting on January 12, 1968, expressed deep concern over the status of gun legislation in Congress. As a result, we voted unanimously to go on record as being opposed to the passage of the Dodd-Celler bills which would seriously curtail activities of legitimate sportsmen and marksmen. Our Club further urges the passage of the Hruska-King bills which provide some of the good points of the Dodd-Celler bills but do not restrict the noble hobbies of outdoorsmen and outdoorswomen.

As Secretary, I have been asked to send you the above communication.

Sincerely,

ROLLIN H. BAKER,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

**Congressional Travel**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion over travel by Members of Congress. Too often the communications media uses this subject to make a blanket indictment of all travel by any member of the legislative branch. One of the most objective editorial commentaries on congressional travel appeared in the January 13 edition of the Christian Science Monitor. I feel it merits widespread public review and, therefore, insert it in the RECORD:

**CONGRESS: HAS FUNDS, WILL TRAVEL**

Members of the United States Congress are still taking plenty of trips abroad at government expense. And the conclusion must be relatively unchanged: That some trips are highly worthwhile in terms of individual enlightenment or committee information. That some trips are moderately useful, say, in reducing a congressman's parochial outlook. And that some trips are downright junkets—free-loading tourism that is wasteful of time and money.

Nearly half the Congress—59 percent of the Senate, 42.5 percent of the House, made trips abroad at government expense in 1966, according to a Congressional Quarterly survey. This January, some 44 senators and congressmen planned to visit Vietnam, the country foremost in public thought. (A legislator who has "been there" has a one-upmanship advantage over a candidate who has not.)

One estimate is that members spend over a million dollars a year on foreign travel. Let it be said that a portion of this is excellent investment. In Vietnam, for instance, many members have earnestly sought to "see for themselves." Sen. Edward Kennedy has probed the refugee problem in 12 days of visits to camps and hospitals. Sen. Charles Percy avoided official briefings and escorts and chartered his own helicopter.

Members of Congress have usefully attended the NATO Parliamentary Congress in Paris, Ditchley Park seminars, Inter-Parliamentary Union sessions in Australia and

Teheran. They have studied development aid, GATT, manpower training, public works, disarmament. They have undertaken missions at presidential request.

Some few members behave like loud-mouth "ugly Americans." Some absurdly assert expertise after a "one country per day" tour of some continent. By and large, however, Congress is a more world-minded legislature because of its members' foreign travels.

### "Washington Report"

## HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, my first "Washington Report" of the session is about to be mailed out to many of my 12th District constituents. During my years in Congress, I have found my newsletter to be one of the most effective means of communication with my district. Not only do the readers have a chance to find out what I have been doing, but also they often write to give me their thoughts on issues mentioned in the "Report."

Because the town of Weymouth has just been added to the 12th District, I am sending a welcoming letter along with the "Washington Report" to my newest constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I place the text of my newsletter, along with explanatory statements, as well as my letter to Weymouth residents, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT—JANUARY 1968

DEAR FRIENDS: The 1st session of the 90th Congress adjourned on the 15th of December. Now, after a thirty day recess, I am back in Washington starting my 10th year as your Representative.

During the adjournment recess I held office hours in New Bedford and visited most all of the 53 towns of my District. Back at my desk, I am reporting on some of the Congressional activities of last year and looking ahead to the Second Session.

#### WOODEN SOLDIERS ON THE MARCH—1967

Miffed by our refusal to rubberstamp his every proposal, LBJ dubbed Republicans "Wooden Soldiers." The truth is, however, that we fought hard for constructive solutions to the nation's problems at home and abroad.

Both in Committee and on the floor, Republican efforts developed or substantially improved most of the legislation to which the President has been pointing with pride.

#### WHITE HOUSE BILL SIGNING CEREMONY

This Congress, the President has said on repeated occasions, is consumer oriented. In the closing days of the First Session I was invited on 5 different occasions to participate in bill signing ceremonies.

This photo was taken at the signing of the Flammable Fabrics Act. (Incidentally, the handsome gentleman looking on from the right is Alexander Trowbridge, the new Secretary of Commerce who summers at Harwichport.)

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

One of the first bills that I filed last year provided increased Social Security benefits for millions of senior citizens.

Office Hours at Bourne—Leroy Crabe of Buzzards Bay came to the Town Hall to ask me if he is eligible for the new Social Security

benefits. Legislative Aide Jane Grefe (who summers on the Vineyard) was back with the answer before I'd even finished talking with Selectmen Sanford and Forni.

#### EXPLOSION

My trip through the District took me to Hanover's Atlantic Research Defense products plant—where a tragic explosion just after Christmas took one life and injured several persons.

I have urged Secretary of Defense McNamara to assign, in all contracts where a real hazard exists and where large numbers of people are employed, safety personnel responsible to the federal government in addition to any employed by the defense contractor.

#### ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY

A consumer bill that has special significance for my District is the *Electric Power Reliability Act* which will shortly be considered by the Commerce Committee. Due to the recent power failures on Cape Cod, power reliability has become a very popular subject for discussion.

Now that all the studies are in, we should have the necessary facts to choose the proper course. Since my District is deeply concerned about this matter, your comments on power reliability will be helpful and appreciated.

#### HIT-AND-RUN POLLUTION

(Here there is a photo taken on the beach just after oil had washed up.) I examined oil damage with local officials Ryder, McNece, and Norgeot.

Coast Guard officials say we will never know who dumped the sticky black oil which recently washed up on Cape Cod beaches. The mysterious ship violated Federal law by flushing its oil wastes into the water, threatening shellfish beds, wildlife, and resort beaches.

This week I asked 3 of the President's Cabinet officers to look into the situation. No less than 3 agencies under 3 different Departments are involved in handling oil spills—an example of Big Government at its most confusing! This leaves a dangerous "authority gap" in enforcing the law.

We must have improvements in reporting pollution incidents, investigating the damage, prosecuting the guilty party, and in cleaning up the mess.

#### ON A RELATED SUBJECT

Several big oil companies think they have struck "black gold" in our Cape Cod waters. They have been looking for oil and gas beneath the fishing grounds for a year, and now it is rumored they may have found it.

An oil company geologist said in a recent news story, "the stuff is out there. We'd be there tomorrow," he added, "if we could establish ownership." Fishermen fear that a headlong rush by the oil companies to our fishing grounds will endanger millions of dollars' worth of fish stocks.

Pointing out that a well off Alaska's coast discharged an uncontrollable flood of oil into the waters for over a year, the fishermen wired the New England governors to ask support for my Marine Sanctuaries Study Act. The bill sets up a system of "ocean zoning" and would keep oil drilling from interfering with fishing operations. Oil mining may have a place in Cape Cod waters, but it should not destroy the other values of this rich environment.

#### ACADEMY APPOINTEES

Peter Hastay, Falmouth; Dwight Crowther and Kevin Beggs, Weymouth; Steven Kramer, Middleboro; Joseph Glass, Hingham—The parents of each of these young men, their communities, our State and Nation, can be proud of these outstanding young Americans.

I owe a special thanks to Cdr. Harkins and the Selection Committee for the fine job they did.

#### OUR MAN ON THE CAPE

With an eye toward bridging the gap between Weymouth and Provincetown, I have appointed Arthur C. Goode of Hyannis as my link to Cape Cod.

Arthur, a former Coast Guardsman, runs his own printing shop, but finds time to take an active part in community and civic affairs—United Fund, Board of Trade, and Heart Fund have all benefitted from the talents of the Mid-Cape Jaycees' founder and president.

Arthur will be keeping me in touch with the problems and plans of Cape Cod—and will represent me when Washington business keeps me away.

#### NEW ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

After six years with the Peace Corps in both a volunteer and staff capacity, William S. Donovan of Weymouth has joined our staff as Administrative Assistant.

A graduate of Stockbridge, Bill was one of the first Corps Volunteers in India—later he was appointed to direct the Calcutta Regional Office.

Prior to joining us Bill served in Washington where he coordinated India's 1,000 Peace Corps Volunteers. His administrative experience and broad public service background will be great assets to my efforts to represent the 12th District.

As we went to press, Louise and I attended the President's State of the Union address—and we're looking forward to a hectic but exciting 2nd session of Congress.

Sincerely,

HASTINGS KEITH.

JANUARY 30, 1968.

DEAR FRIEND: Now that my colleague and friend, Congressman Jimmy Burke, has said "goodbye" to his former Weymouth constituents, I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome you to the 12th Congressional District.

To give you an idea of some of my activities and interests, I'm enclosing a copy of my latest newsletter. As your Representative in Congress, I need and welcome your thoughts on the major issues facing the nation.

At times, the Federal bureaucracy becomes entangled in a mass of red tape. If you'll let me know whenever you encounter difficulties with any federal agency, I'll be happy to try to straighten out the problem at its source.

If you're ever in Washington, make sure you come to 106 Cannon House Office Building to pick up passes to the House gallery and visit over a glass of cranberry juice!

Welcome, again, to the 12th District. I'm looking forward to a close relationship with my newest constituents and a mutually rewarding effort to insure that the ideas and the problems of my District are brought to the attention of Congress.

Sincerely,

HASTINGS KEITH,  
Member of Congress.

### Senator McCarthy's Challenge

## HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a certain line of thought has been heard of late in our land, and it disturbs me. It goes like this: "If you aren't sure you'll win, don't try." The majority is everything, and the minority is nothing. A dissenting vote is a wasted vote.

This is nonsense, of course, but I'm surprised how many people subscribe to

such thinking. Apparently they have forgotten the contributions made to the history of our country by dissenting votes in the Supreme Court, determined minorities in the Congress and articulate minor parties on the national scene. Surely no one would argue, for example, that Norman Thomas was a failure, or his cause a disaster, simply because he was not elected President. Few of the men elevated to that high office have had a greater impact on our Government and society.

I am pleased that a newspaper in my district has attacked this pernicious idea. The newspaper is the Apache Sentinel of Apache Junction, Ariz. Its theme is that the presidential candidacy of Senator EUGENE McCARTHY is providing an opportunity for frank and open debate on issues disturbing a great many Americans—issues that, without his candidacy, might not be debated at all.

The Sentinel editorial was published on January 25. I shall insert it at this point in the RECORD:

#### SENATOR McCARTHY'S CHALLENGE

Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy is doing a great deal more than challenging President Johnson. He is attacking a pernicious idea. The idea is that a political fight is not worth making unless there is good reason to believe that it can be won. It is the idea that principles are secondary to success. That political effort must be judged only by the results. That nothing is worth doing unless it produces tangible rewards.

Sen. McCarthy does not know whether President Johnson can be beaten in the four primaries he now intends entering. He does not know whether the President can be denied renomination, or induced to alter his Vietnam policy. The odds are against achieving any of these ends. Yet the fight to which he commits himself is supremely worth making, whatever the outcome, simply because it offers to millions of troubled Americans a vehicle of political expression.

It is not necessary that these millions should prevail to justify the participation in the political process which Sen. McCarthy offers them. It is to be hoped they will prevail. But in any case the political expression of their convictions on the Vietnam war is valuable in itself. The opportunity for frank and open debate, not only of the war but of the broader issues of foreign policy which the war poses in acute form, will help to make the nation psychologically healthier, no matter what the outcome.

Sen. McCarthy has noted a "growing sense of alienation from politics," especially among young people—a feeling of political helplessness and cynicism which tends to divert energies into a kind of nihilistic assault upon "the system" or withdrawal from it. Why don't some of the anti-war demonstrators find it worth a try to express their convictions through the political process? Should he restore to young people some confidence in orderly political expression he will perform a great public service.

Of course, he will be subjected to slurs on his character, his motives and his patriotism. He may have the fortitude to stand up to them. The official effort to suppress dissent in the name of national unity must be resisted. The idea that by debating the war Americans will only encourage the enemy to resist conceals the assumptions that military victory is attainable, and that no other objective is conceivable.

These assumptions are precisely what a growing number of Americans deny and they are definitely what needs to be debated. Whatever the outcome of his candidacy, Sen. McCarthy deserves gratitude and support for insisting that the debate take place.

## Campaign Warmup—Part 11

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, last December the Kansas City, Mo., Star-Times published an article about President Johnson that was written by Joseph A. Lastelic, one of its Washington correspondents. It is a well-written article that captures the many facets of the President and the complex burdens of the Presidency.

The article follows:

#### CAMPAIGN WARMUP—PART 11

(By Joe Lastelic)

WASHINGTON.—At the age of 59, after four years in the White House, his hair grayer, the lines deeper in his face, the problems weighing heavier on his shoulders, Lyndon Baines Johnson still loves his job.

And he aims to keep it.

In the last four years he has seen the public approval of the way he is doing his job dip from a splendid 80 to a sorry 41 per cent.

Like any man in the public eye, in political office, the President is concerned about his popularity—but he is hardly ready to vacate the White House without a real Texas-style showdown with the Republicans next year.

"I'm not trying to be popular," the President says. "I'm trying to be a good President."

But he knows the realities. As so often he has observed:

"You can't be a statesman sitting on the front porch in Johnson City, Tex.; you have to be elected first."

Four years in the White House, four years of dealing with monumental problems, of realizing that so much that he does or fails to do affects not only his own political fortunes, but the country and the entire world, has taught the President some lessons about life. Each decision means praise or scorn, or both. He is being tested in this period of unpopularity.

While some of his friends agonize and wring their hands and pray that he will change his mind about the things that add up to unpopularity, the President outwardly remains unperturbed. Things are not so bleak as outsiders might suppose in the oval room that is his office at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Vietnam war overshadows all that the President does, but he believes that the enemy has been denied a victory and the tide has been turned, although he honestly forecasts more agony, more bloodshed.

On the home front much has been accomplished with passage of a bundle of social legislation unequaled. More people are at work; there is prosperity.

President Johnson has learned to live without the love and support that followed those worrisome days after the assassination of President Kennedy, and without the widespread approval that was his after the 1964 landslide victory over Sen. Barry Goldwater.

In the last four years there have been occasional rises in the popularity polls—at the time of his handling of the 1965 crisis in the Dominican Republic; the start of bombing of North Vietnam in 1965, and the Glassboro summit conference last summer. He seems to be enjoying another surge at the moment.

The President's best performance in years on television took place last month at a news conference when he put on a necklace microphone, stepped from behind the podium, and told just exactly what the troubles of the country are, the reasons for them, what he proposes to do.

His intimates say it was the true Johnson style—a preview of the 1968 campaign. It was the kind of performance that friends, newsmen, politicians, his own family have seen for years, but he never before got across to the public.

Still, there is a credibility gap that cannot be explained away and Lyndon Baines Johnson is not the least of the reasons for it.

Privately, Mr. Johnson concedes the greatest weakness of his administration is that it does not know how to communicate. The people do not listen, he says. He blames some of it on his personality, his inexperience in the use of television, his being from the South, perhaps. The press he gives a share of the blame for not, in his view, portraying what the government is doing.

Friends remind him that President Truman had his troubles, too. The polls were down on him. His speech delivery with a flat Mid-Western voice was a liability. Yet Mr. Truman got his message across. He did it by being himself, by his "Give 'em hell" speeches. Mr. Johnson is beginning to realize that Harry knew best.

His television performance was in that vein. He has begun to laugh at himself, too, throwing in a few bits of humor at his own expense to add some balm to political wounds.

The President confided, for example, that he had his daughter's wedding at the White House because of a recent bad experience in church. It was the only reaction that Mr. Johnson showed publicly to the Episcopal priest who criticized him from the pulpit about the war in Vietnam.

He has let go with some fiery oratory against the "nay sayers," as he terms them.

"We can take the easy road now," he points out, "denying our responsibilities, hoping that a rise in our polls will compensate for what we ought to have done for our country. Or we can take the harder road of responsibility. We can do what we believe is right for our children's future, though it may mean present pain. In the crises of this hour there are plenty of recommendations on how to get out of trouble cheaply and fast. Most of them come down to this: 'Deny your responsibility.'" Mr. Johnson emphasized he would not choose that road.

The President says that all the palaver from pious politicians does not mean much to him. He corralled members of Congress for a series of stag meetings at the White House. He went down the list of their complaints, told them what perhaps they already knew, but preferred to ignore.

For instance this Johnson view:

They want him to cut spending, but he cannot spend a dime unless they give it to him. Besides, they have exceeded his budget.

On Vietnam he asks what the alternatives are. The answers are that he should work for a negotiated settlement, that he should stop the bombing and see if that will bring peace. He has stopped the bombing, seven times, he answers, with only adverse results for the troops. Ho Chi Minh insists that the U.S. troops get out before he will talk. What is their answer now? Try harder, they say.

His Democratic colleagues tell him that if he does not improve his standing with the voters he will be a liability to the entire ticket—courthouse to White House. Mr. Johnson looks over his audience—spotting among them conservatives, radicals, hawks, liberals, me-tooers, hacks, doves—each with his own set of enemies, and reminds them of another possible liability: "You know, I have to run with all of you."

Unless his health fails, Mr. Johnson will be running next year. He sees no easy victory for himself, or his opponent. Who does he think it will be? How does he view the Republican field of contenders?

Only a few words give this appraisal.

Gov. George Romney of Michigan—a flop.

Gov. Ronald Reagan of California—a little bit of (Joseph) McCarthyism in him.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York—does not want to have his family endure the messy comment that would result.

Sen. Charles Percy of Illinois—an Ivory soap salesman.

Former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon—able, tough, experienced, party people support him.

Mr. Johnson now sees Mr. Nixon as his opponent.

The polls that show him being defeated aggravate the President because he feels they are not an accurate reflection of the voters' views. He concedes they have an adverse psychological impact on his administration.

"Study the questions, see how they ask them," he notes. "They don't put Wallace in, and he's running." Perhaps the pollsters were listening because, for the first time, the latest Gallup poll questioned voters on Johnson, Nixon and Wallace. The President not only won in the nationwide sampling, but in three of the four regions—the East, South and West. The President still ran second to Richard Nixon in the Mid-West.

It was the first good news from the hustings in months.

One reason for the changed voter sentiment was Gen. William Westmoreland's rather rosy recent statements on the progress in the war. The unruly antiwar demonstrators have crystallized more opinion favoring the President's stand. Labor is busy pointing up Mr. Johnson's good deeds. So are administration folk. His own fighting stance on television and at a political rally in New York and at another White House press conference, plus the battling for important bills in Congress have brought supporters rallying around.

Mr. Johnson faces the problems of the presidency—the big ones, the small ones—those that persist in spite of every effort to turn them aside. And sometimes, as he walks the rooms of the White House and thinks of his predecessors, it must occur to Lyndon Johnson to measure their burdens against his and wonder if, in the age of the atom and the urban crisis, he might not carry the heaviest weight of all.

Whether this is true, historians will have to decide. There are, however, those who have noted that until recently, one of Lyndon Johnson's less admirable traits in office was what seemed to be the tendency to feel sorry for himself, to bow his head in mute and abused silence before the critics.

There is the impression that this is changing and that the President, less than a year away from the voters' approval or disapproval of his administration, is standing taller beneath the burden. Burden it is, unquestionably, for this is a time in our history of many frustrations, and if the war in Vietnam is the most dramatic source it is not the only source.

The cost of the military effort there, piled on top the cost of cold-war security, has brought a staggering budget deficit, estimated now at 23 billion dollars even with the proposed spending slash. Inflation pursues its course in a war-time economy yet, technically, there is no declared war. There are problems of aid and trade, of the gold outflow, of interest rates that are the highest in 40 years. Farm prices are down. Other prices are up.

Unhappiness grows among taxpayers because of increasing state and federal taxes and prospects for more boosts. Others complain about the war costing 2½ billion dollars a month while pressing domestic needs get second shrift. The cost of living spirals upward—almost 10 per cent in three years.

Racial unrest is without parallel in this country's history. Crime has increased 88 per cent since 1960. Protesters are everywhere—angry about the draft, the war, open housing, school bussing, dirty air, crowded cities, slum

housing, welfare. Dissent is popular—in the pulpit or in the park.

Much of the rest of the world is in turmoil. In Africa revolutions occur with alarming regularity; Communist subversion feeds on poverty in Latin America; millions hunger in Asia; a new war threatens in the Middle East; Red China sports a nuclear capability; the Russians build an orbital bomb and install an antiballistic missile system. Destruction of mankind is 15 minutes away.

Every day President Johnson wakes up to these problems and others. He is never away from them, even on a rare weekend at the ranch. They don't belong to someone else, they belong to him. When his day is over, they still are there. There are good days, sometimes, when solutions are found. Yet night after night as the President goes to bed he regards himself a failure because he has not found a way to end the war. There is, understandably, an element of obsession in this, the greatest challenge confronting Mr. Johnson.

In 1965, he notes, Gen. William Westmoreland told him the United States would have to get in or get out. The President chose, in his words, not to walk away.

So much has been heard about Mr. Johnson's great drive to find the formula of consensus government. In many ways, over these last four years, he has found the formula and has had his way.

He was persuading others to go along with him—left and right, Senate and House, business and labor—bringing them around to his way of thinking.

Lyndon Johnson has wanted to be a strong President. He has tried to be a strong President. His achievement will be judged eventually in the perspective of history, but his desire has changed the approach of the man to the vehicle of government.

It has transposed him from the posture he had as a strong legislative leader (majority leader of the Senate) to a President being thwarted by other legislative leaders, some of them equally strong of will.

Striving to be a strong President, to make his place in history, the President often finds himself boxed in by a Congress that, at this particular time in history, is fiercely asserting itself.

In fact the three keystones of government on Capitol Hill—legislative, judicial and administrative—are in the Johnson era at an unusually high level of potency. There is an extremely stubborn Congress, a creative and assertive Supreme Court and a hard-nosed President all spinning, as in a maelstrom, about the vortex of power.

The mark of L. B. J. is already on the nation and on the world.

Chinese children throw darts at his likeness. North Vietnamese children are taught to hiss his name—*Gion Xon*. He leads the most powerful nation the world has ever known. Yet sometimes he pauses for smaller problems.

Poor children in the District of Columbia would have no street sprinklers for relief from the heat until late in the summer, the President read in the morning paper. Before the day was over the sprinklers were on their way from the factory.

There are most important matters. He decided America must know that the elections in Vietnam were conducted as honestly as possible and represented the voter's wishes. He would send a team of observers. He telephoned a publisher.

"Why do you want me to go?" the publisher asked. "I'm against everything you are doing out there."

Indeed, that was the reason why he wanted him to go, the President insisted, to see for himself and let his readers know.

There is an old canard that President Johnson does not like to hear bad news, will not put up with those who disagree with him, refuses to hear both sides of an issue.

"If everybody is in agreement," he says in answer to that criticism, "I adjourn the meeting."

Sometimes it takes him so long to make a decision that he is charged with indecision, with a lack of leadership. The explanation of those who work closely with him is that he must have time to study the options, that he cannot act impulsively.

He says himself that if he had allowed a good deal of the advice given him by some he would not be "as comfortable" today as he looks back on what has occurred, from the war to the riots, from legislation to picketing.

*He looks to the old hands for advice, the young ones to carry out the work. Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey is his trouble shooter and his cheerleader. But he is not an assistant President.*

The advisers might be a banker in New York, a farmer in Texas, a businessman in Baltimore, a lawyer in San Francisco or a professor at Princeton, depending on the problem. Perhaps more than anyone else, Clark Clifford onetime counsel for President Truman and Justice Abe Fortas have the President's ear. Other old reliables are Dean Acheson, Truman's secretary of state; Robert Anderson, Texan and Eisenhower's secretary of the Treasury; Eugene Black, former head of the world bank; John McCloy, veteran diplomatic trouble shooter and Gen. Maxwell Taylor. The President loves Sen. Richard Russell (D-Ga.), a hard-liner who seems to be consistently correct about Communist machinations.

George Ball, former undersecretary of State and now a New York lawyer possesses a skill for dissecting a problem and then arguing both the pro and con of it so that there is a complete exposition.

"He can teach it either way," Mr. Johnson says with admiration.

The President relies on his cabinet to carry out policies after he sets them. He makes the decisions. Bureaucrats note his talent for administration and his knowledge of how the government functions—the result of his long senatorial experience. The telephone is his instrument for staying in touch.

Just about every Tuesday the war is the topic at a special luncheon at the White House. The President, the secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and the secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, (who will step down sometime next year) are the regulars. They usually are joined by Walt Rostow, special White House assistant for foreign affairs, and by George Christian, presidential press secretary. Sometimes the chairman of the joint chiefs, Gen. Earle Wheeler, or Richard Helms, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, or Vice-President Humphrey are called in. From these meetings evolve the war policies.

Then there are the weekly breakfast meetings with the House and Senate Democratic leaders to go over legislative matters. The realities of what can and cannot be accepted by the lawmakers are weighed, the decisions made where to push, when to do it, how to do it.

This 90th Congress has been a stubborn one, refusing to do the President's bidding, working on bills at the slowest pace. He had predicted in January that a partisan attitude would pervade Capitol Hill. He was right. Mr. Johnson has had to deal with the lawmakers much more differently than he did with the 89th Congress, when the freshman liberals who came in on his coattails rubber-stamped his bills. He has had to deal also with the political and legislative reality that a year ago, in the congressional elections, he and his party suffered a setback that created a new mold for the 90th Congress and made it less responsive to presidential whim and will.

The President used to go to the hill for lunches, to see his old friends. He really missed the place. Now he has grown comfortable in the White House. His view from the

other end of Pennsylvania avenue both toward the hill and toward the country has changed.

To those who point out his past conservative votes that favored Texas and the South, his statements as a senator ridiculing the very things he sponsors now, the President has an answer. He says he "feels" the problems so much more now than he once did, that he will continue working to solve them no matter how many times his detractors point out, as he views them now, "past mistakes."

Unexpected support comes from time to time from General Eisenhower, whom the President keeps informed of foreign matters, particularly the war, and from Sen. Everett Dirksen, the Republican leader, whose endorsement can mean victory or defeat for a bill. The rent supplements bill opposed by almost every Republican in the House is an example. Dirksen found it the best solution to public housing, said so, and it went sailing through.

Dirksen also is a stalwart L. B. J. supporter on the war. By contrast, Sen. Mike Mansfield, the Democratic leader, voices concern, tends toward being dovish. "Mike suffers from that Montana isolationist complex," the President complained once in disgust. It is that sort of aside that keeps getting Mr. Johnson into trouble. In this political town that remark came back to Mansfield while his ears were still burning. Mr. Johnson should know better. He gets the same kind of voluntary telegraphic reports about what is being said about him at cocktail parties around town.

As for the congressional elections next year, Mr. Johnson feels it is too early to predict what will happen. Those who talk politics with him say two main issues will determine the fortunes of Democrats: The war and the riots.

Unless there is some obvious success in Vietnam, and the cities are quiescent next summer and fall, Mr. Johnson is in deep trouble. The beginning of negotiations, or a hint from Hanoi that negotiations are in the wind, could save the day, on Vietnam. And somewhere there must be the impression that the government is both thinking and doing on the problems of America's cities.

More war and more riots could upend Mr. Johnson and his party.

Mr. Johnson is working to prevent just that. He works drivelingly and expects his staff to do likewise. Even Barry Goldwater compliments him as the hardest working President he has known.

Despite this image of hard workers, experienced captain of government, able legislator, commander in name and fact, Mr. Johnson sometimes is his own worst enemy. The McNamara resignation was mishandled and there was no reason for it to be. The political jabs at Governor Romney over whose fault it was that order was not restored sooner in Detroit hurt both men.

Tales of how and why the President lost his temper, of egotistical and sometimes crude remarks, get belly laughs around Washington but in cold print they are deadly. When he says, "my Congress," all 535 members bristle.

When he demands perfection, calls attention to error, snipes at the opposition, he becomes fair game. He tries to avoid fights over petty matters, over smart alec remarks, but every so often the human frailty of petty reaction shows up.

The same reporters who tried to outwrite each other in praise of the Kennedys, now try to outdo each other in deriding any personal eccentricity or quirk of the Johnsons. A national magazine prints a long article on "The Dark Side of L. B. J." The peaceniks call him a "murderer," accuse him of wanting to prolong the war so that he can napalm children to death.

Signs carried in demonstrations are so

vulgar, that newsmen cannot print what they say. The vilification, the defamation, the attacks on the Johnsons are the worst in his 25 years of covering Washington, says the dean of the White House press corps. The Johnsons suffer in silence. Calls for respect for the presidency, are met with a new tirade of personal insults for the President.

All that is reflected in the polls. "I'm the whipping boy now," the President says. "I'm taking the criticism. It snowballs, it goes 40 different ways."

He takes a look at the polls that reflects that criticism and instead of getting angry tries that new humorous attack: "Maybe I peaked too soon."

The Johnson administration has been a costly one, using red ink by the barrel. It has added 60 billion dollars to the national debt and at the current forecast it will be 80 billion by election time next year.

The war and the many new social programs are responsible. A tax increase, proposed by the joint economic committee in Congress in 1966, would have cut that deficit and helped slowdown inflationary pressures, but Mr. Johnson and his advisers did not try for it. Now they desperately try to get approval of the 10 per cent surtax.

Mr. Johnson's economy maneuvers are billed "the Texas shell game," by an arch critic, Sen. John Williams (R-Del.) "Never before in history," the senator says, "has any man in the White House said so much about economy and done so little about it."

The tax question is an example of Mr. Johnson trying to stay in the middle of the political road he likes so well. Sometimes there are ruts in it.

On the war the President asserts what he is doing is to fight at a rate and in a manner that will not trigger World War III.

He assures Hanoi, the Soviet Union and Red China that we seek no wider war, we want no territory. His critics insist this caution, this slow escalation of tit for tat, the hesitation in starting the bombing has prolonged the war and cost lives.

The President remains very hopeful the Soviets, who supply 80 per cent of the war material to Hanoi, will use their influence to get Ho Chi Minh to negotiate. Still there is the realization that Red China could take over that supply function. It was the Russian diplomats who assured Hanoi Mr. Johnson would be repudiated in the 1966 congressional elections. It did not happen.

The intelligence reports and the bold statements from the Communists are that Hanoi is holding out until the 1968 election is determined. Nomination of hard-liners like Nixon or Reagan at the Republican convention could have an effect on that thinking.

The riots are a constant worry. Yet Mr. Johnson notes "I do not have a local police force to send out every time somebody throws a rock through a window." It is an answer to local governments who blame him for the riots.

He has counseled restraint to business and labor over wages and prices, hinting only a few days ago about controls. He ordered a freeze on government spending and called for a stretchout of highway construction funds. Interestingly, there is no great protest from the taxpayer. The only letters come from special interest groups.

Mr. Johnson will get into a scrap if he sees that is the only way to resolve a problem, but he prefers to talk about it, to "reason together" as he understands the Biblical quotation. So he still gets along with Sen. Robert F. Kennedy (D-N.Y.) and Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) and Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D-Minn.)—a triumvirate of caustic commentators.

McCarthy's candidacy will be another problem, but if he falls flat with the voters in the primaries, it will be a blessing for the President. Mr. Johnson has learned through the years to be patient, to keep an eye on

history, not to worry too much about what is being said today, to rely on friends in a pinch. He comes from a part of the country where, as he remembers, "They know when you are sick, and they care when you die."

There is a story from the Truman era—prior to the 1948 election campaign—which seems to fit now in the life and times of Lyndon Johnson.

As it is told there was a fellow who was celebrating his 50th birthday anniversary by going to the race track and betting \$50 to win on his favorite horse. The animal broke in front, ran ahead until the stretch, then stumbled and fell.

"Damn Harry Truman," the loser exclaimed.

And in like manner, it is postulated, do others blame L. B. J. today.

If the President feels despair—if he feels that the whole country is populated with people with the attitude of the unlucky horseplayer of the Truman era—he doesn't show it.

Indeed, he goes about his business with an outward air of nonchalance that puzzles those who think they can read the political tea leaves.

One thing about polls, the President points out, is that they can go up as well as down.

If by this time the Republicans haven't got the message that L. B. J. will be no push-over, they will before the year of the show-down—1968—is well advanced. And besieged, embattled, and occasionally embittered, the tall, tough Texan is a man who can hold his own when the game is politics and the deed to the ranch is on the table.

## The 14th Anniversary of Asian Peoples' Freedom Day

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of speaking on the 14th anniversary of Asian Peoples' Freedom Day. The resolution passed by the Assembly of Captive European Nations in support of the oppressed people of Asia well deserves the Members' attention. Thus, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include that statement in the RECORD at this point:

THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASIAN PEOPLES' FREEDOM DAY DECLARATION, ADOPTED IN THE 129TH (EXTRAORDINARY) MEETING OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY IN NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 23, 1968

On the Fourteenth Anniversary of the Asian Peoples' Freedom Day, the Assembly of Captive European Nations gathered once again in a plenary meeting to declare its solidarity with the Asian peoples in their struggle against Communist aggression. A common aspiration for personal freedom and national self-determination unites the captive peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania with the oppressed peoples of China, North Korea, and North Vietnam.

January 23, 1954 is a momentous day in the global struggle against totalitarianism. On that date 22,000 Chinese and North Korean prisoners of war in the custody of the United Nations Forces chose to remain in the free world instead of returning to their Communist-dominated countries. January 23 has since been observed as the Asian Peoples' Freedom Day.

The Anniversary of the historic march to freedom of the Chinese and Korean soldiers is of great significance for today's political situation when we are again confronted with Communist aggression against another free country in Asia—the Republic of Vietnam.

The peoples of East-Central Europe will understand and appreciate the determination of the Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese peoples. Dedicated to the principle that peoples everywhere have the right to freely determine through democratic processes the political, social, and economic system under which they wish to live, the Assembly of Captive European Nations firmly supports the struggle of free men in Vietnam against the encroachments of Communism. As in Europe, communism in Asia maintains itself by minority rule, denial of basic human rights, exploitation and the threat of brutal force. The struggle against communism in Vietnam serves a common cause, for a surrender to Communist domination in Southeast Asia would not only jeopardize the security of Free Asia, but would also prolong the colonial domination of East-Central Europe by Communist regimes.

On this Fourteenth Anniversary of Asian Peoples' Freedom Day, we re-dedicate ourselves to the cause of self-determination and national independence for all nations and manifest the unity of the peoples of East-Central Europe and Asia in the struggle for the establishment of a world community of free nations based on the rule of justice and freedom.

### Dulles Policy Worked

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in the last 7 years our country finds itself in a position where it is necessary to call up our Reserve military forces in order to cope with still another crisis situation evolving from the continuing cold war between the Communist countries and the so-called free world.

While there can be no question about supplying unlimited support for our courageous fighting men, I think it is in order to question the conduct of our foreign policy since 1961—a period of almost uninterrupted tension and crisis in all parts of the world.

It becomes even more significant when a comparison is made with the 8-year history of foreign policy under the direction of the Honorable John Foster Dulles. As I am sure you are all aware, it has become almost a national sport for liberal columnists, professors, and other "foreign policy experts" to speak of the Dulles-Eisenhower foreign policy in highly critical—often derisive—tones, but I submit that a close examination of the record will reveal that the Dulles policy worked whereas the policy we have had since 1961 has not worked and there are no indications that things will get any better.

This whole question was outlined rather succinctly in an editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star, Friday, January 26, 1968, and I include the editorial at this point in my remarks:

#### DULLES POLICY WORKED

With every passing year written into the history books, the highly challenged and

questioned and even derided skills of one John Foster Dulles look better and better.

Indeed, at this rate, Dulles is going to look like a genius before long.

Books have been written and speeches made, and it has been very popular for all the cunning folks for years to make deprecatory remarks about Dulles' crude, unsophisticated and "over-simplified" approach to foreign policy.

We are told by all manner of interpretations and theoretical arguments how often this bumbling secretary flirted with disaster by his lack of intellectual approach.

But the record stands before us, clearly, that the eight years of the Eisenhower administration somehow is the only oasis in the entire post-war history of the world.

For eight years, during most of which time Mr. Dulles was secretary of state, and the rest still pursued a holdover of his policies, no Americans were being shot at anywhere.

The spectacular crises, the series of challenges, attempts and expansions of communism took place in endless series in all the years prior to Dulles' tenure, and all the years since his tenure—and yet the cold fact is that except for Khrushchev's big mouth we had little crisis atmosphere, no really major crises of the type that had been and have again become so commonplace, no national emergencies, call up of soldiers, vast increases in draft calls, attacks on U.S. military installations, or wars.

Isn't it about time we quit pursuing all the attractive theoretical notions, and looked at the record to see what we did right on the basis of results, and what we have done wrong?

The initial major attack on Dulles' policies came during the 1960 campaign (Dulles himself was dead by then, and the only major failure of his "brinkmanship" policies was in Cuba after Dulles was "out of it" and "brinkmanship" was not practiced.)

It was made by John F. Kennedy, and resumed even more strongly after his election.

Kennedy condemned "brinkmanship," the Dulles policy of holding Russia directly responsible for overt activities by Communist powers against the U.S., and of "going directly to the source" in flat-out challenge, eyeball to eyeball, when they or one of their "proxies" attempted some sort of coup:

Kennedy espoused the thesis that problems must be kept small, dealt with as specific local problems, and that the thing to be avoided at all costs was just such "massive confrontation" with the Soviet Union.

The doctrine has haunted—and guided—us ever since.

It is a questionable doctrine on the basis of results, but it was a particularly self-defeating doctrine to be publicly announced and explained in lurid detail, for it announced to the Communists that here was a touchy spot that they could exploit.

They have been exploiting it ever since.

As soon as they discovered we were so sensitive to avoid direct problems with them, they plunged us into a "Berlin crisis" which brought a National Emergency and call-up of reserves, etc.; while China massed men and sent warplanes over Formosa. In rapid succession during Kennedy's brief three years, came the Laos attacks and "neutralization"; vast escalation of the Communist attack in South Vietnam; China's direct attack on India; the attempt to seize the Congo; Indonesia declaring war on Malaysia; and Russia's shockingly bold attempt to arm Cuba with 2,000-mile nuclear missiles.

The Cuban attempt brought us, in spite of policy, to our one major "massive confrontation"—and our only major success. It cooled things briefly . . . but not for long.

After Kennedy's death came direct attacks against U.S. non-combatants in Vietnam and against U.S. ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, and the challenges, harassment, and escalat-

ing war in Vietnam that have been with us ever since.

All of these things have been treated as "local problems"—and they just kept growing.

This conduct of affairs has been so successful for those nations openly hostile to us that they are getting bolder and more aggressive every day.

The mere fact that the tougher they get, the louder are the cries among U.S. "dis-senters" for "peace," probably inspired the Pueblo attack—on the thesis that another good scare, or two or three, might destroy what the Communists call "stability of the capitalist system."

So, they are encouraged to adventurism. And we pay the price.

Dulles' policy had been to discourage bold adventurism by the reds—and the record shows that it worked.

Half way measures don't seem to.

### Communist Aggression Relieved

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the account of Communist brutality, murder and sadism by Alan L. Davidson, a former sergeant of the Green Beret, must reach the American people to make them understand the moral degeneracy of the people seeking to bury us.

I include Sergeant Davidson's report from the February 1968 issue of American Opinion to follow my comments, as follows:

#### VIETNAM: WHEN TERROR IS NOT STATISTICS

(Alan L. Davidson, a former Sergeant of the Green Beret, extended his tour to volunteer for service in Vietnam and left there when, as senior medical advisor in War Zone D, he was felled by a dozen diseases. Davidson, still an honorary member of the Vietnamese Special Forces, may be booked for lectures through the American Opinion Speakers Bureau—a course we recommend.)

Recently in Vietnam a brave and capable native Chief, trying to wrest his province from Communist hands, left his village to lead the three Vietnamese Ranger units under his command in an attack against the Vietcong. Though his forces were small, this commander meant to carry the war to the enemy. In his absence a Vietcong force overran his village. They butchered his wife and scores of other villagers, and then kidnapped his eight-year-old son.

That Chief, a friend of mine, returned like any other husband and father to find his wife dead, his only son gone, and his village bloody and burned to the ground. Holding his grief inside himself lest he lose all control and endanger his people, he re-established order and began to rebuild and refortify. His duty came first; for him there wasn't even time to mourn.

Less than a week had passed when very early one morning, it was about two o'clock, the Vietcong again attacked the camp. They ran between the huts and down the main road firing their weapons as they came. The V.C. rushed by the Chief's house; bullets slapped into the wall. My friend tumbled from his bed in his bare feet and ran toward the door, grabbing his weapon and moving to rally his men to a defense. As he bolted from the doorway of his home he stumbled and fell across a burlap sack. He jumped to his feet but the Vietcong had gone as quickly as they had come.

The Chief reached down and picked up

the burlap bag. He opened it, and emptied its contents on the ground. There on the dirt road, in the flickering light of a burning hut, he looked down upon the dozen or so pieces of what had been his eight-year-old son.

The incident was typical of the planned terror employed wherever the Communists have engaged in what they call a War of National Liberation. Such atrocities, and even worse, have been repeated by Communists literally tens of thousands of times from Angola and Algeria, Malaya and Mozambique, to Zambia and Zanzibar. We saw them in Korea where our boys were butchered with their hands wired behind their backs, and now we are facing them again in Vietnam. Often after my lectures across the country on the War in Vietnam I am asked what the Communists are really like. I'd like to answer that question now. Wherever we meet them—in Moscow, Panmunjom, Peking, or Hanoi—they are the kind of degenerate animals who would make it a part of their political strategy to deliver the dismembered body of an eight-year-old child to his father in a burlap sack.

And, the Communist terror is growing.

On December 6, 1967, at ten minutes after midnight, the Vietcong attacked a refugee settlement at Dak Son, in Phuoclong Province. Sixty homes were put to the torch. And then the Vietcong, with whom the President would have us negotiate, turned flamethrowers on more than 250 helpless women and children in an intentional, premeditated act of terrorism and bestial retribution: Their husbands and fathers had refused to join the Vietcong. The next day, human ashes blew through the streets like a macabre mist as the charred remains of mothers and their children were laid out in rows at the base of the one shady tree on the hill at Dak Son. On the lid of a basket were the bodies of a tiny brother and sister still clinging to each other even in death.

Vice President Hubert Humphrey, in a question-and-answer session at the University of Pittsburgh, was recently moved to declare that "The Vietcong has committed the most unbelievable acts of terrorism the world has ever known." The Vice President comes close to the truth. What he does not say is that the Vietcong's National Liberation Front is merely obeying orders in extension of a standard Communist strategy emanating from the Hanoi-Peking-Moscow Axis. The Communists have made a veritable science out of what the Nineteenth Century anarchists called "The Propaganda of the Deed"—they have developed terrorism to its zenith as a political tactic.

22 October 1967. At 2200 hours, two V.C. platoons entered Co Tao Village, Pleiku Province, and drove about two hundred people out of their homes and then burned five houses.

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the acts of bestiality committed by the Vietcong against civilians in South Vietnam are not mere happenstance. The sniper's bullet, the rattle of small-arms fire through a village in the dead of night, the beheading of a hamlet Chief, the explosion of a plastique bomb in a crowded market place, these are acts methodically planned and carried out by the Communists according to the standard plan for all such Wars of National Liberation.

24 October 1967. At 2345 hours, eight civilians were killed and twenty-seven others wounded in a V.C. recoilless-rifle and rocket attack on civilians at Nha Bang Village, Chau Doc Province.

It is an axiom of guerrilla warfare that no guerrilla movement can succeed without the acquiescence of the people or support from an outside source. Yet, contrary to all warnings from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Johnson Administration is now permitting the Communist forces in Vietnam to receive vast support from outside sources. It is by now a thoroughly documented fact that a full

eighty percent of the war materiel directed to the Vietcong is supplied via North Vietnam by Communist nations with which the President insists America must continue to trade. Based on my experience in Vietnam, I can assure you without reservation that any success of the Vietcong in South Vietnam is directly proportionate to the logistical support and increased manpower that is brought to it from North Vietnam.

Even so, while the Communist insurrectionists depend almost completely upon the international community for military aid and diplomatic support, they have found that they must rely upon the local populace for many of the immediate necessities of war—food, clothing, shelter, funds, cover, and intelligence. To ensure these increments the Vietcong has proven most effective in the techniques of gaining control of the civil population by employing the "positive pressures" of a political indoctrination applied with care from the grass roots up, and the "negative pressures" of a terrorism applied against those who refuse to accept their domination. Witnessing repeated acts of monstrous brutality performed with impunity very often has the effect of "converting" survivors into "workers in the struggle for liberation."

2 November 1967. At 2330 hours, two platoons of Vietcong penetrated the Hiep Thanh Hamlet, Khanh Hoa Province, for the purpose of assassinating a village official. They were successful in their mission.

30 October 1967. At 1100 hours, a V.C. unit of unknown strength entered Pleidur, Kontum Province, and killed one civilian in a ritual terror murder.

4 November 1967. At 2240 hours, the Vietcong repeated their performance of October thirtieth at Pleidur.

31 October 1967. At 2000 hours, a V.C. unit penetrated Phu Can District, Binh Dinh Province, fired weapons and threw a grenade into the home of the My Hoa Hamlet Chief. The Chief was killed and three other civilians were wounded.

The techniques utilized in implementing the terror propaganda are many and varied. Threats, intimidation, coercion, mental and emotional stress and threatened destruction of whole families, reprisals, and assassination are all a part of the Vietcong's modus operandi.

8 November 1967. Between midnight and 0105 hours, the V.C. attacked six refugee camps in Dai Loc, Hien Duc, and Dien Ban Districts, Quang Nam Province. In these six incidents, twenty-two refugees were killed, forty-two wounded, and fifty-seven abducted. Some 583 homes were destroyed and 67 damaged; 625 families are homeless.

In 1963, along with the eleven other members of the Green Beret who made up my Army Special Forces Team, I was sent into the now famous War Zone D. Except for a few French-owned rubber and cashew plantations, and villages too small to appear on most maps, Zone D is virtually all jungle. Rough terrain and thick vegetation make the area almost impossible for the Government to patrol on any regular basis.

For over two decades this island of inaccessibility has been a Communist stronghold. Under the canopy of its rain forest, towering in some places as high as 200 feet to form an umbrella over the jungle floor, the Reds have burrowed a honeycomb of underground tunnels and fortifications from which they mount major assaults into the surrounding countryside. The mission of my Team was to help secure a defense around one of the small villages there and to build what was called a strategic hamlet. We were to organize the natives of that hamlet into a self-defense corps that would permit them to act as a militia for the defense of their own town. Our orders were to then train these men in those acts of war which would enable them to take a more effective and aggressive role in defeating the Vietcong terrorists.

The hamlet was Nuoc Vang: ninety-eight families; nearly five hundred people. A year before we arrived the entire town had been located farther up in what was now the very heart and center of War Zone D. For many years the natives of Nuoc Vang had by Vietnamese standards made a fairly good living for themselves, going out into the jungle to cut and collect certain roots, herbs, and barks which they marketed to the French for the making of medicines. There was an abundance of wild game for meat, the crops were good, and life was wholesome and pleasant. I remember asking myself: What manner of Hell would it take to cause a happy and prosperous people like this to move from what was their ancestral home?

The answer, I learned, dates back more than a decade:

After 1954, when the French nation was betrayed by its Far Left and withdrew from Indo-China under the Geneva Accord, Vietnam had been divided into the Communist North and the free South. The Communist Vietminh, now known as the Vietcong, intensified their efforts toward expansion and domination. The Communist strength in the South was made up of Southerners indoctrinated and trained by Ho Chi Minh, Northerners who in the course of fighting the French had moved southward, and those loyal to the Conspiracy who had come to the South posing as innocent refugees. They formed the hardcore of terrorist units which began to strike viciously against every authority or semblance of government that was not under Communist control. This included Nuoc Vang.

Down from North Vietnam came highly trained Communist cadres carrying with them enough arms, ammunition, and money to last about six months. They linked up with local units strategically positioned in the South to form ever more highly organized guerrilla bands. At the end of six months, each cadre became completely self-supporting on the basis of what they procured from raids, "taxation," and ambushes.

24 October 1967. At 211 hours, a V.C. platoon entered Buon Tong Tu, Darlac Province, and collected "taxation" of forty-five kilos of rice from the villagers.

25 October 1967. At 2000 hours, a V.C. platoon entered Hiep Nhon Hamlet, Binh Tuy Province, and took food, oil, and gasoline from the people as "taxation."

Because of its inaccessibility, the Vietcong were able to establish a total domination over the area where the people of Nuoc Vang had lived. Day after day the V.C. would round up the groups of workers from the village, as they pursued their jobs in the jungle, and sit them down for propaganda lectures often lasting throughout the day until sunset.

5 November 1967. At 1600 hours, a V.C. company assembled the people in Buon Ko Edung, Darlac Province, for speeches praising "recent V.C. victories."

6 November 1967. At 1900 hours, in Plei Tram, Kontum Province, approximately one hundred armed V.C. gathered the villagers for propaganda lectures.

In order to obtain effective control, the Vietcong soon went far beyond political indoctrination. Once they had developed a tiny but fanatically dedicated following they began the application of systematic terror to bring the entire village under complete Communist control.

22 October 1967. At 2100 hours, a V.C. platoon murdered a Montagnard in Buon Jat, Darlac Province, after assembling the villagers for a propaganda lecture.

In order to support their oppression the Vietcong soon began to "tax" the village. That taxation often ran as high as ninety percent. The V.C. now told the people of Nuoc Vang what crops to plant, how much they should plant, and how much of their

produce they were expected to give to their "liberators."

28 October 1967. A V.C. platoon entered Plei Or Village, Kontum Province and confiscated three hundred kilos of rice.

7 November 1967. At 1700 hours, approximately one hundred armed V.C. entered Plei Tram, Kontum Province, and ordered the villagers to contribute one thousand baskets of paddy within thirteen days, and threatened reprisals if the quotas were not met.

Though the Vietcong would rail against the Government draft laws which conscript men in their late teens for a specified length of service, the Communists take boys as young as fourteen and fifteen for the duration. The Vietcong method of procuring manpower to swell its ranks is fairly simple. Those who do not accept service with the Vietcong suffer the consequences. From interrogation of Vietcong prisoners and documentation captured in Zone D, we were able to determine that the majority of Vietcong "recruits" were coming from the category of "teenage orphans."

7 November 1967. At 1600 hours, a V.C. force infiltrated Vi Le New Life Hamlet, Chuong Thiem Province, and abducted thirteen youths.

5 November 1967. At 1600 hours, V.C. kidnaped six youths from Tho Bon Hamlet, Quang Nam Province.

Whenever their demand exceeded the supply, the Vietcong simply created those circumstances which provided a broader base of orphaned teenage boys. In 1962 Hanoi sent down orders to "set up specialized units and clandestine forces to take over terror operations." Since that time the level of violent acts against civilians has risen sharply from five thousand a year to now well in excess of 25,000, many the work of elite three-man "cells" that travel from job to job. They did their work well in Nuoc Vang.

In the practice of armed propaganda the Vietcong use every measure at their disposal to disrupt the economic mean, over-all morale, and will of the South Vietnamese people to resist. Their efforts against Nuoc Vang were nearly successful. The village Chief had some seventeen adopted children, all under the age of twelve. These were children of the village adopted by him because they had been orphaned. They were orphaned because their parents had resisted the Communists and been eliminated as "reactionary elements"—examples to others.

7 November 1967. At 2300 hours, a V.C. unit entered Bac Chan No. 2, New Life Hamlet, Kien Tuong Province, and seized Family Registration booklets, I.D. cards, and ballots; then ordered villagers not to pursue their normal commerce and activities upon penalty of mass slaughter.

24 October 1967. At 1200 hours, a truck driver was stopped by three V.C. tax collectors for payment of tax. When the driver said he was unable to pay the tax, the V.C. confiscated his truck. The incident occurred in Tan Ly Village, Binh Tuy Province.

Finally the villagers of Nuoc Vang realized their predicament under the Vietcong. These fiercely independent people, still fired with the will to resist, decided in the secrecy of their village council that they must make a move. The only avenue of resistance open to them was to flee. During the space of a single day the entire village, led by its Chief moved the scores of miles to their present site. They did not move completely out of the War Zone as they owned land there; their crops and livelihood were there; their ancestors were buried there. At least in the new location friendly forces could get to them and, if they could establish a defense for themselves, the villagers of Nuoc Vang could wait in what fragile security they could muster for that day of peace they hoped would come soon.

Immediately upon our arrival at Nuoc Vang, the rest of our Teams set quickly to

work building up defenses and fortifications. As a medic, my duties were of a different nature. Not only was I to provide medical aid to my Team, but I had the additional task of bringing medical assistance to the villagers of the region as a positive step in winning their continued goodwill.

On our second day in Nuoc Vang I slung my medical kit over my shoulder and, with the son of the village Chief as a medical aid—and an interpreter who had come in with us—I proceeded from hut to hut on sick call. After having visited about six of these crude dwellings I began to wonder about the fact that in the center of each home was a pit about six-feet square and six-feet deep. There was no garbage in the pits and the outhouses were in the back. I asked for an explanation. The Chief's son took me outside and pointed to bullet holes in the walls. He explained that since the village had rejected Communist domination, and the Vietcong was not of sufficient strength to maintain troops at the current village location, the V.C. used terrorism to destroy the natives' sense of security. Every ten days or so the Vietcong would come to Nuoc Vang and fire their weapons indiscriminately in all directions. The bullets would spray the mud walls of the huts, or rip through roofs, or ricochet across the floor. When under attack the villagers jumped into their pits to get below the level of small-arms fire.

I wondered what it was like for families to try to lead a life where every moment they stood the chance of being torn apart by gunfire or mortar or grenade; as I lived with these valiant people, I was to come to understand precisely what it was like.

29 October 1967. At 2110 hours, the V.C. mined and destroyed a school and harassed villagers with small-arms fire at Tan Hanh Village, Vinh Long Province.

8 November 1967. At 0130 hours, V.C. forces launched a coordinated mortar, recoilless rifle, and small-arms attack on Nghia Duc Hamlet, Quang Duc Province. Three civilians were killed and twenty-two wounded.

2 November 1967. During the early morning hours, nine civilians were injured and 330 civilian homes were destroyed in a V.C. mortar, small-arms, and automatic weapons attack at Dai Loc, twenty-three kilometers west of Hoi An, Quang Nam Province.

I built a dispensary for Nuoc Vang and, as the word of medical aid spread, natives straggled in for treatment from as far away as thirty-five and forty kilometers. They came by foot, by bicycle, carrying their children slung on their hip or on their back. They came by three-wheeled Lambretta motor scooters, now a favorite native conveyance, or in small buses that serviced the countryside. I soon discovered for myself just how often the Vietcong used their knives, rifles, and bombs on civilians in calculated acts of intimidation.<sup>1</sup>

With disturbing regularity the Vietcong were stopping the village buses and Lambrettas on jungle roads. They would force the passengers to disembark and sit them down by the side of the road for a propaganda session. Always they would demand that the natives hold out their valuables and food. The V.C. would then move down the line and take eighty or ninety percent of everything. They did not take it all because so long as they left something, however small, their propagandists could argue that they were "tax collectors" and not thieves.

29 October 1967. At 1500 hours, a group of V.C. stopped a bus between Tra Tan I and Tra Tan II Hamlets, Binh Tuy Province, and confiscated food supplies from the passengers. The V.C. also demanded payment of VN\$5,000 "tax."

19 October 1967. At 1600 hours, a V.C. squad stopped a bus on Interprovince Road No. 3

<sup>1</sup> Soon we were treating 250 Vietnamese a day at the Nuoc Vang dispensary.

between Vo Dat and Long Khanh, Binh Tuy Province, and confiscated clothing, food supplies, and other commodities from the passengers.

If in a particular village complex the people had been resisting the Vietcong then the bus might be blown up or its passengers captured and killed or mutilated.

31 October 1967. At 1100 hours, one civilian was killed and seven others injured when the bus in which they were traveling was wrecked by a V.C. mine on Highway One, near Phuong Tay Lai Hamlet, five kilometers northeast of Phuong Bien, Quang Tri Province.

31 October 1967. At 1500 hours, eight civilians were killed and one civilian was wounded when the Lambretta in which they were passengers was blown up by a V.C. mine on Highway Nineteen, eighteen kilometers southeast of Pleiku City, Pleiku Province.

I well remember a little twelve-year-old girl the Communists had dragged off one of those buses. They had pulled her around to the side where all the passengers could look on in horror as one V.C. held her arm and another chopped it off with a machete. When I first met Ba Hai her mother had brought her to my dispensary to look at the thin little stump of her arm. Ba Hai never betrayed the pain she felt, but as I looked into her face I saw cheeks stained with a terror and sadness that millenniums could never wash away. I remember thinking: What sort of medicine, what pill could I prescribe to ease the kind of horror the Communists had visited on this little girl of twelve? I was a soldier, and I had seen things that must pale Hell itself—but never anything like that. Later, I was to see many such intentionally mutilated children. The distinct memory of each will haunt my sleep if I live to be a thousand.

Our Team was now training its first group of villagers for the self-defense corps. The fortifications around Nuoc Vang were daily being improved, and the villagers were proving to be good soldiers. But, until those defenses were complete enough to offer constant protection, the Chief slept every night in a different part of the village, or out in the jungle, or in a rice paddy. If the Vietcong could catch him, they would kill him just as they have killed thousands of local leaders all across Vietnam.

31 October 1967. At 1800 hours, the V.C. shot and killed the hamlet Chief at Luy Dong Hamlet, Quang Nam Province.

2 November 1967. At an unreported hour, a V.C. terrorist shot the hamlet Chief at Tan Hung Hamlet, Bien Hoa Province.

The primary targets of the Vietcong are the village Chiefs and Elders, the school teachers, the village medic, and anyone else who might have something constructive to offer the community; anyone who might act as a cohesive and stabilizing influence upon those in every village prepared to offer fierce resistance to Communism. The idea is that, leaderless and terrorized, the people will be more apt to follow the Vietcong.

I remember wondering what the will to resist would be like in (say) California if, in but one year, more than two thousand Mayors and City Councilmen were shot, beheaded, or eviscerated in the main street of their communities and left with their blood to pool in the gutter. Precisely that happened in Vietnam last year. Over the past decade the Vietcong has systematically butchered some fifteen thousand local officials.

30 October 1967. At 1200 hours, V.C. terrorists murdered the Van Phong Hamlet Chief, a student, and a farmer in Van Phong Hamlet, Quang Tri District.

30 October 1967. At 2300 hours, the V.C. abducted a hamlet teacher from his home in Ky Chang Village, Quang Tin Province, and shot him to death a short distance away.

When we had finished the initial defenses at Nuoc Vang, securing them against a Com-

munist enemy who had murdered and butchered members or friends of every family in the village, it was like Christmas and the Fourth of July rolled into one. The grateful citizens of Nuoc Vang announced a feast in honor of their American friends, and it was as if we had brought manna to a starving people. Though we were embarrassed, we were pleased—these were allies of which to be proud. They had become our friends; what they did, what happened to them, was a matter of vital personal concern to each of us.

The Team attended in shifts of three, always leaving nine men behind to guard the camp. My turn came late in the afternoon. It was Sunday, and I said a long if silent prayer as I sat down at the head table and surveyed the buffalo steaks, fruits, vegetables, and even soda and beer brought up the long road from the provincial capital at Phuoc Vinh. It was the best of everything they had, and the mood was one of thanksgiving.

Then, just as I was about to bite into my first piece of steak, a fierce explosion shook the building. I sat frozen with the fifty or so villagers, chilled in silence, expecting that the Vietcong were walking mortar rounds in on us and waiting to hear how close the next one would land. I hoped to hear it, but expected the worst.

Then, from outside came screaming and loud wailing; the unmistakable agony of a woman's grief. I jumped back off the bench and ran out toward the screams. In a hut on the far side of the village I found them. For the villagers' defiance of the Vietcong, a reprisal had been made. The V.C. had taken its pound of flesh.

Earlier in the day, perhaps as the people of Nuoc Vang had joyously begun their feast, the Vietcong had crept into the hamlet and planted a booby-trap. The explosion had torn apart a four-year-old boy and his seventeen-year-old brother. I knelt first beside the older of the two, futilely trying to find a sign of life. The bomb had blown off his left hand just above the wrist and the hand lay nearby on the floor of the hut. I snatched it up and stuffed it into my pocket to get it out of sight of the mothers and children who followed.

The young man's face was mangled beyond recognition, his chest, stomach, legs, and arms were a horrible pulp of confused flesh shredded by shrapnel from one of the Communist countries to which the Johnson Administration continues to send aid and trade. The clamminess and pallor of death were already there. As well as I knew him, I couldn't even recognize Quang until his wife, a bride of three months, broke through the crowd and knelt beside me to cradle against herself the shattered lifeless form which only minutes before had been her whole life. The girl moaned a low, anguished cry as she rocked to and fro. Le van uang would grow cold in her arms before she would finally place him to rest.

I turned to the little boy, his mother holding him up to me—a desperate plea in her eyes. He was alive, could I save him? The child's face and chest were burned almost black from the exploding powder, the smell of burned flesh and hair was sickening. His legs and arms were torn with ugly holes seared at the edges where hunks of fiery metal had pierced and come to rest. The child's chest and abdomen bore no major wounds, but the burns were monstrous and the flesh peppered with the remains of half-burnt wadding. I took the little boy in my arms and, half running to get there, half walking so as not to jar that whisper of life from this tiny body, carried him to our camp. There on a make-shift table in our small dirt-floored cooking area, with only a Coleman lantern for light, I set to work trying to draw together those weak strands of life. His pulse was so light, so weak I had to

cut into his arm to find a vein for the transfusion.

The light went out. Reaching into my pocket for a match, I grabbed the severed hand and threw it aside like it had been a hot coal, horrified at forgetting it was there. The light was back on now. I worked as rapidly as I could, cleaning, wrapping, bandaging—moving across the broken body until I came to the face and opened the eyelids. I knew immediately that this little four-year-old would never see again.

26 October 1967. At 1530 hours, a young boy was injured by a V.C. grenade booby-trap at Tan Hiep Hale Hamlet, An Giang Province.

28 October 1967. At 1800 hours, one child was killed and another injured by a V.C. booby-trap in Long Binh Hamlet, Dinh Tuong Province.

After seeing acts of barbarism like this, day after day, hour after hour, I began to realize something I had read about but never really understood before. I began to understand how the Communists succeed; how a criminally depraved but highly organized one-to-two percent of a population can extend a reign of tyranny over an innocent ninety-eight percent of the people. We Americans place a high regard on human life. The Communists have no regard for that life if its elimination will further the aims of the International Conspiracy in the slightest way. I had read of the Communists intentionally starving to death 10 million Ukrainians, of their butchering 25 million Chinese—I am ashamed to say that those were just statistics to me until I got to Vietnam and saw for myself.

And let me tell you, there are no "moderates," no anti-anti-Communists, no Arthur Larsons or Dr. Spocks or Bobby Kennedys or Franklin Littells out there. If there are, they are fighting for the Vietcong.

When the Communists were unopposed in their initial application of force against the civilian population in Vietnam, they gained control of the situation; the counterforce which must be finally applied to break that control will now be far greater, and the populace has suffered far more, than if action had been taken resolutely at the outset. Instead of permitting our military to go in and win this war, even now, the Communist enemy is given sanctuaries, his major supply base at Haiphong is protected by Washington, his vast stores and troop depots in Cambodia and Laos are placed off-limits, he is given every conceivable advantage. And so, it continues—the Communist terror, butchery, holocaust, assassination, and mutilation . . . all aimed at the people of Vietnam by their would-be masters in the planning rooms of Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi.

The shame, the awful shame of war, is that it is the innocents who suffer. War without human suffering is an impossibility. But for the Communists to exact human misery as a tactic is unspeakable. For the United States, in the face of this, to perpetuate that misery by following a no-win policy is a sin against every fibre of decency. We must have a decided victory in Vietnam—and soon. A victory in which no Vietcong will dare pick up another weapon to use against his fellowman. If we allow the Communists to win by defeating us, by our withdrawal, or by negotiated surrender—and they then achieve domination over the people of that benighted country, which without our clear-cut victory they will achieve—the incredible suffering which the patriots of South Vietnam have already endured will in no way match the Hell that will follow. If we capitulate, by whatever means, we will have broken faith with all those around the world still daring to fight the tyranny of Communism, and we will have broken all faith with everything that has made America great and good.

In 170 reported Vietcong incidents of terrorism, the following were confirmed civilian

casualties during this week ending 11 November 1967: Killed, 134; Mutilated 515; Abducted, 165. The terror is increasing. Confirmed civilian casualties resulting from acts of Vietcong terrorism for the period 1 January 1967 through the week ending 11 November 1967 read like this: Killed 3,031; Mutilated, 6,361; Abducted, 4,114.

Just ordinary civilians, these victims of the Vietcong; just ordinary people like you and your family. That blinded four-year-old boy mangled on a table in a cooking hut at Nuoc Vang looked very much like a four-year-old you may know. Oh, his eyes slanted and his skin was a yellow-tan; but he was a climber of trees and chaser of cats, and his grin could light up a room, and he played at soldier and stuck out his chest with pride at praise from his dad or mom. Just a little boy, really. Not much different from the little boys you know. As twelve-year-old Ba Hal, with her pitiful stump and terrible memories was just a little girl, or the dismembered eight-year-old son of my Chief friend was just another child. Or the 250 refugees turned into human torches at Dak Son in early December were just women and children, mothers and their babies.

And Vietnam's a long way away, isn't it? And the Communists have mellowed, haven't they? And the 115,000 American casualties who have bled or died there trying to stop the Communists as our leaders send aid to the arsenal of the Vietcong were expendable, weren't they?

Ask Dr. Spock about it. Or Bobby Kennedy. Or, better yet, ask the President why he won't let our military win this war and put a stop to the Hell that is going on over there.

In the name of God, people, it's time to stop the Communists before those children in the burlap bags are *our* children.

### City Marine Killed in Action

## HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L. Cpl. John A. Briscoe, a marine from Baltimore, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man, and to honor his memory, by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY MARINE, 19, KILLED IN ACTION—CORPORAL BRISCOE HAD BEEN IN VIETNAM 4 MONTHS

Lance Cpl. John A. Briscoe, a 19-year-old marine who was graduated from Douglass High School in 1966, was killed by hostile rifle fire January 26 at Quang Tri, South Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Corporal Briscoe, who hoped to make the Marine Corps his career, enlisted after his high school graduation and had volunteered for duty in Vietnam, his mother, Mrs. Della P. Briscoe, said yesterday.

She said her son had been in Vietnam since October and was scheduled to return to the United States next November.

TENNIS TEAM MEMBER

While at Douglass, Corporal Briscoe was a member of the school's tennis team and earned three varsity letters, she said.

Mrs. Briscoe described her son as "military-minded" and explained, "In the Marines, you earn what you get as far as rank is concerned, and this is what he wanted."

A native of Baltimore, Corporal Briscoe lived with his family in the 2500 block Oswege avenue.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his father, Jerome Briscoe, and a brother, Anthon I. Fernandes, also of Baltimore.

### Red Flag on the High Seas

## HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James D. Atkinson, a distinguished professor of government at Georgetown University, is the author of a very informative article in a recent issue of the American Security Council's Washington Report concerning the growing menace of the Russian merchant fleet.

While the Soviet Union continues its spectacular rise as a powerful maritime power, the United States merchant marine fleet is faced with mediocrity as a result of shortsighted planning by the administration. A necessary part of our national security is a strong commercial fleet, and in a perceptive manner Dr. Atkinson demonstrates that we are failing to attain this goal. I urge my colleagues to read carefully his timely article which is as follows:

#### RED FLAG ON THE HIGH SEAS THE GEO-POLITICAL CONFLICT

Within the memory of living men, Russia's merchant fleet was so insignificant a factor in world politics that it was scarcely worthy of comment. Thus the great authority on sea power, Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, dismissed Russia's merchant navy with the observation that "Russia has little maritime commerce . . . her merchant flag is rarely seen."

Today the world scene is strikingly different. The hammer and sickle flag of the Soviet Union is seen on all the seas of the world and Soviet plans for the future are so ambitious that they have over 200,000 people enrolled in the Leningrad Institute of Transportation, the Odessa Maritime Academy, and other maritime institutes.

From an almost negligible figure of 1.6 million deadweight tons in 1939, Soviet merchant shipping expanded to 3.6 million deadweight tons in 1958. The really spectacular gains, however, have come in this decade of the 1960's. Thus from a figure of 4½ million deadweight tons in 1963, Soviet merchant shipping jumped to 8.9 million deadweight tons as of January 1, 1965. The latest figure, released by Lloyd's Register on October 10, 1967, indicates that the U.S.S.R. added 1,125,000 tons in the last year alone and the Soviet merchant marine now stands at 10,617,000 deadweight tons which places it in sixth rank in the world. What is significant about all this is the rate of growth, for only five years ago, the Soviet merchant fleet ranked number twelve in the world!

While important, the statistical data alone are insufficient as a guide to the future thrust of Soviet maritime programs. Some indication of burgeoning Soviet operations at sea is given by programs during 1966 and 1967 which are directed at our own Western Hemisphere. When the 19,860 ton Alexander Pushkin dropped anchor off Quebec City on April 27, 1966, it was an historic first. This was the first time in the history of maritime affairs that the Russians had entered the ocean liner traffic of the Western Hemisphere. In view of some of the optimistic predictions in some quarters in the West about future Soviet maritime plans, it is also

worth noting that the Pushkin's maiden voyage came only eight months after Soviet Minister of Merchant Marine, Victor G. Bakayev, had said that the U.S.S.R. had no intention of establishing passenger lines across the oceans. As the British merchant marine continued to decline in 1967 and as the Cunard Line decided to give up the British-Canadian passenger traffic, the Soviets and their Polish partners prepared to take over the British passenger presence. The authoritative London *Daily Telegraph* stated November 11, 1967, that the U.S.S.R. might place "a second new ship on the London-Montreal run and the Poles plan extra sailings from Southampton to Canada next year."

Even the St. Lawrence Seaway, the entrance to the great agricultural-industrial heart of America, the Mid-West, was not immune to Soviet politico-economic penetration. The New York *Times* (November 12, 1967) reported that Peter M. McGavin, executive secretary-treasurer of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO, stated that the Soviet Union made 19 voyages through the St. Lawrence Seaway this year and thus equaled the number of U.S. voyages made on that key waterway.

#### U.S. SHIPPING: DECLINING ASSETS OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. McGavin's comment that "the Russians have caught up with us in our own back yard," that is, in the Great Lakes area, graphically illustrates the steady attrition of U.S. shipping since the end of World War II. Thus in 1947, the U.S. merchant marine carried 70% of our foreign trade while by 1960 it had dropped to 11.1%. Figures released in October, 1967 by the Foreign Trade Division of the Census Bureau are even more alarming. They indicate that for 1966, U.S. flag merchant ships carried only 7.3% of the nation's waterborne foreign trade. This is the lowest figure since 1921! The U.S. stake in the waterborne carriage of capability goes down. In 1965 our aggregate goods continues, however, to go up as our total of exports and imports to waterborne commerce was 427 million tons valued at \$32.7 billion as compared to 1966 when it rose to 452 million tons valued at \$36.9 billion. If present trends continue, by 1970 U.S. flag merchant ships may be carrying less than 5% of our exports and imports.

The American shipping decline is going on at the same time that Soviet shipping is forging ahead. Thus, as of May, 1967, the Soviet Union had building or on order a total of 4.3 million tons of merchant shipping (526 ships) while the United States had only 600,000 tons (45 ships) building or on order. Over the past several years, delivery of merchant ships flying the U.S. flag has been, on the average, only 15 per year while the Soviet Union has averaged over 100 per year. The U.S.-Soviet comparative situation is basically this: We have not embarked on a major effort to build merchant ships since the Second World War; they began a major effort almost ten years ago and are continuing to pursue it with undiminished vigor.

#### COLD WAR ESCALATION AT SEA

On November 16, 1967, the U.S. Maritime Administration released a strangely ambivalent pamphlet on the Soviet Merchant Marine. Taking cognizance of the nature of the Soviet state, the short study points out that the Soviet merchant fleet could be used "as a political instrument for economic purposes and an economic instrument for political purposes." But it then goes on (based on a January, 1967, statement of Soviet Minister of Merchant Marine, Victor G. Bakayev) to indicate that the U.S.S.R. will not upset the international maritime balance. One might agree that this may be true of 1967 or even of 1968. But what of the future? The U.S. merchant marine has been steadily de-

teriorating. And the British merchant marine—upon which many of our exporters and importers have placed reliance—now appears to be headed towards a sharp decline. Can we believe that the Soviet Union will be so conscientious that, in the future, it will refrain from taking advantage of what will be a geopolitical fact of life? A recent pronouncement of Merchant Marine Minister Bakayev suggests that reliance on future Soviet good will on the high seas may be as futile as our past hopes that the U.S.S.R. would refrain from developing an orbital bombardment system. Minister Bakayev pointed out that (August 4, 1967): "You can see Soviet ships on all the waterways of the world. They visit more than 800 ports in 90 foreign countries, and the number of them on world sea routes increases year after year." And then he went on to say something that is cold comfort for those who would rely on Soviet promises instead of a strong, modern American merchant fleet. Said he: "Already today it (Soviet Merchant Marine) stands on a par with the fleets of traditional sea countries in all its indexes, and in the near future it will have no equal competitors." [Emphasis supplied.]

Some indication of the future thrust of Soviet maritime power is given by the escalating Soviet effort at sea to build up the North Vietnamese. American Security Council's Washington Report for August 21, 1967, pointed out that Soviet shipping going into North Vietnamese ports showed a marked increase this year over 1966. As of June 1967 the rate was eighteen ships per month with an additional 2 to 5 Soviet satellite ships per month and that a Moscow Radio broadcast of July 28 had boasted that Soviet ships left Odessa "practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam."

Equally instructive as to the possibilities inherent in employing a merchant marine presence as a psycho-political and subversive warfare weapon is a statement made by the Cuban Communists. In discussing the policy of "maximum expansion of our merchant fleet," Havana Radio on November 1, 1967, stated that young Cubans in maritime training schools would be "taught the language, geography, and history of the countries they will visit." When this is viewed in the context of Soviet directed and assisted training for unconventional warfare in Cuba, it would appear that, far from declining, the Cold War will be intensified at sea during the coming decade.

### Strengthening Crime Prevention

## HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of the crime problem, I believe that the Congress will be interested in a step taken by the city of Monrovia, Calif., for the purposes of strengthening its crime prevention effort.

The city of Monrovia, under an ordinance adopted December 5, 1967, created a crime prevention commission as part of the city government.

As established by the city council, the commission is to consist of not less than 11 members appointed by the mayor, subject to approval by the city council. Included on the commission are the chief of police, the juvenile officer, a member of the city council and at least eight other members.

The commission is not intended to

take over city governing duties or responsibilities. Instead its purpose is to study, to advise, and to make recommendations.

The ordinance provides that in its advisory capacity the crime commission shall:

Gather and analyze statistics about crime; cost and caseloads of the criminal justice system; acquire knowledge about the program and procedures to fight crime; and about those that have proved successful elsewhere; gather data about the social conditions that appear to be linked with crime; and information about potentially helpful individuals and organizations in the community, and communicate their recommendations on such matters to the City Council.

It is stipulated that the commission shall appraise the needs of the city to reduce crime and analyze the resources available to meet those needs and also that the commission shall make recommendations on any other matters which in its opinion will assist in preventing crime, improve the social environment, and make for better utilization of human resources of the community.

The ordinance specifically provides that the commission is not created to act as a police review board. It is not set up to review, discipline, or regulate the actions of the police.

Reflecting their deep concern over the crime problem, discussions which led to the creation of a crime prevention commission had been underway for a number of months by the city council, the city manager, the chief of police, and others prior to adoption of the ordinance. They were determined that more had to be done in an effort to alleviate the crime problem.

Their goal was to come up with a means to assist those who have been chosen to govern the city, to provide them with information, with ideas and recommendations. I believe their approach is the right one. The city of Monrovia, which is located in the congressional district I am privileged to represent, is to be highly commended for the lead it has taken toward solving the crime problem.

Cities far and wide, I am sure, will be watching with interest the results of Monrovia's crime commission to see how effective their approach will be.

#### A Citizen Speaks on Recent Supreme Court Decision

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday a letter from one of my constituents appeared in the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle.

Mr. Dewey Woods has expressed many of the thoughts which I have had since the deplorable decision of the Supreme Court last month, and the support of leaders from both sides of the aisle for legislation to counteract this decision is indeed encouraging.

The letter follows:

CXIV—99—Part 2

#### THOSE COURT RULINGS

The Editor: I am indeed proud to say I have read and re-read an article in which two great Americans, Senator Dirksen, Republican, and House Speaker McCormack, Democrat, are going to fight the ruling of the Supreme Court permitting communists to work in our defense plants.

Both are not only going to fight this decision but they are also going to attempt to curb several more moves not in the best interests of the country—moves likely to be made by the court.

Naturally, I won't attempt to specify everything these two great leaders have mentioned. I am grateful to know that there is a great Democrat and there is a great Republican interested in undoing this last un-American ruling.

It is ridiculous to let the Supreme Court get out of hand. I admit the court has been right in some instances, but I also insist it has been dead wrong in quite a few.

Primarily, I am a liberal. I favor advancement of Americanism, a victory for dignity and progress in general, but in no way will I knowingly favor anything not in the best interests of the country. Nor will I favor anything not in our framework of government.

As I said, the Supreme Court has gotten out of hand. When the states and the U.S. Congress can't make laws without the court nullifying them, then it is ridiculous to have elections.

Yes, I am proud of Senator Dirksen and Speaker McCormack. I am proud that a bipartisan stand is being made. I will not make a personal decision on 1968 until I see what is done toward overturning the defense-plant ruling and others.

I hope that someone will, through Jimmy Quillen perhaps, pass along my sentiments to Senator Dirksen and Speaker McCormack.

DEWEY WOODS.

ELIZABETHTON.

#### Hearst Junior Diplomat Project

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Hearst junior diplomat project is a public service youth incentive program initiated by the Hearst newspapers across the Nation in 1954. It is an outgrowth of an idea of the late William Randolph Hearst, Sr., in the late 1930's, that young American students should be given the opportunity to visit countries abroad to learn how the other half of the world lives. Unfortunately, the outbreak of hostilities after turmoil in various European countries prevented the implementation of this program until after the World War II and the resumption of peaceful economic ties among all nations.

The junior diplomats are selected from the rolls of the newspaper carrier boys who use their newspaper routes as a means of support in some cases, but in most cases use their income from distributing papers to save for college or to purchase items such as clothes, sports equipment, and recreational articles. To select the boys, the Hearst newspapers conduct contests each year and the winners are determined on the basis of courtesy, enterprise, route service, self-sufficiency, and scholarship.

The Hearst newspapers junior diplomat program, which frequently has had the participation of non-Hearst newspapers as well, has since 1954 had close to a million boys competing for the grand prize each year—this prize being an all-expense paid trip to friendly nations abroad. From this million boys 700 have been given the glorious experience to see firsthand the places they have read and learned about. Cooperating with the Hearst newspapers in initiating the program was a U.S. airline—Trans World Airlines with whom Hearst has continued to plan overseas trips excepting to areas in which TWA has no landing rights. Since 1954, these lucky junior diplomats have visited every continent on the globe—groups have visited Great Britain three times, Italy three times, Spain, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, France, Australia two times, Tunisia, Argentina, Brazil, the Philippines, Fiji, Pearl Harbor, and this year Israel and all the Holy Land, for the second time.

This year's trip was all the more memorable for the Hearst junior diplomats, with the cooperation of the Israeli Minister of Tourism and Development, the boys spent Christmas Eve in Bethlehem at the very spot of Jesus' birth. They also attended solemn high Mass together with other VIP's in the St. Catherine's Church in Nativity Square. The Israel Ministry also arranged for the junior diplomats to be guided throughout the Holy Land by Johnny Bauer, considered the country's most erudite guide, and he took the group through the very paths followed by His Holiness Pope Paul VI when he himself visited the Holy Land 3 years ago. This is something any boy, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, only dreams about but very rarely has the opportunity to see for himself. But the Hearst newspapers, together with TWA and the Israel Government made it possible for them to see.

In the concept of the late William Randolph Hearst, Sr., the junior diplomats have also had the opportunity to see how the other half lives—the heads of state and their constituents. Boys remember well their meetings with youths their own age in frank discussions on world affairs, in learning native folklore and participating with host country families and Government officials in receptions and private parties.

That is not all. The junior diplomats act as junior diplomats as they carry messages of goodwill to hosts abroad—these include presidents and mayors, congressional leaders, and regional chiefs. This year in particular, the junior diplomats carried with them and presented personally letters from President Lyndon B. Johnson and from former President Harry S. Truman to President Zalman Shazar of Israel who received the boys and their escorts in the official presidential residence. Young Michael McMillon, of the San Antonio Light, read President's Johnson's letter while little Wally Papciak, of Chicago's American, read the Truman message to President Shazar. The Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives had the junior diplomat personally deliver and read a

message of greetings to the Speaker of the Israel Knesset, the Honorable Kadish Luz, while he received the junior diplomats in his Knesset chambers. We are happy to say that Speaker McCORMACK's letter was received with great enthusiasm as it was read by my own Boston constituent, 14-year-old Michael S. Foster, of the Boston Record American-Sunday Advertiser newspaperboy organization. I was very proud of this boy and his Boston confrere, Jimmy O'Brien, as they departed themselves in the Holy Land, attending church services with fervor and the impressions they made abroad as they reflected the best of American boyhood and opportunity. Michael Foster truly made a fine representative.

Living up to the traditional role of American junior diplomat, young Foster served on a youth panel discussion which was being broadcast over Israel's radio network and under the sponsorship of the Jerusalem Post. The discussion followed a special reception at the International Cultural Center for Youth in Jerusalem. This remarkable center attracts the country's youth representing every religious or political belief, and one of the featured entertainments for the evening was a dance group made up of youthful Armenians and Arabs from the Old Jerusalem area who as young boys and girls want to participate in all cultural pursuits as Israeli citizens in the belief preached by the International Cultural Center for Youth that is the best way for understanding.

When a question period followed, the inevitable subject of Vietnam, our peace-niks and integration in the United States was brought up, and as to whether the world's youth can best accomplish peace, my young constituent Mike Foster quickly rose to defend U.S. policy. Michael told the assembled guests and audience on the radio, that America's peaceniks are not really sincere in their desire for peace. He said most of them are just trying to get out of fighting just to save their own skins and that's all. He brought down the house when he said that Negro boys and girls get along well with their white neighbors—it is just that the parents don't follow the same habits.

The Hearst newspapers, comprised of the Albany Times Union, Albany Knickerbocker News, my own constituent newspapers Boston's Record American and Sunday Advertiser, Baltimore News American, Los Angeles Herald Examiner, San Antonio Light, San Francisco Examiner, and Seattle Post-Intelligencer, together with Chicago's American and the Washington Evening and Sunday Star, are to be congratulated for their public service youth incentive program this year. Similar congratulations should go to the Israel Government Ministry of Tourism and Trans World Airlines who this year made this worthwhile project possible.

I am personally proud of this project for it is in the good old American tradition here that enables youngsters to use newspaper routes to develop personal incentive. I am proud to say that I, too, once sold newspapers. So did many other Members of Congress and other Ameri-

cans who have reached the heights in government and the professions. Our good friend, the Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, as can be seen in the attached letter to the junior diplomats, was a newspaperboy. So was Harry S. Truman, former President Eisenhower, Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren, my own Cardinal Cushing and others in industry, the arts, and sciences—all of whom started their lives as newspaperboys. This is recognized by our men in the executive branch, legislative branch, who annually hail the Hearst junior diplomats as they depart and then return from their youthful missions as junior diplomats in the service of America's senior diplomats.

This year's junior diplomat trip has just ended and already the Hearst newspapers are planning other trips. Where to next, now that junior diplomats have visited every continent? With our sights now set for the moon, perhaps that is next—but that would depend on whether TWA can get landing rights there—nevertheless, it will be something to consider in the Hearst newspaper youth incentive programs of the future—incentives to win college scholarships, go into professions and being inspired to follow a path of public service.

In my remarks, I include:

First. Letter sent by the President of the United States to the President of Israel.

Second. Letter sent by the President of the United States to the American newspaperboys and junior diplomats who took the recent trip.

Third. Letter sent by former President Harry S. Truman to the President of Israel.

Fourth. Letter from the Vice President of the United States to the junior diplomats.

Fifth. Letter from Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Under Secretary of State, to the junior diplomats.

Sixth. Letter from myself to the Speaker of the Knesset of Israel.

Seventh. Letter from the Honorable Zalman Shazar, President of Israel, to William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

Eighth. Copy of a letter from Hon. Moshe Kol, Minister of Development and Tourism of Israel to William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

Ninth. Copy of letter from William Randolph Hearst, Jr., to the junior diplomats.

The above-mentioned material follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, November 16, 1967.

HIS EXCELLENCY ZALMAN SHAZAR,  
President of Israel.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Once more I take this opportunity to greet you through our American Junior Diplomats who are again guests of your country in a manifestation of our nation's mutual respect and goodwill.

In this period of prayer, commemoration, and festivity during the momentous 20th Anniversary Year of the re-establishment of Israel as a modern state, the youngsters' hearts and minds, as well as our own, will hark back to the thousands of years since the establishment of the Holy Land as the fountainhead of great religions.

Now, as the Holy Land holiday lights go on to signal the start of the world's religious and

historic celebrations, it is our fervent hope that this year will indeed prove of even greater significance. May it bring the realization of the ancient dream of mankind for genuine peace on earth.

With all my good wishes and best regards,  
Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, November 16, 1967.

I am delighted to convey my warmest greetings to the American newspaper boys and "Junior Diplomats" who have been chosen to visit Rome and Israel this Christmastime.

Our complex society calls upon mature and responsible young adults to prepare themselves well for the challenging years that lie ahead. The leaders of the free world—and civic spirited men and women everywhere—are working to leave you a better world. But our task would be in vain if it lacked your support.

You who have been selected for this goodwill mission have proved yourselves ready to approach the problems of this trying time. You have given us all reason to be proud and to be reassured by the qualities that you will bring to your duties as citizens and as leaders.

Your trip is another steppingstone in your education for the future. It is another opportunity to broaden the horizons of your own lives and of the life of your nation. I know that you will use it well, and that America will benefit by your success.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

INDEPENDENCE, MO.,  
November 14, 1967.

HIS EXCELLENCY, ZALMAN SHAZAR,  
President of Israel,  
Embassy of Israel, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased most highly to transmit through the visiting Junior Diplomats to your Country, my warm greetings to you, Mr. President, and to the courageous and industrious people of the State of Israel.

I express hope that an enduring peace with dignity and justice will soon come to this and other parts of a troubled world, so that the people can get on with the task of making a better and happier life for themselves.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
Washington.

DEAR JUNIOR DIPLOMATS: I am delighted to greet you newspaperboys as you depart for one of the finest experiences of your lives—an educational and inspiring visit to the Holy Land during the holy season.

When I delivered newspapers back in Doland, South Dakota, we did it to earn money for school, for our personal needs and as a public service to our community. We didn't dream of high rewards. But by distinguishing yourselves on your daily routes, your newspapers are giving you this magnificent opportunity to see the hallowed Biblical and historic sites sacred to three of mankind's greatest religions. You will see, too, the leaders of Israel and the people who have brought life into barren soil and have demonstrated democratic spirit and courage which have won the admiration of the free world.

As you mingle with the youth of Israel in play, cultural activities and prayer during the Chanukah season, you will, I am sure, further absorb some of the qualities traditional to those who love their country and are willing to sacrifice in its behalf.

As Israel celebrates the 20th Anniversary Year of its re-establishment as an independent state, please extend to your hosts my renewed best wishes and high regard. Congratulations to you, to the Hearst Newspapers

and to all those participating with them in this fine project.

From this adventure, may you proceed to build careers which will, I am confident, bring pride to your parents, your teachers, your community and your nation.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, December 14, 1967.

DEAR JUNIOR DIPLOMATS: Please accept my best wishes for an enjoyable holiday visit to Rome and Israel.

The trip will be a memorable experience since you will be visiting two areas whose ancient civilizations contributed so much to history.

I am confident that you will serve as excellent ambassadors of goodwill for the United States and for international understanding.

Sincerely yours,

NICHOLAS DEB KATZENBACH,  
Acting Secretary.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

HON. KADISH LUZ,  
Speaker of the Knesset,  
Hakiry, Jerusalem.

DEAR FRIEND LUZ: It is again my pleasure to greet you, my counterpart in Israel, through the good offices of my two young Boston constituents, Michael Foster and James O'Brien of the Boston Record American and Sunday Advertiser.

The boys are visiting your country as members of the Hearst Newspapers Junior Diplomats as guests of the Israel Government Ministry of Tourism and with the cooperation of Trans World Airlines on a goodwill trip. This, as you know, is the second such group and it has come to my attention that this is the first time that a repeat trip to one country has been made within a period of two years. I am told that the reason for this is the wonderful reaction the boys had during the 1965 visit.

I can well understand such a reaction. All of us in the United States have known about the holy shrines and sites of interest to people of all faiths. Some of us more fortunate have seen these places with our own eyes and have marvelled at the wonders of modern Israel—that strong little bastion across the ocean which shares with my own country the love for freedom and democratic ideals. But recently, every one of us has read and heard about the valor of your people and their determination to stay free. It made us all proud of being your friends.

During this 20th Anniversary year of your re-establishment as an independent state, we have even another reason to salute you and extend to you all our best wishes and our highest regards. As a token of this and as a symbol of our mutual respect and admiration I take this opportunity and pleasure to present to you through Michael Foster and James O'Brien a gavel that I used during the proceedings of the House of Representatives. May it serve as a constant reminder of our friendship and admiration. May it soon sound the coming of peace to your shores and all the world.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

JERUSALEM, November 24, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.  
Hearst Newspapers,  
New York City

DEAR MR. HEARST: I must admit to having been specially pleased when I learned that the Junior Diplomats are once more to come to Israel. We still remember their tour two years ago and are tempted to think that had that not been worth while, you would not have decided to choose Israel as the host country just two years later. Certainly all of us who are to be involved with the boys, will do our best to make this second tour pleasant and memorable for them.

We are happy indeed that the Israel they will visit has so safely weathered what might have been a tragically destructive storm. Six months after the Six Day War the boys will be able to see all of this historic Land of Israel and at the same time to witness the intensity of our country's struggle for enduring peace in our region of the world.

With all my best wishes to you.  
Sincerely,

ZALMAN SHAZAR,  
President of Israel.

JERUSALEM, November 15, 1967.

DEAR MR. HEARST: We are extremely pleased that Israel has again been selected to host the Hearst Newspapers Junior Diplomats programme.

We look forward to the forthcoming visit of the Junior Diplomats and assure you of our cooperation in order to make their trip a memorable one.

We recall with great pleasure their first visit to Israel and the excellent impression they made on us as outstanding representatives of American youth. Their demeanour and spirit endeared them to all who met with them during their stay, and we are sure that the Junior Diplomats of 1967 will have just as successful a tour as the first Group who visited us in 1965.

It is our sincere hope that their tour of Israel will give the bright and energetic boys selected this year, a sense of the strong ties between the old-new Commonwealth of Israel and their own American fatherland whose culture is rooted in the ideals of prophets preached in this very Land of Israel among our ancestors so many centuries ago.

Plans are already well under to ensure the Junior Diplomats complete success for their stay in the Land of the Bible. They will visit the Holy Shrines, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, the Sea of Galilee, the Negev, the Red Sea and the rest of the land long associated with the Bible as well as modern Israel.

We trust that your young Democrats will find their stay here interesting, pleasant and most meaningful.

May I again express to you the sincere appreciation of the Ministry of Tourism for selecting Israel as venue for the Junior Diplomats' programme, and assure you of our utmost attention and fullest cooperation at all times.

Sincerely yours,

MOSHE KOL,  
Minister of Development and Tourism.

HEARST NEWSPAPERS,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR JUNIOR DIPLOMATS: Congratulations on your appointments to represent your community and our nation in a goodwill Christmas Holiday in the Holy Land and Rome.

A few weeks ago I, too, visited Israel while on a Hearst Task Force fact-finding trip around the world. I find it difficult to name any other country as inspiring as little Israel. Not only for the hallowed shrines of the Holy Land and the sites of ancient miracles—but also for the modern miracle performed so recently by its people overcoming of greatest odds in their struggle to survive.

As our prize-winning newspaperboys you are now privileged to visit the Holy Land for an experience men of all religions have dreamed of for ages. I know that you will keep your eyes, ears and hearts open and return home richer in knowledge, faith and understanding—particularly for the meaning of devotion to one's country and democratic ideals.

This is the year Israel celebrates its 20th Anniversary of its re-establishment as an independent state, and the program laid out for you by the Israel Government and TWA assures us that you will come back with pleasant memories that will last a lifetime. I hope that in your participation and mingling with the wonderful people of Israel

and Rome you will be leaving with them a similar fine impression of American youth. Extend to all my best holiday greetings.

Shalom and good wishes.

Sincerely,

W. R. HEARST, Jr.

**Students, Teachers Would Be Hard Hit by Travel Restrictions—Experiment in International Living Backs Reuss Plan To Attract More Europeans to the United States**

**HON. HENRY S. REUSS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, most of the possible forms of restriction on American travel overseas would bear particularly on students and teachers, whose low-budget visits to Europe represent an important part of their education and of the development of intercultural contacts.

One of the outstanding organizations concerned with educational travel is the Experiment in International Living. The group's president, Gordon Boyce, points out:

Restrictive legislation threatens the existence of established institutions like the Experiment, whose constituency comprises students and teachers, a large proportion of whom receive financial assistance. They go abroad, not as tourists, but to live and to learn. Moreover, for years it has been our policy to insist that Experimenters limit their overseas spending to a very modest scale.

Accordingly, the Experiment supports my alternative to restrictionism. This proposal which would achieve an improvement in the American tourist deficit by creating incentives to bring an additional 500,000 European visitors to the United States this year. Details of the plan are found on pages 35 through 37 of the RECORD of January 15, 1968.

I include hereafter the text of Mr. Boyce's letter:

THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING,  
Putney, Vt., January 25, 1968.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,

House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I have noted with considerable interest and enthusiasm your current efforts to attract more dollars to the United States through the medium of free travel-stamp booklets to first-time visitors to this country. As an institution which for many years has been deeply involved in programming for foreign students, teachers and professional coming to the United States, and which is committed to the maintenance of a sound dollar, The Experiment in International Living strongly supports your thinking along these lines.

The Experiment is perhaps unique among U.S. educational exchange organizations because its operations involve bringing more people to this country (2,800 in 1967) than it sends overseas. We estimate that in 1967 these incoming programs generated some \$1,200,000. It is our considered judgment that a proposal such as yours could, for instance, enable this single institution to increase the flow of people to this country under its aegis by a third in the ensuing year.

Your approach to the problem of eliminating the imbalance in our international trade pattern seems to me to be sound, constructive and feasible. As you know, The Experiment in International Living was founded in 1932 and in subsequent years has developed into a major institution carrying on educational exchange programs on six continents, including sizable operations in the Western Hemisphere. As a volunteer, nonprofit instrument of higher education, we have long worked closely and harmoniously with agencies of the United States Government, including the State Department, the Peace Corps, Volunteers to America, AID and the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs. As such, we feel that we have contributed effectively to strengthening our Nation's position in the world. Indeed, this may be the reason why, in 1965, President Johnson himself said, "The imaginative development of new approaches to world understanding is the hallmark of the successful Experiment in International Living."

Consequently, we view with no small concern any legislation which might be aimed indiscriminately at overseas travel as another method of solving the problem with which you are grappling. Such legislation threatens the existence of established institutions like The Experiment, whose constituency comprises students and teachers, a large proportion of whom receive financial assistance. They go abroad, not as tourists, but to live and to learn. Moreover, for years it has been our policy to insist that Experimenters limit their overseas spending to a very modest scale. At the same time, their presence abroad annually makes it possible for us to generate an increasing flow of dollars to the United States on the part of their foreign counterparts.

Committed as we are to supporting our national interests, we look upon your proposed plan with confidence and enthusiasm. We are eager to give our full backing to this or to any similar proposal which will at the same time help meet the problem of the dollar drain and protect the existence of long-established, nonprofit institutions engaged in low-cost international exchanges for students and teachers. I hope you will let me know how we can help.

Faithfully yours,

GORDON BOYCE,  
President.

### Salute to the Honorable Clyde Ellis

#### HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman from Arkansas who is extremely well known on the congressional scene retired last week after 25 years as general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I refer, of course, to the Honorable Clyde Ellis, a former Member of this body who represented the old Third Congressional District of Arkansas.

On January 15 at the "Salute to Clyde Ellis Dinner," Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman outlined the outstanding record of the NRECA since Clyde Ellis took over its leadership in 1943. Not only did the Secretary recount the achievements of NRECA under Mr. Ellis, he also discussed the importance of direct loans and the important role which they have played in building rural America.

I would like to take this occasion to wish Clyde Ellis well in his future endeavors. I also include Secretary Freeman's speech at this point in the RECORD:

"SALUTE TO CLYDE ELLIS" DINNER ADDRESSED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN

When I received the invitation to address this "Salute to Clyde Ellis" dinner, it occurred to me that the term "salute" was especially appropriate to the man we honor here tonight.

Let me tell you why from deep personal experience I have crouched in many a duck blind with Clyde and never have I seen a man salute more ducks, with more salvos, at longer range and with less effect than he.

Clyde may have been the model for that story of the grizzled, dead-eye hunter who took his grandson hunting with him for the first time. When the first duck came over the old-timer blasted once, twice, three times. As the duck flew into the distance the man watched. Then he turned to the boy and said, "Son, you're witnessing a miracle—Yonder flies a dead duck."

But that is not being fair, Clyde is a good hunting and fishing companion, and one, incidentally, who can eat more buckwheat cakes than any man alive.

It is just that the old Ellis optimism on occasion leads him to believe that his gun will reach farther and hit harder than any one else's, and then that typical Ellis aggressiveness takes over and he lets go at that far-out duck or goose. So don't go with him if you want to stay hidden in that blind waiting for the sure shot.

But Clyde never insisted on sure shots, and that, I think, is a principal reason for the magnificent record of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association since he took over the helm in 1943, just 25 years ago this month.

He would be the last to agree, but the hand of Clyde Ellis is in the lights that blaze over rural yards that once were dark from dusk to dawn—five million of them across the land.

The hand of Clyde Ellis is in the steel plant in rural Congaree, South Carolina, and in hundreds of other plants that offer new hope, and new directions to millions of Americans in Town and Country, U.S.A.

His hand is in history's greatest production achievement, that of the American farmers.

His hand is in electric cooperatives formed or being formed in 25 countries throughout the world.

I personally felt his hand this summer when I visited the rural water system at Six-Mile, South Carolina, when I visited man-made Saddle Lake in Indiana, the farmer-owned welding shop in southern Iowa, and the small farmer machinery co-op in Mississippi.

Clyde's hand today is almost everywhere that rural Americans are using their government to help them to help themselves.

That hand is there not only because of the electrical energy it helped to supply, but also—and I think this is even more important—it is there because Clyde Ellis and NRECA have made *credit* a respectable word in government circles.

In a few moments I want to emphasize how powerful an element credit has been and can still be in building America, provided we don't handcuff ourselves.

But first let's take a look at some of the things that NRECA and Clyde Ellis have done since he assumed the leadership in that wartime January 25 years ago.

Some of you may recall that shoes were rationed to three pairs per year, and rationing began on canned goods, meat, fat, and cheese.

The year loomed darkly for rural electric cooperatives.

Sixty percent of rural Americans were still struggling with kerosene lamps and Delco energizers, and materials for line construction were frozen.

Insurance companies were extremely reluctant to write accident and casualty policies covering co-op systems employees.

This was the picture facing Clyde Ellis as the new General Manager of the NRECA. Typically, he charged right into the problems. The first annual meeting of the NRECA membership was called just two weeks after he took over his new job.

By that time 393 of the co-ops and power districts were members and the meeting was a demonstration of strength.

In their official action, the delegates urged that they be permitted to help in the nation's war effort by making more rural electric service available to increase food and fiber production with less manpower.

They needed power for pumping, for lights, for milking, for refrigeration, for irrigation, for welders. They argued that without widespread electrification the farms of America could not possibly produce the sharply increased volume of food and fiber needed at home and abroad to win the war.

Clyde and members of the association pressed this case with Congress, the White House, the administrative agencies and, as Clyde recalls it, with anyone else in Washington they thought might help. Help came. OPM amended the construction freeze order that same month, and insurance, after a bitter struggle, came to the co-ops.

Not every problem dealing with getting rural America electrified in the succeeding years was brought to a successful conclusion by Clyde and NRECA, but it wasn't due to any lack of will or dedication on the part of either.

Marquis Childs, in his book, *The Farmer Takes a Hand*, put it this way: "Ellis, his staff and the farm leaders behind them bring to rural electrification a devotion so intense it is almost religious in nature. Ellis' drive, coming from many sources in his own background, in the mainspring in NRECA's struggle in behalf of its members."

The cheaper rates (2-cent power in 1968 compared to 4½-cent power in 1943), the farm lights, the milking machines, rural telephones, the billion-dollar-a-year appliance market, the thousands of productive jobs created are great accomplishments—magnificent accomplishments.

But there is a spin-off here that stands on its own as a magnificent accomplishment, one that is not measured in miles of lines or numbers of farms. It is the demonstration that the proper use of credit can unleash dynamic forces of development in Town and Country, U.S.A.

The use of government credit was applied to the monumental task of energizing a blacked-out town and countryside, and in one generation it has revolutionized rural life. Today, 98.4 percent of our farms are served by central station electric service.

It resulted in the formation of dynamic rural corporate organizations that have chalked up the finest loan repayment record in the history of banking.

And everyone has profited: country America, small town America and city America, which reaps the benefits of rural production—and, contrary to the gloomy predictions of those who tried to block REA 35 years ago, the government is getting its money back—with interest.

Since 1935, \$5.3 billion have been advanced in REA loans; \$1.8 billion have been paid back, plus interest, and—listen to this—\$306 million of this has been paid back *in advance of the due date*.

Total losses on this \$5.3 billion investment in rural America since the program began have been 44—not million—but 44 thousand dollars, involving two co-ops. And one of these was a small co-op off the coast of North

Carolina that was wiped out by a hurricane in the '40s.

Now with this dramatic accomplishment before us, I would like to ask you a big question, a question I hope you will think about when you leave here tonight:

Are we applying this blueprint for progress, this primer on credit to the unmet challenges of Town and Country America?

Have we applied it to the 3.9 million substandard homes of rural America?

Have we applied it to the gullied, eroded land?

Have we applied it to the 43,000 small towns that lack a sewer system?

Have we applied it to the 33,000 rural communities that lack a central water system?—to the farm house—a house that I have seen—were water is hauled a mile and stored in a barrel?

I regret to say: We have not. But why?

In large part we have *not* made optimum use of this important key to improving the quality of American life because of a Federal system that insists on recording loans made directly from a Federal agency to individuals, associations or groups on its books as if they were expenditures from the treasury—*when they are not*.

This, to me, is one of the most frustrating paradoxes of our time.

I know of no bank, no business that treats a disbursement of funds for investment, a loan to a creditable borrower, as an operating expense—but the Federal Government does.

On the other hand, by Federal rules, a loan insured by a Federal agency—a loan which the Federal Government guarantees will be paid—is *not* an expenditure.

But insured loans fall short of Town and Country needs. They usually are subject to the vagaries of the local credit market, so the supply of money at the local bank—a bank which perhaps has no funds to tie up in long-term investment.

Town and Country community development leaders, with bankable plans for sound projects for solid community growth, need somewhere to turn for funds they can't borrow at home.

Unfortunately, far too few today can turn to the direct Federal loan. They are shut out, their projects cut down by a Janus-like procedure that looks at loans two ways.

This simply doesn't make sense. As any businessman or banker knows—as all REA borrowers know—a loan from anyone to anybody for any purpose is merely the temporary exchange of one asset (money) for another asset (notes, mortgages, collateral, and so forth.)

If it is a sound loan, and the borrower conducts a sound operation, the loan will be repaid—with interest—and the lender will be restored to his original fiscal position.

In many States and cities of the United States—and even in some of the so-called "less developed" countries—the government bookkeepers treat government loans for what they are: capital investments that are self-liquidating, or repayable.

But in the Federal Government we continue to insist—contrary to common sense at best, and with an almost lunatic fanaticism at worst—that loans be treated as budget expenditures and loan repayments as receipts, with the net difference charged or credited to the public debt.

In a growing economy, with a growing need for and use of credit, this means that in any given fiscal year loan outlays will exceed repayments of previous loans. This in turn means—under present practices—a net charge to the public debt, which it should not be. The end result is an artificial constraint on the total availability of government credit in any given fiscal year.

I had hoped that the Commission on Budget Concepts appointed by President Johnson last year would resolve this prob-

lem for us once and for all. Their recent report did address itself to Federal lending at some length—but their recommendations stopped short of advocating a basic change in the bookkeeping.

They recommended that the Federal budget at least separate loans from other expenditures—so that the public can see the subtotals. And they would show the net difference between loans made and loans repaid. But they would still add that "net" difference to the grand totals for the budget and charge (or credit) the difference to the public debt.

Losses on loans, interest differentials, would be carried in the operating expense part of the budget, not the lending part.

So the fundamental problem remains—though recommendations of the Commission will help improve the debate somewhat by highlighting the numbers a little more clearly.

But I propose that we stop debating. I propose, and I urge every one of you here tonight to propose, that we eliminate this handicap to development now, that we change this archaic bookkeeping system so that our national growth will be helped, not hindered.

If you have any doubts about what can be done with the direct loan, I call your attention once more to the repayment record under REA, and to the gains of Clyde Ellis and NRECA under this program and for this Nation.

Please don't misunderstand me—I am not pessimistic. There is exciting progress in Town and Country U.S.A., but it is progress in halting steps when measured against the task—progress that should come in giant strides, and that *could* come in giant strides if we took out of our boots some of the lead weights that we ourselves have put there, and started realizing the great potential of government credit.

Everyone here is aware that one of the greatest problems this Nation faces is rural-urban imbalance. We have permitted people to be literally driven by economic necessity to the big city, all too often into the ghettos. This very night the people-space equation cries for attention as we search for a national policy for rural-urban balance rather than continuing to squeeze more and more people onto less and less space.

But as I said, all is not bleak. There is reason for cautious optimism that an important change is beginning.

Efforts by Clyde Ellis and NRECA, the USDA and millions of people all over this land to build up Town and Country U.S.A. appear to be getting some results.

A recently-released Census study shows that on a percentage basis, the growth of metropolitan areas—that is cities of more than 50,000 and their surrounding territories—is slowing, while the percentage growth of non-metropolitan areas—Town and Country—is increasing.

Metropolitan areas are still growing faster than non-metro areas, but the gap is narrowing.

It is also significant that new jobs in cities of under 25,000 have been increasing at a faster rate than in large metropolitan areas over the past few years. In the decade of the 50's, new jobs in these small cities and rural areas, grew at about 2 percent a year—about the national average. But from 1962 to '66 employment grew at about 4 percent a year, higher than the national average and that of metropolitan areas.

In the 1950's, Town and Country had about 17 percent of the Nation's job growth. In 1962 to '64 this grew to about 25 percent—up about half.

Increasing activity by local leaders in self-help programs shows up dramatically in the expansion of USDA Town and Country programs.

Funds to build the basic water and sewer

facilities a community needs to attract industry have gone from less than \$1 million in 1960 to \$22 million this year. The number of people helped each year has grown from 20,000 to more than a million.

Loans for private homes, migrant labor housing and Senior Citizen housing have increased 13-fold since 1960, from about \$40 million to more than half a billion dollars a year.

Since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1965, some 45,000 individual and group loans, totaling \$96 million, have gone directly to the poor, giving these families a means to raise their incomes.

In the Department, we're integrating conservation with economic development through Resource Conservation and Development projects. Seven years ago we did not have one such project in the United States. Now, 41 have been approved for planning and operations embracing 100 million acres—an area almost the size of Iowa, Illinois and Wisconsin combined.

Each of these projects conserves natural resources in an integrated, well-planned manner; each brings jobs to local communities, conserving the human and economic base of rural America.

Seven years ago there were 312 Watershed projects approved for operations; now we have 827. Multi-purpose projects have increased from 95 to 439.

Since the advent of Greenspan in 1963, the Agriculture Department has been able to make 139 grants in 27 States to set up parks, wildlife sanctuaries, hunting areas and water-based recreation. We have loaned \$61 million to rural communities to develop outdoor recreation areas that add to the attractiveness of the community and encourage the location of new business and industry.

This then is the vision of Clyde Ellis now proving itself.

Clyde's perspective of the future and his forceful leadership is helping to make his visions realities brings to mind this quotation:

"A vision without a task  
Is a dream.  
A task without a vision  
Is drudgery.  
But a vision and a task  
Are the hope of the world."

Fortunately for America—rural and urban—today is for Clyde Ellis commencement day, not graduation day. Fortunately, for all of us, he will continue to be Mr. Rural Electrification, still taking those optimistic, aggressive long shots: I close my part of this testimonial program tonight by announcing that Clyde Ellis has accepted an appointment to my staff. He will serve as a special consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture with special emphasis on building Town and Country U.S.A. so rural-urban balance can become, like rural electrification, not a dream, but a reality.

Clyde, welcome aboard.

### Highway Safety on Secondary Roads

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Joseph A. Sturrett, county engineer of Stark County, Ohio, spoke about highway safety on secondary roads at the recent convention of the American Road Builders Association, and in the course of his address offered some original thinking on the subject of Federal aid that deserves

the attention of legislators and public officials everywhere. Mr. Sturrett points out how Federal aid may distort the balance that should be maintained in local projects, erode local responsibility, and create new problems that localities cannot afford to correct. I commend these remarks to you as follows:

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY ON SECONDARY ROADS

(Address to American Road Builders Convention, by Joseph A. Sturrett, Stark County Engineer, Canton, Ohio)

My topic of discussion today deals with highway safety on the secondary roads and its relationship with political policy.

Although we all strongly favor the building of better highways, I feel just as strongly against the policy of granting a decade of first priority to a single federal highway system; mostly on new location; and when completed will serve only 20% of the highway users.

The great consumption of time and money needed for the interstate system has led to a dangerous neglect of the existing routes and a tremendous loss of life and property. A correlation can be drawn with this policy and the man who came home to find his house on fire with his family still within it; and he proceeded to build a new house on new location without putting out the fire or saving his family.

I don't think the Congress intended to promote negligence by enactment of the Highway Act of 1956. I do not think the Congress intended to relieve the states of their basic responsibilities to the existing system, but this is exactly what is happening in Ohio. With every mile of new state highway construction, the old state routes are "journalized" over to local governments without any compensation to them. It is no wonder that Ohio, which leads in highway construction, is also among the leaders in highway tragedies. The old "killer" roads which have been all but forgotten in the light of our four lane super highways are still with us. They have not been plowed under and they still have the narrow bridges, the blind hills, the dangerous curves, and impossible sight distances. Lacking in both legislation and funds, county government can only resort to long range programs, during which time valuable funds are wasted on repetitive maintenance.

In view of all the growth factors affecting our local communities it would be suicidal to neglect these secondary roads until the completion of the interstate system in 1972 or the freeways in 1980 or after. The inefficiencies and losses from the disorder and congestion of traffic in many of our urban areas far outweighs the advantages of the few miles of interstate highways which pass through them.

To promote highway safety most county engineers without capital improvements funds must use a legally approved system of signing. Signs are no match to the elements of fog and darkness, rain and snow and sleet. These signs which warn of danger are a product of law to save harmless those in government but no guarantee to do the same for a driver in a snow storm.

Although engineers in secondary highway administration have been critical of the distribution of highway revenues, their criticism has never been lacking for recommendations. At our 1964 annual convention in Tucson, Arizona, it was pleaded that we seek a better balance to the construction of the interstate system with the secondary routes. It was pointed out that failure to do so would result in the paradox of building the world's greatest highway system without solution to highway safety.

#### TRAFFIC DEATHS INCREASE

Since that convention, our traffic records have borne out this truth and dictates that something is not right. Since then our an-

nual rate of traffic deaths have increased by 10,000 and now totals more than 53,000, and it's going to get worse. If we project this selfish and inconsiderate policy into the next decade, more than half a million people will perish on our highway systems and 15 million more will suffer disabling injuries; and the property damage will exceed twice the cost of building the interstate system. I believe that a proper balance to all highway construction could reduce these figures by 25 percent.

I have heard it said at interstate dedication ceremonies that this system has already saved 3,000 lives during the past year. You may hear it repeated at this convention. The question now arises as to who shall be accredited for the increase of 4,000 fatalities during the same year. We have two groups of thought on this question both of which contradict one another. One group is naive and the other is rationalizing. The first group are those who apply statistics to prove that only 2 lives are lost for each 100 million miles of travel on interstate; while 10.4 lives are lost on off routes for the same travel. From these figures I would think that here is definite proof of deficiency alone taking an extra 8 lives on the off routes. But the second group doesn't think so. During the past year their efforts have focused upon many varying aspects, such as safety belts, driver inspection, law enforcement, drivers license, vehicle inspection, alcohol tests, and even automobile manufacture. If we are going to use statistics, then we must place all our drivers and automobiles into one common denominator and look for truth. The fact will then remain that this is the same driver and the same vehicle which travels so safely on interstate but finds himself in danger on the off routes, mostly because of highway deficiency.

#### COUNTY ROADS NEGLECTED

You have often heard the term of "feeder route" as applied to the function of certain roads as feeders to super highways. In my experience this is a mis-nomer. The interstate super highway is really the feeder inasmuch that it gushes its great volumes of traffic into the deficient areas at certain points. This is where the trouble begins and the exposure to highway danger is 10 times greater. This is where a driver leaves a high speed facility and suddenly finds himself mixed with slow moving local traffic on narrow and congested roads. Eventually this congestion causes a complete disruption of the normal traffic patterns over a wide area; this in turn leads to the destruction of the esthetic values of many residential and school areas. Many of these local roads, never built for the heavy loads of interstate, are being severely damaged by this movement.

We in the engineering field often use the so-called benefit-cost analysis in order to justify certain projects or to establish priorities; and which dictates that the first warrant for highway construction is based on traffic use. But counties do not have the financing nor the political influence to apply this formula even though a county road carries more and heavier traffic. The same data which justifies interstate highways is meaningless for county systems because highway problems have fallen into separate and distinct domains of interest. The Federal Bureau of Roads is intensely interested in completion of the interstate system, while the states in addition to interstate are interested in building their own freeways. In Ohio all of this is being done with callous disregard for the county systems; not only by transferring defective state mileage to them but by neglecting to provide increased revenue needed to solve the original impossible highway problem.

Most county engineers have known the key for highway safety for many years. Our message has simply not gotten through to the right people; and if it ever does what

plan of action shall we recommend to them? We could ask for a larger share of the current highway revenues, or we could request an increase of fuel taxes specially earmarked to county roads; but all this would only lead to endless debate and controversy. Inasmuch that I have made some strong allegations it is only fair that I propose a better way. First, in spite of this paper, I recognize that state and federal highway administrators are only doing their jobs; and doing it very well in the national interest. Our only gripe is that they make no allowance for our position. Secondly, I am very much annoyed at criticism leveled at the President for all the things that go wrong at the local level. I would propose that we take an objective and comprehensive look at our local problems, not just highways, but the whole picture.

#### LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Take a good look at our slums, our air and water pollution and all the rest, and try to understand how it all came about. You will see that we are slowly and surely becoming a nation of beggars; and depending upon someone else to do our job. For too many years local government has been asleep. The evils of impassive public acceptance of events during the past 30 years are now resting on the doorsteps of every American. The failure of local governments to provide for their own needs over the years has led to an ever increasing participation of federal government into local affairs. We are now in crisis in almost every facet of government. We refused to tax ourselves so Uncle Sam did it for us; and this has been going on for a long time. The one hitch to this is that he doesn't give our taxes back to us unless we qualify, and fill out papers, and match what they give, and follow their rules. Even then we can never get it all back because Uncle Sam spreads it around; even into areas where it was not collected.

Another hitch is that a big chunk of these taxes are used for administration and planning. We are now pushing pencils instead of shovels and depending on government to do our thinking. The rank and file of our communities have been lulled, by promises, with a secure concept that somebody is doing the job. They have heard the dreamers and planners talking of the shocking pink roofs and town houses and the wonderful world of tomorrow; but they pay no attention to the basic needs for our kind of civilization. While they are dreaming we are concerned with raw sewage that pollutes our streams; garbage that litters our countryside roads; and an impossible roadway system. As crisis develop, these people are slowly learning that nobody is doing the job. They will soon realize the utter impossibility for it to be done by federal or state government. Slums and urban blight are developing more rapidly today after many years of federal assistance; the ultimate conclusion will be that it can and must be done by the local community.

Being fully aware of the sincere interest of the President in highway safety and the uncertainties developing in local communities, I believe he would be more fully advised by these aspects to the problem. I believe it is time to give the country back to the people. Let them become part of the team of government by giving them back the life blood of their taxes. Let them face up to the challenges of increasing crime, welfare, unemployment, traffic congestion, and all the other problems. I believe they can do it faster, better, and cheaper. These are dangerous years only because we are faced with unsurmountable problems which have accumulated over the passing years.

#### SIMPLIFY FEDERAL ROLE

I would suggest that the multi-billion dollar federal programs for aid to local communities be replaced by a simple letter each

year to each county budget commission. This letter would contain an appropriate share of their tax funds to be used without restriction as they see fit. The role of the federal government should be in guidance and technical assistance. I believe we must make our people responsible for their own welfare. I feel confident that only then shall we dispel the great dangers which threaten the security and well-being of our citizens.

In times of distress and disorder human nature inevitably goes to the extremes and believes in what it wishes to believe, and casts aside calm, logical reasoning. Hence we have mob rule as well as strikes fostered by a surprising minority who ring the note of discord and allow human nature to do the rest of the job; while they pull away from the clash.

Only the intelligent and calm thinking citizen who understands and accepts responsibility can improve our local communities.

Retired Maj. Gen. Edward H. White  
Writes His Grandson, Edward H.  
White II

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently a number of papers in Texas carried a copy of a letter written by the father of one of our deceased astronauts, Lt. Col. Edward H. White, Jr., to his grandson, Edward H. White II, which I believe to be a masterpiece and an inspiration to anyone who reads it. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this article:

DEAR EDDIE: A GOOD MAN'S LIFE IS NEVER QUITE ENDED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—When the Apollo spacecraft caught fire at Cape Kennedy on Jan. 27, 1967, Maj. Gen. Edward H. White lost a son and Edward H. White II lost his father. Astronaut Ed White died in the blaze along with Col. Virgil I. Grissom and Lt. Cmdr. Roger Chaffee. Later, the elder White, a retired Air Force general living in St. Petersburg, Fla., gathered his memories of Ed White and sent them along to young Eddie, now 14 years old, in the form of a letter. Following is that letter, adapted by permission from Guideposts Magazine on the occasion of the anniversary of the spacecraft disaster.)

DEAR EDDIE: This is one of those evenings when I've been thinking a lot about you. These past weeks have been hard for all of us; it takes a lot of love and courage to get through a time like this. I know you and your mother and your sister have plenty of both. But I think it helps if all of us keep in close touch, exchanging thoughts and feelings and memories. I know it helps me.

Earlier, your grandmother and I were looking at a scrapbook of clippings about your father's career. Some of them dealt with incidents long before his famous spacewalk in June, 1965, long before the accident at Cape Kennedy took him from us.

You know Eddie, as I leafed through that scrapbook your father's characteristics seemed to jump at me from every page. Confidence, for example: I never knew anyone who had more of it. Once when he was 12 or 13, just about your age, I took him up in an old T-6, an Air Force trainer, and let him take over the controls for a few minutes. I was amazed. No nervousness. No tension. He seemed to know, instinctively, that a good

pilot doesn't strap himself into a plane; he straps the plane onto himself. He really flew it.

I heard someone ask him once if he hadn't been surprised when he was chosen out of so many applicants for our space program. He smiled, shook his head, said he had worked so hard and prepared so carefully that he didn't see how he could not be chosen!

I think that calm self-assurance was based on several key things, Eddie. One was determination. When your father was a youngster we always told him, if he wanted something, go after it. We'd back him up, but he'd have to provide the drive and the energy. And he always did.

I remember once when he was on the track team at West Point he told me that he expected Army to win the mile relay unless one of the other runners—slower, with little chance to win—tried the tactic of cutting in front and slowing down Army.

"What'll you do if that happens to you?" I asked him.

"I'll run right up his back!" your father said. And that's exactly what did happen. Both runners went sprawling, but your father was on his feet first and Army won the race.

Another thing he mastered was discipline. They'll teach you some day at West Point, Eddie, that nothing worthwhile is ever achieved without it—and they're right. Part of it is self-discipline—doing the things that nobody else can make you do. But part of it is also acceptance of the fact that orders must be obeyed as well as given.

When your father made his walk in space, some reports made it sound as if he was having such a good time outside the capsule that he refused at first to come back in. That was not so. He was having a marvelous time, but he came in as soon as the command reached him.

I heard your grandmother telling a very high-ranking general in the Air Force that this was the case. "I already know that," the general said. "But how do you know?" she asked, astonished. "Because I know Ed," the general said quietly.

Integrity . . . Perhaps that was the main source of your father's self-confidence. A man who has it has no reason to distrust himself.

Duty, Honor, Country . . . that's the West Point code that he lived by. Someone asked him once what he was risking his life for. Was it the Air Force? Was it NASA? He shook his head. "For my country," he said.

Another characteristic that your father had was optimism. He believed that ultimately the exploration of space would become a moral substitute for war, a contest in which nations would compete without bloodshed, for knowledge and honor. He believed that in most men the good far outweighs the bad.

He believed that if a man succeeds in doing what he wants with his life, and does it well, then that life—be it long or short—is fulfilled.

I know I don't have to remind you, Eddie, of the depth of your father's faith. No one knows better than an astronaut just how important faith is. When you step out of the hatch of a spacecraft in space, you're stepping out on faith . . . faith in your equipment, faith in the knowledge and skill of hundreds of other men, faith in your own endurance and training and, above all, faith in God into whose hands you commit yourself, whether things go well or badly.

The world was surprised to learn, after the Gemini IV flight, that your father had taken into space with him three small medals representing the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths. But we who knew him weren't surprised. If the Apollo launch had been carried out as ordered, he had planned to carry with him some mustard seed, each tiny grain representing the power of faith to move mountains. But in the end those orders were changed by a higher command.

I think the main thing to remember about

all this, Eddie, is that a good man's life is never quite ended; something of it always remains to touch and illuminate other lives.

On weekdays at West Point, for instance, there is an informal devotional service early in the morning. Cadets are not required to attend, but your father used to find time to go. Someone told me that before the accident at Cape Kennedy the average attendance was four or five cadets. After the accident it was 175. The track team came in a body, every single man. Your father would have liked that.

On the day of the funeral at West Point, when the people were asked to join in the Lord's Prayer, do you remember that response? Not a murmur or a scattered whisper. No, the sound of a thousand voices, resonant and strong, went rolling out across that noble river and those lordly hills.

The scrapbook also contained a clipping from 1952 when your father tried out for the Olympic track team. He didn't make it, but he was in the finals at Los Angeles. Sports columnist Bill Corum introduced some of the athletes on a television program, including your father. Afterward, Corum couldn't remember his name, but something about your father impressed him so that he wrote about him anyway, not knowing who he was.

This, in part, is what Bill Corum wrote: "He was the last boy that I introduced. He was from West Point and he stood that way and talked that way. Standing there before the microphone, he looked so clean and fine; so good and sound. Suddenly, there was the hot feeling of tears in my eyes, and I was thinking of all the others who had walked the hills around West Point before this shavetail lieutenant—Eisenhower and MacArthur, U. S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, down the long, long roll-call of heroes to the last of our soldiers or sailors to die . . ."

And then, Eddie, Bill Corum added something that was quite extraordinary when you think of the years that had to pass before your father would soar in space over the oceans and continents. He wrote that when he said his nightly prayer he added this:

"Young soldier, may your children and those after them look out as you did last night, unafraid—across the Sierra Madre, the Rockies, on to the Hudson, North and South and across the oceans—as free men in this land of glory . . ."

All this is part of your heritage, Eddie; it's a great one. Live it and pass it on.

Love to all three of you.

GRANDDAD.

### How Long—Oh, How Long?

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the quadrennial marathon of presidential election is with us again. The hullabaloo of the national conventions this summer will be followed by the final ordeal of the presidential campaign itself this fall.

Since coming to Congress in 1959 I have continually urged that presidential campaigns be shortened. Modern jet travel and the increased coverage of politics by the mass media have made the present pattern of campaigning obsolete. Campaigns today are unnecessarily long, physically taxing on the candidates, un-

duly boring for the electorate, and extraordinarily wasteful in terms of the money spent and the physical and intellectual efforts expended.

In an article on political fundraising in this month's issue of the Reader's Digest, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower suggests that the presidential election campaign be shortened—to cut costs and concentrate voter attention. General Eisenhower writes:

The most important and obvious step (to cut costs) would be to shorten the campaigns themselves. Our endless political contests are a relic of the horse-and-buggy era, when a candidate needed a lot of time to get around and to get his views before the voters. Today, with fast and universal communications, such campaigns are no longer needed. Indeed, their tiresome repetitions often actually damage the cause of a candidate; people simply get bored.

I wholeheartedly support this suggestion, and encourage my colleagues to consider its relevance to the marathon which lies ahead.

### Great Tradition of Democracy

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in the great and treasured tradition of our democratic society, individual political clubs have an opportunity to voice their opinions on matters of great concern and the selection of candidates.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD two such resolutions from organizations in my district:

RESOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF THE WILLISTONS & ALBERTSON, INC., JANUARY 16, 1968

At a meeting of the Democratic Organization of the Willistons & Albertson, Inc. held on January 15, 1968 at the VFW Hall in Albertson, L.I., New York, the following resolution was introduced by Committeeman Martin Schwartz:

Resolved: That the Democratic Organization of the Willistons & Albertson, Inc. supports the Administration's policies in Vietnam as the best possible means for securing a just and honorable peace. It is felt that the presence of American troops in South Vietnam is necessary to help stop Communist aggression.

Furthermore, the Democratic Organization of the Willistons & Albertson, Inc. supports President Johnson in the nomination for the President of the United States.

The resolution was passed almost unanimously by the members present. Presiding over the meeting was John Sinon, the new Club President who was installed at the same meeting by Judge Gibbons. Also present at the meeting was Emil Pomerantz, the outgoing Club President and Arnold Barnett, the Democratic Zone Leader.

The resolution was also passed almost unanimously at a meeting of the area's committeemen held prior to the club meeting.

RESOLUTION OF THE SYOSSET-JERICHO-WOODBURY DEMOCRATIC CLUB, JANUARY 3, 1968

Whereas, Senator Eugene J. McCarthy has decided to challenge President Johnson for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1968; and

Whereas, this opposition is based in large measure upon:

(1) The administration's plans for continued escalation and intensification of the war in Vietnam; and

(2) The administration's lack of a positive approach for a compromise or negotiated political settlement in Vietnam; and

Whereas, Senator McCarthy is cognizant of and concerned over the bearing the Vietnam War has on other areas of United States responsibility, to wit, failure to appropriate adequate funds for the poverty program, for housing, for education, for foreign aid programs and for other national needs;

Whereas, there is growing evidence of a deepening moral crisis in America, frustration and discontent;

Now, be it resolved, that the Syosset-Jericho-Woodbury Democratic Club firmly convinced that the nomination for the Presidency of the United States of Senator Eugene J. McCarthy would be in the best interests of America and in the best interests of the Democratic Party, hereby supports the nomination of Senator McCarthy and pledges to give to Senator McCarthy all possible aid and assistance.

### Federal Jury Says Gun Selling by Mail Broke Permit Laws

#### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of Saturday, January 20, 1968.

While no one should prejudice the instant case, the fact that the Department of Justice has finally begun to enforce provisions of the Federal Firearms Act against improper and unlawful mail order sales should afford everyone some peace of mind.

For too long a time, the Department of Justice and its sister agency, the Department of the Treasury, have been trying to push through unwise legislation, which would essentially strip the law-abiding citizen of the right to purchase firearms, instead of exercising the powers and prerogatives of those agencies under existing law to control shipment of firearms in interstate commerce in violation of State law.

Perhaps this highly desirable change on the part of the Departments of Justice and Treasury will lead to a reappraisal of the unwise position of those Departments with regard to firearms control laws. Perhaps these agencies will commence using the tools available to them without spending so much time seeking authority to harass law-abiding citizens by pushing for unworkable legislation.

The article follows:

GUN SELLING BY MAIL BROKE PERMIT LAWS, FEDERAL JURY SAYS  
(By Edward Ranzal)

A Federal grand jury here indicted a Rockland County concern yesterday on charges of unlawfully shipping pistols and revolvers to customers in four states. The indictment was described as the first of its kind in the country against a mail-order company dealing in firearms.

The indictment named a Nanuet, N.Y., sporting goods store, one of the store's owners and a mail order company with the same address as the store.

United States Attorney Robert M. Morgenthau said that the store, called Lombard's, had sold weapons at the store and by mail to customers in states where persons may not buy guns locally without permits or licenses.

Mr. Morgenthau explained that the Federal Firearms Act, enacted in 1938, prohibited Federally licensed firearms dealers from shipping weapons to persons in other states that have laws requiring the purchaser to present a purchase permit from his state.

The Federal law, Mr. Morgenthau said, is intended to prevent gun dealers from defeating state firearms legislation by shipping guns in response to mail orders or visits from customers.

In addition to the sporting goods store, which was described as the largest dealer in hand guns in the state, the indictment named one of the store's owners Bernard Lombard, 40 years old, of Monsey, N.Y., and the related mail order company, King for Price, Inc.

The indictment charged that the defendants had filled orders for 44 customers in New Jersey, North Carolina, Michigan and Missouri. These states have local laws requiring permits or licenses to purchase pistols or revolvers.

Mr. Morgenthau said that 33 shipments were made to buyers in New Jersey, many of whom had visited Lombard's in Nanuet to place their orders.

### Subsidizing of Foreign Companies

#### HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, I inserted a letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from Charles B. West. In this letter Mr. West explained why we should encourage the subsidizing of foreign companies through our foreign aid programs.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Herbert Salzman, Assistant Administrator for Private Resources in the Agency for International Development. Mr. Salzman made mention of Mr. West's letter and stated that AID agrees with Mr. West's suggestion and gave instances in which his ideas were being carried out. For the interest of my colleagues I respectfully submit Mr. Salzman's letter to be printed in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,  
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1968.

HON. BEN BLACKBURN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLACKBURN: I noted with interest your comments and Mr. Charles B. West's letter on Private Enterprise and Foreign Aid which appeared in the Congressional Record of January 23 on page 787.

We in A.I.D. agree wholeheartedly with the need to increase the role of private enterprise in our foreign assistance efforts. We recognize that our public resources are limited and, alone, cannot possibly do the job that needs to be done to help improve the lot of the underdeveloped world.

That is why we are doing more than ever before to—

Encourage U.S. investment in the developing countries through A.I.D.'s Investment

Guaranty Programs and new forms of pre-investment assistance.

Use A.I.D. loans and technical assistance activities to support policies and create conditions that make it possible for private enterprise to grow and prosper.

Rely on private U.S. resources to carry out A.I.D. programs overseas, using public resources only as a last resort (Last year, for example, 96% of A.I.D.-financed commodities were purchased in the U.S.).

That is why, also, A.I.D. set up last year an Office of Private Resources and, within that Office, a Private Investment Center. These new organizations provide a focal point for the Agency's contact with the U.S. business community and for our efforts to involve American private enterprise in overseas development.

As an ex-businessman myself, I like to think of our objective in these terms: as much private assistance as possible, as much public assistance as necessary.

We are grateful for your and Mr. West's interest in this subject. If you, or any member of your staff, would like to talk about it further, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT SALZMAN.

### David Rockefeller: Speaking Freely

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most articulate, knowledgeable, and responsible citizens is David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank. In November he spoke with Edwin Newman, of NBC News, on a variety of matters ranging from his private art collection, to our overseas investments and the balance of payments; to his bank's involvement in ghetto problems.

Of particular note are his comments that the investment Chase Manhattan is making in training, counseling, and employment programs for people in ghetto areas is a good investment for the bank.

For those who may have missed this fine program—and who still have doubts that such efforts are risky business for the private sector, I include the transcript of this program at this point in the RECORD:

#### SPEAKING FREELY

Guest: David Rockefeller, President of Chase Manhattan Bank.

Host: Edwin Newman, NBC News.

Mr. NEWMAN. At the lower end of Manhattan Island stands the shiny and spectacular home of one of the world's great banks, the Chase Manhattan. It's an unusual bank, not only because it's so big and powerful and rich, but because a lot of its money hangs on the wall, in the form of paintings by contemporary artists. Hello, I'm Edwin Newman. Speaking Freely today is David Rockefeller, President of the Chase Manhattan Bank. The paintings that hang on the walls of the Chase Manhattan offices reflect his influence. And he uses his influence in many other ways as well. I'll be asking you about some of those ways later on, Mr. Rockefeller, but tell me first what is the connection, if any, between banking and contemporary art.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I suppose we got involved in it, as far as the bank is concerned,

primarily as a practical question. We decided that to create the kind of image that we would like to have of ourselves, namely a forward-looking, progressive bank, we wanted to have the best contemporary architecture. And in our judgment, the best contemporary architecture requires art as a supplement. In the old days, you used to have friezes and cornices and all kinds of sculpture that was built into the architecture. But today it's mostly very simple, and it needs color and design in the form of pictures and sculpture that can be added to the walls. And so we had a relatively modest program for painting and sculpture that could be added to the building. In addition to this, though, we felt that it was a useful thing in the sense of giving education and hopefully pleasure to both our employees and the people who come to see the building. And also in giving support to contemporary painters and sculptors.

Mr. NEWMAN. You were mentioning, Mr. Rockefeller, the image of the bank, and you wanted to give the image of a forward-looking bank. Banks didn't always have that image, did they? They didn't impress people in that way. When did this change in the thinking of bankers come about?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I would guess that a good deal of the change came in the post World War II period, when banking became a good deal more competitive, the world was changing in many ways, people were coming back from the wars, a lot of new and younger people coming into the banks. And I think this was the period when the biggest change was probably taking place.

Mr. NEWMAN. How much competition is healthy among banks? I have the impression at times that the bank managers are on the verge of going out into the streets and grabbing people and forcing loans on them. How far should this go? I mean, we're all being urged to borrow money and spend it. Is there not some kind of limit that's imposed by prudence?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Competition is a basic element in the free enterprise system, and the type of society that we have, and I think it's as necessary in banking as it is in any other form of business. Whether there can be too much of it, perhaps so. Certainly it would be bad if bankers were forced to make loans which were unsound loans. I don't believe that that danger exists today. I believe that competition in banking, though it's very keen indeed, is probably healthy and good for the customer.

Mr. NEWMAN. You don't think it's leading to too large a consumer debt?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I really doubt whether it is. Actually that isn't the area where banks compete most actively, really, in the consumer loan area. We do a lot of advertising in that area but we're also quite careful in our advertising not to encourage people to borrow unless it's in their best interest to borrow.

Mr. NEWMAN. Where does most competition come between banks, or among banks?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Probably in seeking business deposits and loans, more than individuals; although certainly we're very anxious to get the business of individuals. But I think it's probably keener in the business area.

Mr. NEWMAN. Of course banks make their money in a great many ways, don't they? I mean trusteeship, technical advice, business advice, arbitrage.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. That's true. The trust departments of banks are very important.

Mr. NEWMAN. How big should any bank be allowed to be, do you think? The Chase has assets, I believe of sixteen billion. At least that was the last figure I saw. Is there a point beyond which it is not safe to go? Is there a point at which a single economic institution—a financial institution—in the United States could be too big?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I've always felt that big-ness should be measured in relationship to the market, that it could be dangerous if it grew out of proportion with the market and with competition. But I am not concerned as long as it is not excessive in that regard. For example, there are six major banks in New York City, and a lot of smaller ones, but six very large ones. I don't feel, myself, that this constitutes a threat.

Mr. NEWMAN. Since we are talking about the ways in which banks have changed and the way that banks have developed and expanded, banks do a great many things now that they didn't used to, don't they? They're much more active in community affairs, and that's been a particular interest of yours. What do you think is the obligation of a bank to the community in which it exists, from which it draws its profits?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think we have many obligations. In the first place, the bank cannot grow and prosper unless the community in which it operates is healthy and prosperous. Therefore, anything that we can do to make in our case New York City and the neighboring counties healthy is to our own interest.

Mr. NEWMAN. What about all the urban problems? Your bank opened a branch in Harlem in 1962. It had been, I believe, twenty-five years since, twenty-five years earlier, that you had opened a branch in Harlem. Why was there that gap? Why had nothing happened in those intervening twenty-five years?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think the figure you're thinking of is the twenty-five years since any commercial bank had opened a branch in Harlem. Why that is true I don't entirely know. Of course, in the intervening period we'd had the great depression and the war. And no banks were being very expansion-minded in that period, so I think that's probably the principal explanation. But we deliberately thought out a location in Harlem, because we were convinced that the Negro community in our city is a very important one, it's a growing one, and we felt that it was important for our bank to be identified with it and to help it in any way that we could in improving their economic position in the city.

Mr. NEWMAN. Now you had a deliberate program, I think, of recruiting Negro employees, did you not?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We did, and do. We are—in the first place, we need any good employees that we can find. Our problem is to find qualified employees, these days. And this is not easy. But we did deliberately feel that with the growing Negro population of the city it was important that Negro employees should be thoroughly represented at all levels in our bank. And in point of fact we have a very large number.

Mr. NEWMAN. A claim was recently made that in fact they find advancement rather more difficult than being hired in the first place.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, I think that claim was not fairly made, and not founded in fact. As a matter of fact we are doing everything in our power to not only hire Negro employees but to give them in-bank training, to give them opportunities, as other employees also have, to study at night and take school or college or even graduate courses at the bank's expense. And they are encouraged to move ahead just as rapidly as their talents permit.

Mr. NEWMAN. You mentioned the difficulty of getting qualified employees, Mr. Rockefeller. The fact is that in the circumstances that exist in this country, it's necessary to hire people who are not qualified, and train them, is it not?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. This is the drama of the recent period, that there exists, particularly in the central cores of our urban areas, a large number of disadvantaged people who,

though they may go to school, don't apply themselves for whatever reason, whether it's family background or whatever, and consequently even though they may have a school certificate, they are unable to read or write to a degree that would be necessary even for the simplest jobs. Furthermore, their motivation is not good. And I fully agree with you that we've got to do more in business as well as in government to find ways of motivating and training these people so that they become employable. We have had an interesting program here in the banks that we've been undertaking for the past four or five years in relation with the New York City Board of Education. They have brought to us boys and girls, many of them Negroes, not all, who appeared to be potential drop-outs from high school but who, in their opinion, had promise and ability. And we have employed them during their junior and senior years at high school in the afternoons or early evening, have paid them, and have kept them on as long as they stayed in high school, didn't actually leave school. And then we've guaranteed that if they completed their high school course with a C average or better that we would employ them and give them a permanent job in the bank.

Mr. NEWMAN. How has it worked out?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We've been very pleased with the results. I think something like eighty percent of those that we have hired in this way have stayed with us, and we're not—I guess we're in our third or fourth year—and we're now getting the benefits of many of them as very good permanent employees.

Mr. NEWMAN. Has this spread to any other companies that you know of?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, it has. And in point of fact, because we were so pleased with it as a program, we have had a couple of seminars with personnel officers of other companies telling them what we have done. Although I don't have the exact facts at my fingertips as to how many others have done the same thing, I understand that quite a number have.

Mr. NEWMAN. Well, if you take that principle involved there, which is that you're hiring people who are not qualified but whom you hope to make qualified, and you apply the parallel on a larger scale, you go into a ghetto—it's a risky place to be for business, for many reasons—what risks should a bank take in encouraging business in the ghetto and investing in the ghetto area where riots are possible or upsets of one kind or another, pilferage may be greater, or whatever the risks may be—they're well known. How do you balance the profit-making motive of a bank against its community responsibility?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well, after all, the bank is lending its depositors' and its shareholders' money, so that it has to give first consideration to doing it on a basis where it feels it has a reasonable chance of getting back the money it lends, with an appropriate amount of interest. So that we do not feel that it would be right or appropriate to make loans that we knew were not going to be repaid. On the other hand, frequently a loan appears not to be a good one largely because the man who's seeking to borrow has little managerial experience or little experience in finance, and what we are trying to do is to give financial counseling through our lending offices to people that we feel are people of integrity but who perhaps may lack a little experience, and help them be able to borrow and repay the loan. And we think this can be quite constructive.

Mr. NEWMAN. Mr. Rockefeller, you've had a good deal of experience now dealing with urban problems, as a banker and also as a citizen. You're well known to be extremely interested in the problem, and you're a member of a variety of organizations trying to do something about it. Do you think we're getting anywhere?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I'm sure we're not getting there as fast as we would like. I'm sure there's

a lot more that we can and should do. Perhaps the one good aspect that one might cite from the tragic riots of last summer and the previous summer is the fact that perhaps a larger number of people in the business community but also in labor and religious organizations have recognized that is a problem which is the problem of everyone, not just of government, that the private sector has got to take a much more active personal interest in seeing that these very serious social urban problems are dealt with. And I hope very much that, for example, the National Urban Coalition which was stimulated by a group of mayors including our own Mayor Lindsay, and an organization called Urban America, in the middle of last summer—I hope that it will be helpful in stimulating well-directed, effective, citizen participation to deal with these problems.

Mr. NEWMAN. What do you think private business ought to be doing in dealing with the urban problem?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think there are a number of ways in which they can become involved. Certainly one is the area of job opportunity, job training, and employment we've already discussed. And I believe that the type of program that I mentioned that we're undertaking, if it were generalized, it couldn't be adapted exactly for each business and industry but the same sort of thing could be very helpful. I believe that if private citizens became more involved in matters of urban planning and participation in local citizens' groups, to stimulate intelligent planning and construction, urban renewal projects, that this would be helpful. As one looks around the country and sees the cities in which there have been successful attacks on urban blight, almost without exception—in fact I don't know of an exception—the successes have been where municipal governments have been well led and worked with well led business and civic organizations in dealing with the problem.

Mr. NEWMAN. There are some people, are there not, who think that private enterprise really will not do anything substantial or anything very constructive in the city, Professor Galbraith being perhaps the best known exponent of that idea. And there's a feeling that private enterprise will go into these things only where it is guaranteed against risk, by the government, and that therefore there's really no reason to have private enterprise in it.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well, Professor Galbraith is an old friend of mine. We were at Harvard together and I have great respect and admiration for him. I don't agree with him on this particular subject. I think he's too pessimistic about what business can and will do. I'm convinced that business is increasingly aroused and aware, and willing to take an active part. And I think that if sound techniques are devised which will give a reasonable degree of protection and incentive, that there are lots of ways in which they not only can participate individually and personally but also financially. I have in mind specifically a proposal that my brother, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, has proposed for New York State. It's to organize a corporation which would be quasi-public, to be called the New York State Urban Development Corporation. The idea would be that a group of citizens, primarily from the private sector but perhaps having some from government as well, would be the trustees of this corporation, that the state would provide a kind of revolving fund which would enable these citizens to go to deteriorating areas in our cities anywhere in the state, acquire sizeable pieces of property big enough so that a broad type of development could be undertaken, through the process of condemnation acquire the land, plan its development, get the project underway, so far largely with state funds. But then as the process had achieved a degree of maturity, sell off the projects to private developers

who by that time would be in a position to see that the risks were manageable and that the opportunities were considerable. And then, once the whole piece has been sold off, move on to another. This to me is the type of proposal where government and business can work together, each providing the element that it can best provide. And under those circumstances, I believe that business can and will do a lot.

Mr. NEWMAN. Mr. Rockefeller, how dangerous do you think the situation in our cities is?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think it's very dangerous.

Mr. NEWMAN. I was much struck the other day by something I read that Carl Sandburg said in 1919, when he was a newspaper reporter. He said most—he was covering a riot, a city riot—and he said no slum is separate from the community. It gets its revenge. That's what's happening in our cities, isn't it? The slums are taking their revenge.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I'm sure that's true. The sad, perhaps tragic, aspect is that in many respects our country has made enormous progress in eliminating poverty. Certainly the percentage of people in our country who could be classed as poor is much lower today than it has ever been in this country or I believe in any country in the world. And I think that the minority groups by and large are better treated today, with less discrimination, than has been true before. But I suppose it's understandable that those who remain in the poverty category, or those who are still being discriminated against, see a hope that they didn't see at all before, and therefore are perhaps less willing to sit back and take the treatment that once was accepted as inevitable. I think this is perhaps one of the key reasons why there's more trouble, even though basically less of a problem in many respects.

Mr. NEWMAN. Well, you yourself testified about a year ago before a Congressional committee, to which you said that unless we deal with our urban problems we may well end up—this is a quote, I think—we may well end up with a series of spectacular super-highways connecting hundreds of squalid cities. You accept attribution on that?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I do.

Mr. NEWMAN. Isn't that what we have already? Isn't it one of our difficulties that we recognize these things when they've already happened to us? Don't we already have these squalid cities?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We certainly have squalor in the cities. I think it's fair to say that a lot of the cities are not squalid. But certainly there is much too much squalor, and this is what we've all got to deal with promptly and effectively.

Mr. NEWMAN. It's always seemed to me—this is a personal observation—that there really is not a very widespread realization of how bad the situation is, and how awful some parts of our cities are. Or in fact even the degree to which the automobile dominates the cities. And that it would take rather more drastic measures than any that have been adopted so far to deal with this. But, I don't know whether you agree with that.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I'm sure that many of us have not been exposed as much as it would be good for us to all the depth of poverty that exists in our cities. And I'm sure that we need to do much more than we have. And I'm also a little bit concerned that, in our spirit of enthusiasm and our earnest and honest desire to do something about it, that we rush to spend money for the sake of spending money.

I don't think this is necessarily wise, and I sometimes am concerned that some of the programs which have the best motivation are perhaps not as well thought through as they should be.

Mr. NEWMAN. One of our problems and one of the complications, Mr. Rockefeller, is surely the fact that a great deal of our attention

necessarily goes overseas. A great deal of our money is spent overseas, in Vietnam for example. But we are involved in the international financial picture. Is the American dollar in any danger?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The American dollar certainly, as a result of the devaluation of sterling, of the pound, has been subject to question and pressure. And I'd like to come back to that. If you'll permit me I'd like to say just a word or two on the first question that you raised, which by implication could infer that perhaps we shouldn't be spending money overseas when we have so many problems at home. I personally feel that we should be spending a lot of money overseas, and that this is very much in the interest of our country as a whole. I don't believe that we can live in an isolated, insulated package in this country. The day is long since past when that was possible. And without debating the question of Vietnam, which is a totally separate problem, I myself feel that this country has an obligation in its own interest and as well as for humanitarian reasons to help the struggling people of the developing nations of the world at the same time that we're helping people in our own slum areas. I think if we don't do this that we will have far more serious problems in the future. And personally I am distressed that we have cut the foreign aid program back as far as we have. Even though I'm very much in favor of reducing expenditures. And this comes to the other question that you raised, the soundness of the dollar. I still feel that we must help other countries help themselves.

Mr. NEWMAN. Mr. Rockefeller, you were saying that we should be prepared to spend money abroad. Of course we have spent a good deal of money abroad for many years now but how do you square that with all the insistence we hear now on lower government expenditures, and with necessity for a tax increase, and the concern about descending the dollar and the necessity to do away with the deficit we have, year after year?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well this is a serious problem, and the answer is not an easy one, obviously. I'm simply saying that I think such dollars as we can spend must not be directed in one area alone, that it must be spread over a range of areas, including the international. But you raised the question earlier about the strength of the dollar, and I would like to say just a word about that.

The dollar is strong basically because of the strength of the U.S. economy, which is back of it. But it's also strong based on the confidence that people have in it. So far as our economy is concerned, it's very strong, it's certainly much the strongest economy in the world. And by and large people have enormous confidence in it and in the dollar. However, over the period of the last fourteen or fifteen years, we have been spending, because of direct investment by businesses all around the world, because of military expenditures, not only in Vietnam but in helping our allies around the world, and because of the foreign aid program that I spoke of before, we have been spending more than we've been receiving. We've had a deficit in our balance of payments. Now this is different from many deficits. It's different from the deficit of Britain, for example, which had a deficit in her balance of payments, but this is because she is importing more goods than she's exporting. In our case, we are actually exporting more than we're importing, and these other expenditures for capital and military expenditures and aid which close the deficit. Over a long period of time, foreign governments were perfectly willing to accept that deficit, which meant that they were willing to hold dollars as reserves rather than exchange those dollars for gold, which they would be entitled to do. And in the process, and in the course of the last twelve or fifteen years, foreign governments have accumulated some seventeen or eighteen billion dollars of reserves. More recently, though, as this deficit

has persisted, foreign governments have become concerned; they felt that it was unwise and they didn't want to go on indefinitely holding more and more dollars. So there has been a tendency to demand more—a higher percentage of gold. And this has caused our gold supply, which was very big and still is big, to be reduced from twenty-three billion dollars some ten years ago to about thirteen billion dollars today. Obviously that can't go on at the same pace. We've got to find a means of stopping the outflow of gold and also stopping our balance of payments deficit. And herein is the problem so far as uncertainty about the dollar.

Mr. NEWMAN. Surely, Mr. Rockefeller, that emphasizes the amount of money that we are spending in Vietnam.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well it does, although Vietnam by no means is the principal source of our balance of payments deficit. It's the most recent cause, but the balance of payments deficit existed for many years before we started in Vietnam.

Mr. NEWMAN. Yes, but if I may say so, as I understand it people want gold more than they want dollars, because there's perhaps less confidence in the American dollar than there used to be. People would rather have gold. And one reason they would rather have gold is that they think the American economy rests too heavily on war expenditure and military expenditure generally. Is that not true?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Perhaps. I would have thought that the uncertainty about the economy was based more on a question as to whether we were going to take steps internally to stop inflation. For a period of four or five years, from 1960, '61, through 1965 or '66, we had been able to grow at a rapid rate with almost complete price stability. And this was a wonderful thing for us and certainly helped to create confidence in the dollar. In the last year or two, our government deficit has been growing, and we've been pumping more money into the system, and the price level has been rising. And this is causing great concern among the business and financial circles who hold the dollars overseas, because they're afraid that it will have a further adverse effect on our balance of payments deficit. In other words, if our price level is rising faster than the level in other countries, this then means that our exports become more expensive and are cut down, imports from other countries are relatively cheaper and are more attractive, and consequently our deficit goes up. Therefore, in my judgment, the thing that most of all would restore confidence in the dollar on the part of financial and business groups abroad is a serious effort on the part of our government to raise taxes and reduce expenditures, which of course is precisely what President Johnson and Secretary Fowler have been advocating. And I'm very hopeful that their sincerity in wanting to do this will be acknowledged by Congress and that Congress will enact the proposed bill.

Mr. NEWMAN. How, Mr. Rockefeller, do we do all the things in our cities that you agree are so urgent, if the government is to spend less money, and if, as we know, the reductions—if indeed they come—are bound to come in civilian spending, in particular in the so-called War on Poverty?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I suppose there are two answers to that. One, we probably cannot move at as rapid a pace in terms of expenditure on any fund as might be desirable, but secondly, I don't really think the answer to the urban problem is so much expenditure of funds as how they are spent and the actions that go along with them. I'd rather see us put more emphasis on the effective use of those funds that we can spend.

Mr. NEWMAN. You were talking a while ago about foreign aid. And you, I know, are par-

ticularly interested in Latin America. Is there not a certain degree of disillusionment in this country, tends to express itself this way. Why should we put our money into Latin America, the Latin Americans don't do very much to help themselves, and surely the rich Latin Americans do very little—don't pay their taxes, hide their money in Switzerland or wherever. And it's said not only about Latin America but about many other countries—Greece for example. Is that not a fact?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think there probably is some disillusionment. Whether it's justified or not, I think it's fair to say that a lot of people have become discouraged with the effectiveness of our foreign aid. Sometimes perhaps this is justified. I personally believe that the Alliance for Progress which was started by President Kennedy several years ago, in 1962, although it has not achieved all that we could have hoped, has been successful to a considerable extent. The rate of economic growth in Latin America has increased, particularly in the last two or three years. But on the whole there is greater stability, there is a greater desire for the Latin American countries to work together, and more interest in the LAFTA concept—Latin America Free Trade Area concept. I think that the business communities in Latin America, with whom I've worked a good deal, although surely there is much still to be desired, are also becoming more responsible. There are many more Latin American businessmen today who are involving themselves in problems of their slums and of their governments, which they didn't do nearly so much in the past. So that I'm not as pessimistic as many people are.

Mr. NEWMAN. Well perhaps I'm one of the pessimists, but is the rate of economic growth keeping up with the rate of population growth?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes. In fact, it's exceeding it, not by as much as one would like but, as I recall it overall, the rate of economic growth per capita as opposed to just the aggregate has been around two to three percent in Latin America in the last two or three years.

Mr. NEWMAN. You said once, not very long ago—I'm speaking about the part that American private enterprise can play in these areas like Latin America, or I think it's fair to say American private enterprise tends to be rather suspect among certain political groups, I think that's even an understatement, a gross understatement—you said that the United States must beware of excessive zeal when it operates overseas, especially in those areas where it has technological superiority, Latin America of course being a particular example of that. What did you mean by that "excessive zeal"?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. What I meant was that, because we have the degree of economic power and strength that we have, I think that we have to be all the more careful when we invest or go overseas to handle ourselves as individuals and as corporations in a manner that is not offensive to the people who are our hosts. And I think there have been times in the past where the epithet "the ugly American" was justified, that our businessmen went in, in certain cases, and disregarded the national interests and customs, and stayed in little close-knit communities by themselves, paid only attention to making money and taking it out and getting out. I think that's changing; and it must change even more. I think we have to, when we go to countries, recognize that we are their guests, that we have to conform not only to their laws but to their customs, and behave accordingly, become acquainted with the people, learn the language, and deal in a way that will make people who are fair-minded see that we are there as friends, not to exploit them.

Mr. NEWMAN. Well, take another way in

which this expresses itself—the brain drain, the technology gap. Is the United States right to recruit, to import trained men and women from poorer countries that have paid to train those people and really cannot spare them?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. This is not always our initiative. Quite frequently, people who have been trained in this country or in other industrialized countries see great opportunities here and seek employment here.

Mr. NEWMAN. Suppose we leave them aside and say only those who are actively sought by American corporations, which recruit in Europe for example, or even in India.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes. I think it's quite important that we not impose artificial restrictions and barriers. I do recognize that the point you raise is an important and real one. I do feel that it's desirable for American companies as much as possible to do basic research and product development research in the countries where we have investments, using the nationals, as you suggest, of the country, in their own countries. And I think more of this is being done. This certainly seems to me to be desirable.

Mr. NEWMAN. But there is, for example, a tremendous amount of resentment in England against American companies—it's been expressed by the British government against a particular American corporation recently which was accused of trying to recruit atomic scientists, nuclear physicists and so on. Is it possible to avoid that when you have the imbalance that exists between a country like the United States—companies like American companies which have so much money and so much to offer?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think one of the ways to avoid it is more U.S. investment rather than less. Because, especially where that investment goes in a partnership basis with local investors, it's a way in which our technology is brought to those countries. And this, I think, is very important. Another thing that I think they can do more than they have in the past is to review their own educational systems.

I think too often the European educational system has been based on classical studies and humanities, which are certainly important, but they stress this at the expense of training in business and management. And one reason I believe that there is a technological gap between the United States and other countries in the world is because we have on the whole better management techniques. I'm not sure that this isn't more important than our technological superiority. And I believe they could do more in that area than they have.

Mr. NEWMAN. What is your view of President DeGaulle's objections to conduct of American industry in Western Europe, his resistance to what he feels is an American economic domination of Western Europe?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well he probably expresses a view that is not uniquely his. I'm sure there are a lot of other people . . .

Mr. NEWMAN. Perhaps uniquely expressed by him.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think that there are many in Europe who are increasingly concerned. Just very recently a book that appeared in France called "The American Challenge", which has been read a great deal, on this very subject, and very much discussed these days. So that there is certainly a great deal of concern. On the other hand, as that particular book points out, the fault if there is one is hardly that of Americans going in so much as it is that of the Europeans not stirring themselves more to be more effectively competitive.

Mr. NEWMAN. Stefan Schweibel, who wrote that, was arguing that it was the superior organization of talent that accounted for American supremacy—economic supremacy—and President DeGaulle was at some pains to say that it wasn't that the United States was doing this by being able to export infla-

tive dollars with which to take over European industry.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well with all due respect to President DeGaulle, I think I agree more with Mr. Schweibel.

Mr. NEWMAN. Mr. Rockefeller, a relatively personal question. Are there ever any times when it is a disadvantage to be named Rockefeller?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Oh I suppose so. Can't say that it worried me very much.

Mr. NEWMAN (laughing). There are none that come to mind? I mean, you don't feel yourself marked out, and that as soon as people know who you are, all eyes are on you?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well I suppose to the extent that anyone has a name that is prominent, and they are treated differently from other people, one isn't happy about that. But I don't feel that it's all that disturbing.

Mr. NEWMAN. You referred, earlier in this conversation, to your brother, Governor Nelson Rockefeller.

Of course you have another brother, Governor Winthrop Rockefeller, and you have other people in your family who have embarked on political careers. Do you have any political ambition?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. No. I have been interested in public service all my life. Matter of fact, my first job was as secretary to Mayor LaGuardia here in New York. Found that a very interesting experience. I've greatly enjoyed the opportunities that my relationship with the Chase Manhattan Bank has given me to serve in various capacities. I am fortunate to have been asked to serve on various Presidential and other committees, and participate in a number of ways such as the Urban Coalition, in public affairs. But I have no ambition to emulate my two distinguished brothers.

Mr. NEWMAN. In fact, the line between what is called private enterprise but which really isn't so private, and public life, is not so clear-cut, is it? I mean, a man in your position does a tremendous amount of public work.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. It really is true. I suppose I spend somewhere between twenty-five and thirty percent of my time in things that might be described "public" in one way or another, either in direct participation with government as in some of these committees, or on quasi-public, civic type of activities.

Mr. NEWMAN. It is also true that it's impossible for business to function without coming into politics, isn't it? It's even impossible now to deal with economic matters, the Alliance for Progress for example, without coming into it as an intensely difficult political issue, the issue of birth control.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. That certainly is true.

Mr. NEWMAN. Which leads me back, I think, to Latin America, where the population problem is a staggering one. There have been estimates that the population of Latin America is going to double in twenty-five years. Now do people who offer assistance to Latin American countries, Latin American governments, industry, whatever, have the right, do you think, to impose conditions or attempt to impose conditions, including birth control programs, on them?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I would question whether they would be wise in trying to impose conditions respecting birth control. On the other hand, I see no reason why we shouldn't explain very clearly what the advantages and needs are to control population, and work with governments who are willing to have us work with them in determining methods that could reduce the rate of population growth. I would very much favor that.

Mr. NEWMAN. There is more to it than that, of course. I mean, these countries I suppose have to be advised to do some other things as well, such as not seek to industrialize quite so fast as they all tend to, to try to build up their agricultural production more.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, I think economic growth must be a balanced one, and I fully agree with you that perhaps too little emphasis has been placed on agricultural development relative to large-scale industrial development. Having a steel mill has become some kind of prestige item in the minds of many countries, and this may or may not be the thing that they need the most. I certainly feel it's important for us to use our influence and give our assistance in trying to help these countries direct their economies in the way that will be most to their advantage.

Mr. NEWMAN. I've seen estimates—speaking of population explosions—that the population of this country is going to be something like three hundred million or perhaps even three hundred forty million by the end of this century, by which time it will surely be an academic problem to me. But anyway, is it possible to say that's too many? Is it ever possible to figure out what an optimum population would be—the ideal population? I realize it's a matter of density and distribution as well. But are we losing something in the United States by having so many people?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. That's a pretty difficult question to answer. I certainly am inclined to feel that there must be some limit beyond which it would not be to our country's advantage to go. On the other hand, I can't imagine that we would want to take steps to put an absolute ceiling on it. It seems to me that we would be better advised merely to take steps to discourage the rate of growth. And perhaps to make the best use of our resources for the benefit of that population which we do have.

Mr. NEWMAN. Well, if we look forward a bit, given the population growth, can we figure that we're going to have a shorter working week, for example?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Possibly. I think, myself, that the wants of man are almost unlimitedly expandable, and therefore I'm not concerned about overproduction in the sense that we can produce more goods and services than people can consume. We might of any given product, but not overall. And I imagine there probably will be a gradual trend to somewhat shorter hours and more leisure. But I don't believe that this will be forced in a rapid way, because of technological advance, as some people have suggested.

Mr. NEWMAN. Let me ask you one other question, a very brief question. Is the check going to disappear and be replaced by the credit card? Should have asked about it at the beginning.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The credit card has become an important factor in our economy today, and I imagine it will continue to grow. I doubt, myself, whether we will ever have a completely check-less society. I think there are too many conveniences for the check.

Mr. NEWMAN. The future is not check-less then?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I don't believe so, altogether.

Mr. NEWMAN. Thank you very much, Sir. David Rockefeller has been speaking freely. This is Edwin Newman, NBC News.

## Saigon Government Rewards Corruption

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today's news again reveals the abysmal gulf between the official fiction and the harsh reality of our "other war" in South Vietnam.

My colleagues will recall the great fanfare some months ago when two high officials in the South Vietnamese Army were dismissed for corruption. We were told this was significant. It was the start of the big cleanup. At last, we were told, we could expect our ally in Saigon to crack down on those people in high places who were robbing us blind.

So what has happened? Those two high officials have been promoted to even higher places. Their "punishment" turns out to be a reward. All of this is set forth in an article appearing in today's New York Times, which, without objection, I shall insert in the RECORD following my remarks.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to another item appearing in the same newspaper. This is an editorial concerning the sad fate of the one South Vietnamese official known to oppose corruption. I am speaking of Maj. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, the officer entrusted with directing both the pacification program and efforts to eliminate corruption in the South Vietnamese Army.

What has happened to General Thang? He has become so embittered by the noncooperation of his fellow officers in that august army that he has resigned.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time the American people stopped kidding themselves about the progress we are making in this "other war." Our ally, the Government of South Vietnam, is quite evidently unwilling to clean out the corruption of which today's press again reminds us. And until this is done there is virtually no chance that anything like a majority of the people of South Vietnam—let alone Vietnam as a whole—will ever give that government their support. And, without their support, all our efforts will be in vain.

What a strange kind of commitment we are honoring in Vietnam. Here at home we are told Americans are in this war to help the Vietnamese resist aggression. But is this the way the Vietnamese see it?

Just a few weeks ago a member of the Vietnamese National Assembly argued against lowering their draft age to 18, contending that Vietnamese should not be called upon to die for Americans in an American war. On hearing this convincing argument his fellow assemblymen voted 46 to 1 against lowering the draft age. Of course, they expressed no objection to continuation of the 18-year-old draft for American boys.

As long as this is an "American war" which they are merely tolerating, they apparently feel it is only natural that we should carry the greater burden. Apparently we face an uphill struggle to capture the hearts and minds of the South Vietnamese Government, to say nothing of its people.

Mr. Speaker, the other morning I heard Robert Komer, the head of our country's pacification effort, describe in glowing and effusive terms the great and substantial progress being made in this "other war." I would like to know how these bleak facts fit into that rosy picture.

Without objection I also insert the New York Times editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### SAIGON REWARDS TWO DISMISSED AIDES—MEN ACCUSED OF CORRUPTION GET HIGH POSTS IN ARMY

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, January 29.—Two South Vietnamese Army officers dismissed from Government positions last fall on corruption charges have been placed in desirable army job, it was disclosed today.

The official announcement of their dismissal last fall said that they would be severely punished.

The officers, both lieutenant colonels are Le Duc Dat, the former chief of Phuocuy Province, and Ho Nhat Quan, the former appointed Mayor of Vungtau, a seaside resort town just east of Saigon, Phuocuy Province is just to the north of Vungtau.

The dismissal announcement had said that Colonel Dat would be "severely punished" for "having committed mistakes while discharging his duties having indulged in illegal activities."

#### NAMED A COMMANDER

The announcement added that Colonel Quan has been ordered to report to the Defense Ministry for strong disciplinary measures.

Informed sources have disclosed, however, that Colonel Quan has been made commander of artillery forces in the III Corps area, which includes a dozen provinces around Saigon. Colonel Dat, the sources said, has been made assistant commander of the 18th South Vietnamese Army Division.

The case is not without precedent here. American advisory officials in another province recently made a determined and prolonged attempt to document the corruption and inefficiency of a military officer holding a provincial job. He was promoted one grade in rank and given a better job.

An American working in the field remarked: "The promotion policies of the South Vietnamese Army can be summed up in five words, 'foul up and go up.'"

For several days, Vietnamese military spokesmen avoided answering questions about the present assignments of Colonels Dat and Quan. Finally, they flatly refused to answer. Inquiries to a Vietnamese civilian information official also failed to elicit answers. However, informed sources in the military region where the two officials are working disclosed their assignments.

Colonel Dat enjoyed a good reputation for ability and drive with his American colleagues. His dismissal did not especially cheer some Americans.

#### THE HONEST VIETNAMESE

Old Vietnam hands in the American mission have called him "the most effective administrator, innovator and inspirational leader South Vietnam has produced in seven years."

Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky has said he is "the most valuable, most trusted, general in the Vietnamese Army."

The Vietcong grudgingly concede in a captured document that he is "very determined to succeed."

Everyone acknowledges that he is "incorruptible," a rare quality in Saigon these days.

He is Maj. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang, Number Two man in the Vietnamese Army and the man entrusted with the two most vital programs in Vietnam's crucial "other war"—pacification and the elimination of corruption.

General Thang resigned last week, embittered by the failure of the Thieu regime and his fellow officers to support his anti-corruption drive and frustrated by the continuing ineffectiveness of pacification programs to which he has devoted himself tirelessly for more than two years.

The departure of this honest and able Vietnamese from the military regime casts a shadow over persisting official American hopes for reform in Saigon. It calls into question the unwavering public optimism of Rob-

ert E. Komer, who directs American support of the pacification program. And it reinforces the grave doubts about the regime and the "other war" voiced by Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts following his recent visit to Vietnam.

General Thang's resignation adds urgency to Senator Kennedy's demand for "a confrontation between our Government and the Government of South Vietnam on the entire question of corruption, inefficiency, waste of American resources and the future of 'the other war.'"

Dr. Bob Jones, Sr.

#### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., one of the world's greatest evangelists, an educator, a dedicated and devoted American, recently passed on to his eternal reward.

Among the many eulogies and editorial tributes to this great Christian American in the news media of the Nation was the following editorial in his hometown paper, the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., on January 18, 1968:

DR. BOB JONES, SR.

On the day that Dr. Bob Jones, Sr., simply fell asleep after 84 years and a period of declining health, one who had worked with him and loved him most if not all of his adult life summed it up:

"There must have been great rejoicing in Heaven this morning when that old warrior arrived at the gates."

We are sure that sentence, spontaneous and affectionate, aptly sums up the feelings of Dr. Jones' countless friends and admirers, the thousands who had heard him preach and the many more who knew him only by his personal reputation and that of the University he founded and gave his name.

The death of Dr. Jones came as a shock to his family and friends, of course, but it was not unexpected. The atmosphere on the campus is not so much one of mourning as of remembering the extraordinary man as a powerful personality and of tribute to his long and fruitful career.

We were struck by the phrase, "old warrior," used by his longtime associate. In many ways it characterizes Dr. Jones' evangelical ministry which spanned almost exactly the biblically allotted three score years and ten.

So many times have we heard him refer to BJU ministerial students as "our preacher boys" that we suspect, somehow, the phrase stemmed from the fact that he was himself a "boy preacher," speaking from the pulpit at 13 and licensed to preach at 15.

He didn't stop preaching until a short time ago and as a preacher he was, indeed, a warrior. "Dr. Bob" was a man of unshakable fundamentalist beliefs, a born conservative and a fighter by nature. In the defense and extension of his beliefs and in his efforts to achieve his firm purposes he was indomitable and uncompromising.

Those two words applied to his relations with friend and foe alike, and such a man always has his foes. Those characteristics were hallmarks of his evangelistic career.

They were apparent in the founding and building of Bob Jones University. We believe he was the first to call it "the world's most unusual university," which without a doubt it is.

They are reflected, too, in the fact that his son and his grandson are following closely

in his footsteps even while possessing, each in his own right, the individuality which is a part of the Bob Jones legacy.

It would be presumptuous for anyone to attempt to evaluate the life and career of this strong man. For, as long as Bob Jones University stands, as long as there is a Jones of his lineage engaged in evangelism, so long will that career extend.

### Understanding Eartha Kitt

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in all of the comment regarding the recent unfortunate incident at the White House involving Mrs. Johnson and Miss Eartha Kitt it appears that there is no "middle-ground" opinion. One view has it that Miss Kitt was justified in her actions and should not be criticized and the other extreme has it that Miss Kitt was guilty of violating all of the elementary rules of good grace and manners in her confrontation with the President and Mrs. Johnson.

I was interested, therefore, in reading an editorial appearing in the Peoria Journal Star, January 23, 1968, which, while not excusing Miss Kitt, does give some rather perceptive reasons as to why she behaved in such an atrocious manner. The editorial goes on to discuss the quality and style of dissent in general as it has been expressed all over the country in recent months by various individuals and groups in our society who are dissatisfied with this or that aspect of life in this great country of ours.

I include the editorial at this point in my remarks:

#### UNDERSTANDING EARTHA KITT

If Eartha Kitt's taking unfair advantage of her guest status at the White House upset you, consider for a moment that this is a lot better than the times when Miss Kitt wouldn't have been there, and Negroes generally operated under the rule of staying out of sight and sound as much as possible.

"Keep quiet" and "don't bother anybody" was a way of life, and not a good one.

Upon discovery that they can speak up, that they can be heard, that they can complain, and that they can get cheers and sometimes agreement from their complaints, it is certainly true that many Negroes have not only thrown that old rule overboard, but in the freedom of it have gone much farther and thrown away a lot of other rules.

So what have long been regarded as legitimate and "responsible" methods of complaint, and self-imposed social rules as to time and place which have long been followed by the average person in America have also been thrown overboard and violated from time to time.

Each time it sends out a shock wave among all who have always accepted, as a matter of common decency, standards for complaint.

We seem beset these days by young people, ignorant of the long self-imposed standards of fair play in our free society, who throw all rules to the wind when they want to raise Cain about something . . . and show business people, who never understood much about matters of taste, anyway, have been doing likewise, when they have a kick to make.

Miss Kitt is show business, and it isn't

surprising that she doesn't realize there is something cheap in using Mrs. Johnson's prominence and newsworthiness to get attention that she couldn't get on her own.

So, Negroes are not alone in this, but they, alone, have a reason for it.

It must be remembered that Negroes were largely prevented from taking part for a long, long time. They had no practice at complaining, even though they had much to complain about.

It's a new experience and a new freedom. If by the standards of most of us, who have had our own occasions to complain, and have worked out over the generations acceptable ways to go about it, they seem to get "carried away" at times, or to throw in everything they can dream up when "reaching" for a complaint, or to choose a platform or method of complaint that is offensive, and even unfair, we must remember that we came by these standards through practice, and through learning that some ways are more effective, and others just more offensive.

We must remember that they were denied that practice and experience.

They're just getting it now.

It is much better than the old silence.

It will be better still, of course, when it becomes less strident and more specific and constructive . . . when we get working and workable complaints put where they'll do the most good in the manner that can get the fastest action.

That will come as it is finally discovered that there are a great many people willing to work on the nuts and bolts of problems, wherein the real progress comes—and it is more urgent to get down to nuts and bolts than to run in circles enjoying to the fullest the right to complain.

For the mere right to complain is empty if just exercised for its own sake, without skill, judgment and a sense of specific purpose.

Negroes will discover this, just as most of us have.

Youth may not, if pampered as they have been.

And show business apparently never will, because the show business involvement in policy and politics has combined a hopeless and irresponsible mixture of monumental ego and rampant emotions ever since John Wilkes Booth threw aside all sense of reason at Ford Theater in making his political point.

### The World We Want

#### HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an article by AFL-CIO President George Meany in the inaugural issue of International, the new monthly publication of the Seafarers International Union of North America. Mr. Meany calls upon union members to make the great dreams of the American labor movement come true by step-by-step progress "by men willing to work, to sacrifice, to struggle." Mr. Meany's premise is that eloquence is no substitute for action—a principle that has guided the labor movement throughout its history. That principle has also been the watchword of those who have worked most effectively to win better, fuller lives for all Americans. With permission, I now offer Mr. Meany's article, "The World

We Want," for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

#### THE WORLD WE WANT

(By George Meany, President, AFL-CIO)

It is not at all surprising that the Seafarers International Union of North America is discussing "The World We Want."

Every generation of American trade unionists, starting with the Philadelphia cordwainers who united in a brotherhood of workers when the Republic was barely a decade old, has discussed this subject.

They discussed, they decided, they planned and they acted. And in great part each generation has benefited—for trade unionists have never been satisfied with just bettering themselves or their fellow Americans. Their eyes have always been on the future—on the kind of world they would build for their children and their children's children.

So it is today. The SIU and all the unions of the AFL-CIO are dedicated to building a better today. But they also dream of a far, far better tomorrow. And they dare to so dream because they are confident of achievement through a very practical mechanism—the trade union movement itself.

Dreamers, yes. But first of all they are practical men who know dreams can be achieved a step at a time by men willing to work, to sacrifice, to struggle. That is the way to achieve the kind of world I think America wants.

But first, before we can plan for tomorrow, we have to consider where we are today.

Today the rights of labor—the right to organize, to bargain collectively and to strike—are firmly established by law. Although the law is sometimes violated, the violations are subject to legal remedy, imperfect though it may be.

The labor movement itself has grown from a beleaguered handful into an accepted and influential force in American life. Moreover, though our critics are many and noisy, the AFL-CIO is widely recognized as a force for good.

And what a tremendous impact this has had upon American life as a whole!

Especially in the last quarter century, the conditions won by unions at the bargaining-table have spread to many other workers all over the nation. Wages have risen and work weeks have shrunk. Paid vacations and holidays, pensions, health insurance have become standard.

But vastly more important, the basic nature of American society has changed for the better. There is almost universal acceptance of the trade union principle that it is the obligation of the people as a whole, acting through their government, to insure the economic and social well-being of all, to eliminate injustice, to widen opportunities and to sustain a continuing campaign against all barriers to human progress.

To be sure, reactionaries are still among us. But except for a fanatical fringe, even today's reactionaries have come to recognize that it is indeed a duty of government, as the Constitution puts it, "to promote the general welfare."

So we approach the future having achieved many of the goals of the founders of organized labor. And the victories of the past suggest that as we look to the future, we must count no goal too high nor any dream impossible of fulfillment.

Let me list a few of them:

We want a society in which poverty and near-poverty are unknown, remembered only by historians; a society whose every member has a comfortable home, an ample table and full access to the good things of life.

As an essential prerequisite, we want a society in which every person able and willing to work has absolute assurance of a job at decent wages.

Equally essential, we want a society in which there is limitless opportunity for all—

and education, employment and every other avenue.

We want a society in which there is far more leisure time, with far more rewarding ways to fill it—more music and drama, more parks and woodlands, more time to fish and clean streams and rivers to fish in.

Inherent in such a society are many other specifics—retirement early enough to enjoy leisure and with an adequate income to insure that leisure, the best of medical services without financial penalty, the finest schools and colleges with room enough for all and available to all—for without these, the other wants cannot be met.

But the world we want involves more than the perfection of society in the United States. The world we live in is today a small one. There is no spot on earth too remote to be hit by an atomic missile launched anywhere else. So the world we want must also be one in which a free society can be secure. Here, too, there must be no limit to our dreams.

We want a world in which all men, in all nations, will be free—free from tyranny, free from fear, free from poverty and ignorance; free to pursue their own destiny in their own way, free to choose their government and, above all, free to change their minds and change that government.

We want a world of peace—peace based upon freedom, security and progress, upon the abundant well-being of all mankind.

Does all this sound visionary? I hope not. For in the light of where we are and where we have come from, it is less visionary today than the goal of the early trade unionists who sought free public schools a century and a half ago.

Every objective I have cited goes only a little beyond those that are already in sight, if not within reach. Now let us talk about reaching them.

The first step is a hard-headed recognition

that the tallest buildings go up one floor at a time. I do not know of any form of human endeavor, individual or collective, in which it is possible to leap from a dream to its realization without a great deal of hard work in between.

Every calling has its quota of individuals who can't or won't accept this disagreeable fact. I am sure you have your share of youngsters who want to steer the ship without the preliminary toil of learning how to coil a line. There are countless others who see themselves as editors or columnists, but scorn such mundane skills as spelling and grammar. Still others demand immediate acceptance as artisans—electricians, carpenters, plumbers and the like—without ever having learned the trade.

So it is with the world we want. To cite only one example, poverty cannot be abolished by a Congressional declaration of good intentions. Poverty will be abolished only by the combined effect of a vast number of undertakings, involving public works, tax policies, housing, education, social security, public assistance, medical care, unemployment compensation, wage-hour statutes and many more. To those who only dream of the ultimate, who yearn for an instant millennium, many of these undertakings appear to have distressingly limited objectives. But these are the bricks with which the world we want must be built, brick after brick after brick.

These bricks will not be laid in their courses without still another kind of practical, day by day effort—political effort. Keeping precinct card-files, ringing doorbells, baby-sitting for voting mothers on Election Day may be uninspiring drudgery to some who believe that a proper platform for their own eloquence would be more than enough. It would be easier, but it wouldn't win elections.

Although the relationship may appear to be more remote, the same principle applies to world affairs. Human freedom will not be extended to new areas, nor protected where it now prevails, by dramatic gestures or moving appeals. Freedom must be protected the hard way, as young Americans are protecting it now in South Viet Nam. Freedom will be extended only as other peoples, one by one, are inspired by the example of those who enjoy it, and escape from the chains of tyranny. To an even greater degree than in domestic matters, this can come about only step by patient step.

There may be some readers who think I have contradicted myself by urging—as some might put it—big ideas and small actions in pursuing "The World We Want." I disagree.

In summary, my message is this:

Let us never forget that tomorrow is shaped by today. Long ago the AFL-CIO put it this way:

"What we, the citizens of today, do will shape the world our children will inherit tomorrow. If they are to be free and secure and enjoy happiness, we must lay the groundwork. It is to building this better world that the AFL-CIO is dedicated—to the ultimate good of all mankind."

In setting our sights on that world, let none of our dreams be small ones. Let our ultimate goal be the ultimate itself, undefined by doubts or fears or what, in 1967, might seem to be realities.

But as we continue on this quest, as old as the history of man, let us ever be aware that great gains are an accumulation of smaller ones, just as an army's triumph is won by its platoons, its companies and its battalions.

No dream can be too great; no need can be too small. This, I submit, is the road to "The World We Want."

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 31, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Very Reverend Joseph A. Grifferty, O.S.A., pastor of St. Nicholas of Tolentine Church, Bronx, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, You have created man to Your own image and likeness, that he might know You, love You, and serve You. Heavenly Father, You have planted in every human heart love of home and country. Grant that these legislators, through their knowledge and love of You, may serve You and their country to the full extent of their God-given abilities. Enlighten their minds and move their wills so that every decision of theirs may redound to the benefit of our beloved country and bring credit to their solemn deliberations. Left to their own devices, their best efforts for the common good might fall short of their goals, but assisted by Your guidance and help, we are assured of the success of their bipartisan endeavors and this aid we humbly ask through Your benevolent interest in the work of Your dedicated servants. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14563. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide for increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1542. An act to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies.

### DON'T MAKE A MOCKERY OF AMERICAN SACRIFICES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope published reports indicating a willingness by the administration to compromise with the Communists to get to the conference table are incorrect. Cessation of bombing without matching concessions by the Communists is too high a price to pay for negotiations.

There should not be a cessation of bombing until the fighting in the south

by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong forces is stopped. Realistic action by both sides to bring about negotiations would provide reason to anticipate a measure of success at the conference table. Surely those who are eager for negotiations at any price realize that the failure of the Communists to provide a quid pro quo means the fighting would go on indefinitely while endless negotiations take place. This would result in killing more Americans and in raising the eventual price for peace.

### THE BEST WAY TO LOSE A FRIEND IS TO LEND HIM MONEY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed shocking to all Americans, although it came as no great surprise after our earlier experiences, that the North Korean Communists would commit one of the most drastic acts of piracy by seizing a ship and crew of the U.S. Navy in international waters. But the American people are dismayed by this grave insult and by the virtual silence of our erstwhile allies.

It is certain that if we allow North